

THE SOCIALIZATION OF SEX DIFFERENCES IN
INTERPERSONAL PROBLEM SOLVING STYLE

by

GERI ANNE DINO

B.S., Ramapo College, 1977

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1981

Approved by:


Major Professor

SPEC
CDLL
LD
2668
.T4
1981
D56
c. 2

Acknowledgments

A plethora of thanks is extended to my advisor, Dr. Mark A. Barnett for his encouragement, support, and assistance on this project. He combined appropriate amounts of expressive and instrumental advice and had as much patience as I had typographical errors in the manuscript. I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. William Griffitt and Dr. Frank "Skip" Saal for their helpful input on this investigation. Very warm and sincere appreciation is also extended to Kiersten Saal, who served as the very able confederate in these studies. Her acting talents and patience combined to produce realistic tape-recordings of a child experiencing interpersonal problems. I am also grateful to her parents, Cathie Creighton-Saal and Dr. Skip Saal for the use of their home during several taping sessions. Special thanks is given to my mother, Louise Dino, and Jeane "Skip" Phelps for their helpful comments concerning the perspective and thinking of parents, which provided an added insight into the interpretation of some of the findings in the present studies. Appreciation is also extended to Laura King for her assistance in sorting and coding data. Finally, I am most grateful to my family and friends for their support, understanding, and tolerance as I worked on this project; they always seem to go "beyond the call of duty."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	1
List of Tables	iv
Introduction	1
Adult Sex and Sex-Role Stereotypes	2
Sex Stereotypes	3
Stereotypes held by laypersons	3
Stereotypes held by theorists	4
Sex-Role Stereotypes	5
Sex Differences in Expressiveness and Instrumentality	6
Self-Report Personality Measures	6
The BSRI	6
The Personal Attributes Questionnaire	7
Affective experiences	9
Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication	10
Interpersonal Problem Solving	11
Implications of Sex Differences in Expressiveness and Instrumentality for Interpersonal Behavior	13
Sex-Linked Socialization of Expressiveness and Instrumentality: Stereotypes and Practices	15
Stereotypes Concerning the Differing Roles of Mothers and Fathers	16
Stereotypes of Boys' and Girls' Personality and Behavioral Differences	17
Stereotypes of Parents	17
Stereotypes of Childless Adults	18

Sex-Linked Socialization Practices: Parents and	
Childless Adults	19
Socialization Practices of Parents	19
Socialization Practices of Childless Adults	20
Summary: Review and Critique of the Literature	21
Description of Pilot Study and Study 1	22
Pilot Study	22
Study 1	23
Method	26
Results	31
Discussion	36
Study 2	38
Method	42
Results	46
Discussion	52
General Discussion	56
References Notes	62
References	63
Footnotes	72
Appendices	74

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: Mean summary scores for expressive and instrumental responses by Sex of "Parent" and Sex of "Child" for Study 1.
- Table 2: Summary of the 2(Sex of "Parent") x 2(Sex of "Child") x 2(Type of Response) ANOVA on summary scores for Study 1.
- Table 3: Intercorrelations among subjects' PAQ M and F scores and their expressive and instrumental summary scores for Study 1.
- Table 4: Number of subjects in each cell for Study 2.
- Table 5: Mean appropriateness summary scores for expressive and instrumental responses by Sex of Subject, Sex of Parent, and Sex of Child for Study 2.
- Table 6: Summary of the 2(Sex of Subject) x 2(Sex of Parent) x 2(Sex of Child) x 2(Type of Response) ANOVA on appropriateness summary scores for Study 2.
- Table 7: Mean helpfulness summary scores for expressive and instrumental responses by Sex of Subject, Sex of Parent, and Sex of Child for Study 2.
- Table 8: Summary of the 2(Sex of Subject) x 2(Sex of Parent) x 2(Sex of Child) x 2(Type of Response) ANOVA on helpfulness summary scores for Study 2.
- Table 9: Intercorrelations among subjects' PAQ M and F scores and their appropriateness and helpfulness summary scores for Study 2.

The Socialization of Sex Differences in Interpersonal Problem Solving Style

The study of the psychology of sex differences is controversial, the issues often value laden and emotional, and the conclusions of serious social and political concern (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Pervin, 1978). The traditional stereotype assumes that females are expressive and interpersonal, and males instrumental and independent. Evidence of expressive and instrumental differences between males and females in interpersonal problem-solving situations (e.g., Kelly, 1979), verbal (e.g., Haas, 1979) and non-verbal (Frances, 1979) communication styles as well as from general self-report (e.g., Spence & Helmreich, 1979a) concur with these stereotypes. These differences, particularly in interpersonal problem solving style, have important implications for adaptive functioning in a number of significant areas including helping (Latane & Darley, 1970; Schwartz, 1977), leadership and management (Morris & Shaskin, 1976) and child rearing (Shure & Spivack, 1978).

The effects of these sex-linked stereotypes on the socialization of boys and girls has been extensively examined (e.g., Atkinson & Endsley, 1976; Block, 1973; Fagot, 1974; Seavey, Katz, & Zalk, 1975). Although social changes may have reduced the extent to which some blatant stereotypes exist (Weinraub & Brooks-Gunn, Note 4), less obvious sex-linked socialization practices may still prevail. The present studies examined the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style, an important area where subtle sex-linked stereotypes may still be found.

The first study involved male and female undergraduates as hypothetical parents and explored the relative amounts of expressive and instrumental responses given to a "son" or "daughter" experiencing several interpersonal

problems. In the second study, undergraduates' perceptions concerning the sex-role appropriateness and helpfulness of expressive and instrumental parental responses given to sons and daughters was examined. In both studies, the relationship between subjects' responses and their self-reported degree of expressiveness and instrumentality, as measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) was also explored. Sex-linked differences in the use, and rated appropriateness and helpfulness of expressive and instrumental responses, may help increase our understanding of the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style in boys and girls. In addition, by uncovering some subtle forms of stereotyped responding to young children, the continued development of instruction for promoting more egalitarian socialization of boys and girls might be aided.

Adult Sex and Sex-Role Stereotypes

Both common sense and an extensive amount of psychological literature provide evidence for pervasive sex-linked stereotypes (e.g., Block, 1973; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson & Rosencrantz, 1970; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Urberg, 1970, Wesley & Wesley, 1977). Several researchers (Del Boca & Ashmore, 1980; Hoschild, 1973; Spence & Helmreich, 1979a) have distinguished between two categories of stereotypes - sex and sex-role stereotypes. These researchers have defined sex stereotypes as attributed or perceived differences in the personalities of males and females. In contrast, sex-role stereotypes are described as judgments about the appropriateness of various role behaviors for males and females. While there is a considerable amount of research pertaining to sex stereotypes, the literature dealing with sex-role stereotypes is frequently anecdotal, grounded in assumptions, and lacking in empirical validation. Both sets of stereotypes, however, are relevant to the present studies.

Sex Stereotypes

Stereotypes held by laypersons. The results of studies on sex stereotypes indicate that women are generally perceived as expressive and interpersonal while their male counterparts are perceived as instrumental and autonomous (Broverman et al., 1970; Spence & Helmreich, 1978; Urberg, 1979; Wesley & Wesley, 1977). These stereotypes tend to be held by individuals throughout the life cycle (Spence & Helmreich, 1979b; Urberg & Laboivie-Vief, 1976) and concur with the traditional dichotomy of masculine and feminine traits (Hoffman, 1977; Mischel, 1970; Mussen, 1969).

One measure used to assess the stereotypes adults have is the Sex-Role Questionnaire¹ (Rosencrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman & Broverman, 1968). It consists of 122 items describing a wide range of personality traits including expressiveness, autonomy, persistence and independence. Subjects are asked to indicate whether a particular trait is more characteristic of women or men. Women are typically perceived as more emotional, gentle, nurturant and expressive than are men. In contrast, men are typically perceived as more independent, logical, decisive and instrumental than are women (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson & Rosencrantz, 1972; Rosencrantz et al., 1968).

A second measure used to assess sex stereotypes is the Adjective Checklist (Williams & Bennett, 1975). This measure consists of a number of adjectives and the subject's task is to indicate whether the attribute is more characteristic of women or men. Studies employing this measure (Karabetian & Smith, 1977; Williams & Bennett, 1975) have obtained results similar to those studies using the Sex-Role Questionnaire. Women tend to be described as interpersonal and expressive, and men as autonomous and agentic.

Stereotypes held by theorists. Sex stereotypes are not only part of the layperson's theorizing, but the psychologist's as well. Most theories, whether they stress the social, cultural, or biological determinants of behavior, are consistent with the general stereotype that females are expressive and interpersonal while males are instrumental and independent.

David Bakan (1966) proposed a theory which assumes that a fundamental distinction underlies all levels of human existence; the agency-communion polarity. He identifies agency as manifesting itself in self-assertion, the urge to master, and the repression of feeling. Communion is manifested in expressiveness, interpersonal contact and a sense of belonging with others. He contends that men tend to be agentic or action-oriented. Women, he argues, tend to be communal, due to a lack of differentiation between self and others.

Guttman (1965) has explained the difference in masculine and feminine styles as primarily culturally oriented. According to Guttman, men inhabit an impersonal milieu governed by the laws of economics and politics. Women, in contrast, inhabit an interpersonal, family-oriented world governed by forces of feelings and shared experiences. Based on these different "ecologies," he speculates that men and women come to develop different adaptive capacities.

Other theorists, working within a psychoanalytic framework, have described females as "intuitive" and open to the subjective feelings states of others (e.g., Deutsch, 1944). According to Freud (1961), the social interactions of females are guided more by affect than reality considerations. In a recent review, Hoffman (1977) contends that there appear to be no theorists who disagree with the stereotype that females are more expressive and emotional than males.

**THIS BOOK
CONTAINS
NUMEROUS PAGES
WITH THE ORIGINAL
PRINTING BEING
SKEWED
DIFFERENTLY FROM
THE TOP OF THE
PAGE TO THE
BOTTOM.**

**THIS IS AS RECEIVED
FROM THE
CUSTOMER.**

Sex-Role Stereotypes

In addition to the stereotypes about personality differences between males and females, there are stereotypes concerning appropriate and desirable role behaviors for males and females. Studies examining these stereotypes (Elman, Press & Rosencrantz, 1970; Gilbert, Deutsch & Strahan, 1978) have found that appropriate sex-role behaviors for women include nurturance, interpersonal orientation and emotional responsiveness. For men, appropriate behaviors include dominance and independence in problem situations. Gilbert et al. (1978) examined college students' perceptions of the ideal man and the ideal woman. Both sexes agreed that it is desirable for men to be high on stereotypically masculine traits and low on stereotypically feminine traits. While male subjects endorsed the opposite pattern for women, female subjects indicated that it is desirable for a woman to be equal on masculine and feminine traits. Gilbert et al. concluded that sex role stereotypes are alive and well and that the attitude that these stereotypes are becoming less prevalent may be more in the "eye of the researcher" than in the "heads of subjects."

In summary, women are typically perceived as expressive, interpersonal, nurturant, and dependent while their male counterparts are typically viewed as active, instrumental, and independent. In addition, there is some evidence which suggests that the stereotypes which individuals have concerning the appropriate behaviors for males and females (sex-role stereotypes) are consistent with the prevailing sex stereotypes. As with all stereotypes, however, questions arise as to what degree they appear to reflect relatively veridical generalizations about the personalities of individuals, and to what extent they are merely commonly held "myths".

In line with this concern, a review of the evidence bearing on expressive and instrumental differences between men and women will be presented next.

Sex Differences in Expressiveness and Instrumentality

Included in the vast literature on sex differences are a number of studies that directly examine differences in expressive and instrumental attributes and behaviors in men and women. These studies have examined very global personality differences by relying on self-report as well as more specific behavioral aspects involving verbal and nonverbal communication styles and interpersonal problem solving.

Self-report Personality Measures

A large amount of the evidence that is used to support sex differences in expressive and instrumental traits is based on general self-report personality measures. Several investigators, using a wide variety of instruments, have reported results which indicate that women are likely to characterize themselves as expressive, interpersonally-oriented and dependent, while males describe themselves as action-oriented, decisive, and independent (Bem, 1979; Spence & Helmreich, 1978, 1979a; Wesley, Wesley, 1977).

Two of the most commonly used self-report measures of sex differences in personality are the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) developed by Sandra Bem (1974) and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) developed by Spence, Helmreich and Stapp (1974). Each of these instruments contains separate, structurally orthogonal, scales for the measurement of masculinity and femininity. Although the development of both measures was guided by similar theoretical assumptions, there are certain critical differences.

The BSRI. The BSRI is a very general measure of masculinity and femininity based on items originally selected from the Adjective Checklist

(Williams & Bennett, 1975). The BSRI has been designed to assess the extent to which the commonly held definitions of desirable masculine and feminine attributes are reflected in an individual's self description (Bem, 1979). Bem maintains that the primary goal of the BSRI is to measure and facilitate the investigation of within-sex, rather than between-sex, differences. Nevertheless, males and females have been shown to differ markedly on this measure. Females generally score substantially higher on feminine attributes than males. Males, on the other hand, generally score significantly higher on masculine attributes than do women (Bem, 1979).

The Personal Attributes Questionnaire. The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence & Helmreich, 1974), in contrast to the BSRI, is a measure of relatively restricted content, containing items describing the personality traits of expressiveness and instrumentality. Since the PAQ specifically measures these two dispositions, it is of particular relevance to the present investigation. The PAQ Masculinity (M) scale consists of a series of trait descriptions, each stereotypically more characteristic of males than females, but socially desirable to some degree in both. The Femininity (F) scale consists of trait descriptions more characteristic of females than males, but also socially desirable to some extent for both sexes. Studies employing the PAQ have frequently classified subjects into one of four categories using median splits on each of the two scales: masculine (high M, low F), feminine (low M, high F), androgynous (high M, high F), and undifferentiated (low M, low F). It has been found that the majority of males are classified as masculine and the majority of females are categorized as feminine (Spence & Helmreich, 1979a, b).

Spence and Helmreich (1978) maintain that the PAQ measures dispositions which have a considerable influence on behavior. Studies by Wertheim, Widom, & Wortzel (1978) and Spence and Helmreich (1978) have shown a relationship between an individual's standing on the PAQ and his/her choice of a traditionally masculine and feminine career. Helmreich, Spence, and Holohan (1979) have also found that masculine women are more dominant in same-sex problem-solving groups than are androgynous, feminine or undifferentiated women.

Helmreich et al. (1979) contend that since the PAQ is a dispositional measure of expressiveness and instrumentality, one's standing on the PAQ should be, at best, only minimally related to one's activity preferences and sex-role attitudes when the behaviors under investigation do not specifically involve expressiveness and instrumentality. Several studies have demonstrated that this is the case. For example, Helmreich et al. (1979) explored the relationship between an individual's PAQ category and his/her preference for sex-linked activities such as nailing two boards together and folding a napkin, which do not involve expressive or instrumental skills. As expected, only minimal relationships were found between PAQ category and activity preferences. Other studies which have been correlational in nature (rather than utilizing the four PAQ categories) have examined the relationship between individuals' M and F scores on the PAQ and their sex-role attitudes. For example, Spence and Helmreich (1978) examined the correlations between individual's M and F scores on the PAQ and their scores on the Attitude Towards Women Scale (AWS; Spence & Helmreich, 1972). The AWS is a global measure of attitudes towards the rights and roles of women, and includes items which are not specifically expressive or instrumental in nature. This study

reported only weak relationships between subjects M and F scores on the PAQ and the AWS.

In summary, the PAQ has been designed to measure a limited set of socially desirable expressive and instrumental personality traits. Spence and Helmreich (1979a, b) maintain that the dispositions which the PAQ measures should be related to the tendency to exhibit either expressive or instrumental behaviors. They also contend that an individual's standing on the PAQ should be only minimally related to his/her activity preferences and sex-role attitudes when these preferences and attitudes do not specifically involve expressiveness or instrumentality. Unlike past research, the present studies explored the relationships between individuals' M and F scores on the PAQ and judgments about behaviors which are specifically expressive and instrumental in nature. The first study investigated whether subjects' F and M scores on the PAQ are related to their preferences to offer expressive and instrumental responses to (hypothetical) children seeking advice. The second study examined the relationship between individuals' F and M scores on the PAQ and their attitudes concerning the appropriateness and helpfulness of expressive and instrumental parental responses to offspring.

Affective experiences. A second area where sex differences have been found using self report is in descriptions of affective experiences. Carlson (1971) tested the agency-communion formulation of Bakan (1966) by analyzing the verbal descriptions of various affects as experienced by men and women. College students cited critical incidents in their lives regarding the positive affects of joy, excitement, and surprise and the negative affects of shame, fear, anger, and disgust. The responses of men were found to be more self-, action-, and task-oriented (agentic) than

were those of women. The responses of women tended to be characterized by expressive and interpersonal themes (communal). In addition, significantly more men than women were categorized as agentic, and significantly more women than men were categorized as communal, based on their overall response pattern. Thus, the sex differences found in self-reported affective experiences parallel those found using self-report personality measures.

Verbal and Non-Verbal Communication

In the area of verbal communication, most studies have focused on verbal interactions in heterosexual couples. In a study by Heiss (1962), unmarried couples were given various topics to discuss and the content of their verbal interactions was analyzed. It was found that women tended to show more interpersonally-oriented behaviors than men, including agreeing with their partners and giving positive feedback. Men, on the other hand, tended to dominate the task-oriented aspects of the discussion, including asking direct questions and guiding the direction of the conversation. Similar results were found by Borgatta and Simpson (1972) using basically the same procedure. These findings may be viewed in two ways. From one perspective, they may reflect the traditional expressive-instrumental distinction between men and women. From a related point of view, they may also reflect differences in social power within the groups, with men occupying the dominant power position.

Aries (Note 1) reported that in single and mixed-sex groups, males responded more to the task confronting the group than did women and also had difficulty in responding to the interpersonal demands of the situation. Females, in contrast, were oriented more towards the interpersonal, rather than task-related, aspects of the situation.

The reported tendency for women to focus on feelings and men on action in interpersonal situations may be part of a sex difference in communication

style. In her review of the literature on sex differences in language use, Haas (1979) concluded that women's speech is more often supportive and expressive, and characterized by a focus on feelings and psychological state, than is men's speech. On the other hand, men's speech tends to be loquacious and directive, focusing on external objects and action.

In addition to verbal behavior, sex differences have been found in non-verbal communication. Several investigators have found that women tend to engage in more smiling, laughing, and greater eye contact than do men (Exline & Winters, 1965; Frances, 1979). These findings have been interpreted to mean that women are more oriented toward interpersonal factors in a relationship than are men. In addition, these findings may be due to the fact that these behaviors are more often expressed by individuals of either sex (typically females) who are in a subordinate power position (Johnson, 1976; Lockheed & Hall, 1976).

Interpersonal Problem Solving

A number of studies have examined sex differences in interpersonal problem solving in both adults and children. A recent study by Kelly (1979) found sex differences in comments made during interpersonal conflicts. Undergraduate couples were asked to report how likely it would be for each member of the pair to say a particular comment; the comments were typical of those that might be stated in an interpersonal conflict. The female of the pair was reported by both sexes to be more likely than the male to cry, sulk, or criticize her partner for not considering her feelings. The male of the pair was reported by both sexes to be more likely than the female to show anger, reject his partner's emotional expression, and to employ a rational, rather than emotional, approach to understanding the problem.

These findings are consistent with those of a second study (cited in Kelly, 1979). Undergraduate couples were given a list of interpersonal behaviors that would frequently occur in an interpersonal relationship, such as discussing feelings. The members of each couple were asked to judge whether a particular item was more characteristic of themselves or their partners. Both sexes agreed that during the discussion of interpersonal problems the woman gives more emphasis to communication about feelings and expresses more concern about the problem than the man does. Men were judged as both more likely to focus on their own concerns relative to some external task (e.g., work), and as more likely to assert superior authority and information, than were women.

The tendency for adult females to focus on feelings in interpersonal problem situations while their male counterparts focus on action, has also been found in a study which explored children's responses to other youngsters experiencing various problems. In an experiment by Hoffman and Levine (1976), young boys and girls were presented with several hypothetical situations via videotapes. In each situation, a young child, the same sex as the subject was experiencing a problem. Two of the situations involved a personal problem, and another involved an interpersonal problem. After each situation, the child was asked, "How do you feel?". In spite of the explicit request for a feeling response, it was found that boys, but not girls, tended to give a large percentage of action-oriented, instrumental responses (e.g., "I'd call the police", in response to a situation in which the story character was unjustly accused of breaking a window). Hoffman and Levine suggest that giving an instrumental response to a feeling request may indicate a "... preexisting orientation toward instrumental action. The boys' responses may thus reflect a tendency to act rather than feel in interpersonal situations" (p. 558).

In summary, the available evidence suggests that women are more likely than men to describe themselves as expressive, emotional and dependent. In contrast, men tend to describe themselves as independent, assertive, and action-oriented. Research exploring sex differences in verbal and non-verbal communication, and in interpersonal problem situations, provides evidence consistent with these self descriptions. Thus, the research on sex differences in expressiveness and instrumentality closely parallels the sex and sex-role stereotypes which state that women are and should be expressive, and men are and should be instrumental.

Implications of Sex Differences in Expressiveness
and Instrumentality for Interpersonal Behavior

The existence of expressive and instrumental personality and behavioral differences between males and females has significant and serious implications for effective functioning in a number of important areas, such as interpersonal relations, helping, leadership, and child rearing. Although these areas are at first glance quite diverse, they may all be considered as part of general interpersonal problem solving.

Effective interpersonal problem-solving skills have been used as an index of overall psychological adjustment (Anthony, 1973; Pierce & Dragson, 1969; Shure & Spivack, 1978). Horowitz (1979) reports that many of the problems presented by clients in psychotherapy stem from deficiencies in interpersonal relating and problem solving. A number of clinicians and theorists using various models (e.g., Carkhuff, 1972; Gelatt, 1962; Gordon, 1970; Katz, 1966) describe effective problem solving as consisting of several stages which include the exploration of feelings, values and attitudes (requiring expressive skills), and the active planning of solutions and

ameliorative action (requiring instrumental skills). These writers also maintain that any attempt at helping an individual deal with an interpersonal problem must include these basic features.

In addition to clinical models of helping, Schwartz (1977) and Latane and Darley (1970) have proposed general models of helping in everyday situations which include, among other factors, (a) an awareness of another's need for help, (b) the perception that there is some action which could alleviate that need and (c) recognition of one's own ability to provide relief. Factor (a) may be considered an expressive skill which involves sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others. The final two steps are concerned with ameliorative action and may be considered to involve instrumental skills.

Another area in which both expressive and instrumental skills are considered crucial is in effective leadership and management. Morris and Shaskin (1976) describe a model of effective problem solving for supervisors and managers in organizational settings which includes the same general stages as in the problem-solving models suggested by clinicians. According to Morris and Shaskin, the first step in effective organizational problem solving is to have the various parties involved share their concerns, attitudes and feelings about the problem. The second stage involves generating and implementing appropriate ameliorative action.

Other investigators have also emphasized the importance of both expressive and instrumental skills in dealing with marital difficulties (L. Barnett & Neitzel, 1979) and child rearing (Shure & Spivack, 1978). Various programs for parents, such as Parent Effectiveness Training (Gordon, 1970), stress the importance of both dealing with the child's feelings and helping the child to develop appropriate solutions.

Bakan (1966) has described the importance of a combination of expressive and instrumental skills by stating that a strong sense of agency (instrumental orientation) unmitigated by a sense of communion (expressive orientation) is destructive to the individual and society. Similarly, communion must be mitigated by agency in order for the individual to function effectively. He contends that the major developmental task of males is to learn to balance agency with some degree of communion, and for females to balance communion with some degree of agency.

In summary, it appears that both expressive and instrumental skills are crucial for successful interpersonal problem solving in a variety of areas. This implies that the individual who possesses both types of skills would be the most adept problem solver. Yet, the available evidence suggests that females are stereotyped as, and tend to show, predominately expressive behaviors while males are stereotyped as, and tend to show, primarily instrumental behaviors. These differences reflect and, no doubt, are influenced by the prevailing sex-role stereotypes that women should be expressive (i.e., feel) and men should be instrumental (i.e., act). However, if both expressive and instrumental behaviors are necessary for effective interpersonal problem solving, such stereotypes and differences may lead to considerable difficulty for both males and females in a variety of areas (Bem, 1979; Spence and Helmreich, 1979a).

Sex-linked Socialization of Expressiveness and Instrumentality: Stereotypes and Practices

Studies examining various aspects of sex-linked socialization are quite prevalent in the literature. Given the existence of pervasive sex differences in expressive and instrumental behaviors, exploring antecedent conditions which might contribute to these behavioral differences is of particular importance.

Three major foci will be discussed in the following section: (1) theorizing concerning stereotypes about the differing roles of mothers and fathers in child rearing, (2) research examining stereotypes about the differences in personalities and behaviors of boys and girls and (3) sex-linked socialization of boys and girls. With respect to the third focus, the sex of the socializing agent, whether parent or another adult, has also been explored.

Stereotypes Concerning the Differing Roles of Mothers and Fathers

Parsons and Bales (1955) and Johnson (1963) have described sex-roles in the family as a group phenomenon. They maintain that the family, like any other social group, requires some of its members to serve expressive functions while other members are needed to perform the instrumental roles. The expressive function deals with the internal affairs of the family including responsiveness to the feelings and concerns of the members and the harmonious relations among them. The instrumental role, on the other hand, involves acting as a liaison between the family and the environment, meeting the adaptive functions of maintenance and equilibrium in relation to goal objects. Although Parsons and Bales suggest that males and females in the family may serve both functions, it is the mother and daughter(s) who primarily serve the expressive function while it is the father and son(s) who primarily serve the instrumental role. Parsons and Bales suggest that parental roles must be differentiated along an expressive-instrumental continuum for the child to acquire proper sex-role identification. This identification, according to these theorists, is seen as a process that ensures the continued filling of expressive and instrumental roles necessary for the society to function.

In addition to the theorizing of Parsons and Bales, Russo (1976) contends that there is also a general stereotype which states that the primary

care of the children belongs to the mother and the economic support of the family to the father. In addition to this general stereotype, more specific stereotypes about parental behaviors have been found. For example, a recent study (Shepard, 1980) explored college students' perceptions of their parents. Mothers were seen as more nurturant and concerned with feelings than were fathers. In contrast, fathers were perceived as more demanding and apt to exhibit a lack of concern for feelings than were mothers-perhaps, Shepard suggests, indicating a greater concern by fathers for instilling instrumental skills. One purpose of the present studies was to assess whether people perceive it to be appropriate for a mother to be predominately expressive and a father to be predominately instrumental in dealing with their children's interpersonal problems.

Stereotypes about Boys' and Girls' Personality and Behavioral Differences

Also relevant to the present studies is research concerning the stereotypes adults have about personality and behavioral differences between boys and girls. Unfortunately, only a handful of studies have examined this issue.

Stereotypes of parents. The results of a study by Block (1973) suggest that parents express different values in rearing their sons and daughters. She found that parents tend to stress achievement, self-aggrandizement, and assertion for their sons; for girls, the emphasis is on interpersonal relatedness, protection, and support.

Similar results have been found by Atkinson and Endsley (1976). Parents of young boys and parents of young girls were presented with a questionnaire which contained a series of hypothetical situations involving their son or daughter interacting with the parent or other persons in ways prejudged by the investigators to be more typical of males or females.

It was found that parents liked more, more often encouraged, and thought it was more important to encourage stereotypically "feminine" behaviors (e.g., seeking parental affection) in daughters than in sons and stereotypically "masculine" behaviors (e.g., walking home from school independently) in sons than in daughters.

Stereotypes of childless adults. Several studies have examined the sex-related stereotyping of children by childless adults. This method is particularly useful for assessing stereotypes because individuals may be more likely to admit and express stereotyped judgments about the personalities of boys and girls, in general, than they would if they were describing the personality of their own child. In addition, several studies have found that childless adults' attitudes about children and child rearing may reflect how these individuals later act toward their own sons and daughters. For example, Moss (1975) and Moss and Robson (1968) found that newlywed women's perceptions and attitudes about babies expressed two years prior to the birth of their children significantly predicted the women's actual behavior toward their infants.

Fagot (1974) examined the attitudes of college student nonparents about the appropriate play activities for boys and girls. It was found that roughhouse and aggressive play were perceived as appropriate for boys while playing dolls, dressup, and looking in the mirror were considered appropriate for girls.

In a study by Condry and Condry (1976), undergraduate nonparents rated the videotaped behavior of a nine-month-old infant dressed in a yellow outfit, and described as either a boy or a girl. A major finding was that the students attributed different emotions to the infant based on assigned sex alone. For example, in one situation where the infant was crying, the "boy" was frequently described as "angry" and the "girl" as "afraid".

The evidence concerning both parents' and nonparents' stereotypes about boys and girls are important in that these stereotypes may guide and be reflected in the sex-linked socialization of specific behaviors such as interpersonal problem solving. Thus, the conditioned rewards, incentives, and sanctions given to sex-appropriate and sex-inappropriate interpersonal problem solving behaviors of boys and girls may be affected by these stereotypes.

Sex-Linked Socialization Practices: Parents and Childless Adults

Socialization practices of parents. As the prior review indicates, sex differences have frequently been found in the important area of interpersonal problem solving. In spite of the consistency of these findings, few studies have examined the sex-linked socialization of boys and girls which might contribute to these differences. Most of the studies which have examined problem solving in children have focused on task-oriented behaviors such as how parents interact with their child while he/she is putting a toy together or solving word problems (e.g., Rothbart, 1971; Rothbart & Maccoby, 1966; Rothbart & Rothbart, 1976). These studies have found that help seeking is more often reinforced in girls than in boys. Rothbart and Rothbart (1976) contend that since girls are more often reinforced for help seeking in the home, they are more likely than boys to seek help outside the home and thus gain less experience in independent problem solving. This contention is supported by the findings of Crandall and Rabson (1960) who found that girls seek help in the classroom more than boys do. Although in one sense help seeking may be considered an instrumental act, it appears to be instrumental only in the sense of getting someone else to solve the problem rather than independently attempting a solution.

In contrast to studies which have found gender-related socialization practices, Shure and Spivack (1972, 1978) examined the socialization of interpersonal problem solving skills and found no differences in responses given to sons and daughters. However, only the mother-child interaction was examined in these investigations.

Socialization practices of childless adults. Seavey, Katz, and Zalk (1975) gave adult nonparents the opportunity to interact and play with an infant described as a boy, girl, or simply "a baby" with sex unspecified. It was found that the adults used sex-stereotyped toys when playing with the "boy" and "girl". In the condition where the infant's sex was unspecified, adults of both sexes attributed maleness or femaleness to the infant based on stereotyped cues such as strength and fragility.

Also relevant to the present studies is whether mothers and fathers differ in the ways they respond to their sons and daughters. M. Barnett, King, Howard, and Dino (1980), examined the extent to which parents (1) were affectionate with their children and (2) emphasized the feelings of others in discipline and non-discipline situations. Mothers reported engaging in more affectionate interaction with their children and emphasizing feelings to a greater extent than did fathers. These findings concur with those of other studies which have found that mothers (1) tend to be more affectionate with their children (Goldberg & Lewis, 1969; Noller, 1980) and (2) focus more on the intentions, needs, and feelings of others in discipline situations (Bearison, 1979) than do fathers.

In a retrospective study of undergraduates' early socialization experiences (M. Barnett, Howard, King, and Dino, 1980) it was demonstrated mothers were rated as having been significantly more affectionate and as having emphasized feelings to a greater extent than were fathers. It

was also found that while fathers were rated as having had discussed feelings with sons and daughters to a similar extent, mothers were rated as having had discussed feelings with daughters to a greater extent than they had with sons.

In summary, research on sex-linked socialization has demonstrated that both parents and non-parents emphasize different values and respond differently to boys and girls in accordance with prevailing sex-linked stereotypes. However, little is known about the sex-linked socialization of interpersonal problem solving style. This gap in the literature is of particular concern in light of the evidence presented earlier which indicates that males and females differ in their approaches to interpersonal problems.

Summary: Review and Critique of the Literature

There is a plethora of evidence indicating that sex and sex-role stereotypes can have pervasive and powerful influences on behavior (e.g., Broverman et al., 1972; Kublinsky, Cruse, & Sugawara, 1978; Mischel, 1970; Newman & Newman, 1978; Wesley & Wesley, 1977). The traditional stereotypes assume that males and females are and should be expressive, and males are and should be instrumental (Broverman et al., 1972; Elman et al., 1970; Gilbert et al., 1978; Spence & Helmreich, 1979; Wesley & Wesley, 1977). Studies examining expressive and instrumental differences between males and females in a variety of areas including communication style (Haas, 1979) and interpersonal problem solving (Kelly, 1979, Kelly & Thibault, 1978) report findings consistent with these stereotypes.

Moreover, there is considerable evidence indicating that both parents and non-parents emphasize different values (Atkinson & Endsley, 1976; Block,

1973) and respond differently (e.g., M. Barnett, Howard, King, & Dino, 1980; Baumrind, Note 2; Bearison, 1979; Fagot, 1978; Seavey, Katz & Zalk, 1975) to boys and girls in accordance with prevailing sex and sex-role stereotypes. In addition to these sex-linked differences in socialization, there may also be stereotypes which influence the ways that adults differentially respond to boys and girls in situations where there are no blatant norms for sex-appropriate behavior, such as when the child has an interpersonal problem.

The development of effective interpersonal problem solving skills is considered to be crucial for healthy psychological adjustment (Anthony, 1973; Pierce & Dragson, 1969; Shure & Spivack, 1978). A number of researchers and clinicians maintain that effective interpersonal problem solving includes the ability to be empathic and sensitive to the feelings of others (requiring expressive skills) and the ability to generate solutions and plan ameliorative action (requiring instrumental skills). Since both abilities are deemed important for successful problem solving, the findings which indicate that females are encouraged and tend to be expressive while males are encouraged and tend to be instrumental are of considerable significance. Therefore, knowledge concerning the influence of sex-linked stereotypes in the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style may enhance our understanding of sex differences in this important area of social functioning.

Description of Pilot Study and Study 1

Pilot Study

An initial attempt to explore the sex-linked socialization of interpersonal problem solving style was a pilot study by Dino and Barnett (Note 3).

This study involved undergraduates as hypothetical parents and explored the types of responses given to a "daughter" or "son" experiencing an interpersonal problem.² Each subject was asked to imagine that he/she was the parent of either a 7-year-old girl or boy and was presented with a tape recording of her/his child describing an interpersonal problem that had recently occurred. Subjects were given the opportunity to respond in an open-ended, written manner to the tape recording of the child. Individual responses were coded as expressive (focusing on feelings), instrumental (focusing on action), or other (neither expressive nor instrumental). Two independent raters coded the responses and agreed on 98% of their judgments; disagreements were settled by a third rater. Tests of simple main effects indicated that (1) "sons" received a significantly greater proportion of instrumental responses than did "daughters", (2) "fathers" offered a significantly greater proportion of instrumental responses than did "mothers", and (3) while "daughters" received a significantly greater proportion of expressive responses than instrumental responses, a trend in the opposite direction was found for "sons". Thus, a consistent pattern of sex differences was found in the types of responses given and received by males and females.

In spite of the consistency in these findings, there was a major difficulty with the pilot study. Due largely to the open-ended nature of the response measure, approximately 50% of the subjects' responses could not be categorized as either expressive or instrumental. In addition, only one interpersonal problem situation was used.

Study 1

As in the pilot, Study 1 involved male and female undergraduates as hypothetical parents, and explored the types of responses given to a "son"

or "daughter" experiencing interpersonal problems. Each subject was asked to imagine that he/she was the parent of either a young girl or boy and listened to tape recordings of his/her "child" describing three interpersonal problems. Following each tape recording, each subject was asked to indicate how likely he/she would be to respond to his/her "child" in a particular way. Four possible responses (two expressive and two instrumental), obtained through pilot testing, were presented to the subjects. Based on his/her responses to the hypothetical situations, each subject received two scores indicating the extent to which he/she favored giving (1) expressive and (2) instrumental responses. Of special interest were the relationships among subjects' expressive and instrumental scores, the sex of the "parent" , and sex of the "child".

Prior evidence has suggested that parents and nonparents emphasize different values (Block, 1973); Fagot, 1974) and respond differently (e.g., M. Barnett, King, Howard, & Dino, 1980; Bearison, 1979; Fagot, 1973, 1978; Seavey, Katz & Zalk, 1975) to boys and girls along traditional stereotyped lines. In general, an interpersonal orientation and sensitivity to the feelings of others are stressed for girls, while independence and mastery are emphasized for boys. Therefore, a significant Sex of "Child" x Type of Response interaction was predicted. It was expected that (1) "daughters" would be more likely than "sons" to receive expressive (E) responses, (2) "sons" would be more likely than "daughters" to receive instrumental (I) responses (3) "daughters" would be more likely to receive E than I responses, and (4) "sons" would be more likely to receive I than E responses.

Studies examining sex differences in communication style (Frances, 1979; Haas, 1979) and, in particular, interpersonal problem solving style (Kelly, 1979) have demonstrated that women tend to focus on the feelings, needs,

and intentions of self and others (expressive orientation) while men tend to focus on task-related aspects of the situation, such as generating solutions and planning ameliorative action (instrumental orientation). In addition, several studies (M. Barnett, Howard, King, & Dino, 1980; M. Barnett, King, Howard, & Dino, 1980; Bearison, 1979) have found that mothers tend to focus more on the intentions, needs & feelings of others than do fathers in both discipline and non-discipline situations. Therefore, a significant Sex of "Parent" x Type of Response interaction was expected. It was predicted that (1) "mothers" would be more likely than "fathers" to give E responses, (2) "fathers" would be more likely than "mothers" to give I responses, (3) "mothers" would be more likely to give E responses than I responses, and (4) "fathers" would be more likely to give I than E responses.

The Sex x "Parent" x Sex of "Child" x Type of Response interaction was also explored. Several studies have found that males and females emphasize similar values (Atkinson & Endsley, 1976) and respond similarly (Baumrind, 1974; Fagot, 1974; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967) to one another when dealing with boys and girls. In contrast, other studies (M. Barnett, Howard, King, & Dino, 1980; Bearison, 1979, Noller, 1980; Seavey, Katz & Zalk, 1975) have reported differences in the ways that males and females respond to boys and girls. For example, M. Barnett, King, Howard & Dino (1980) found that while undergraduates rated fathers as having discussed feelings with sons and daughters to a similar extent, mothers were rated as having discussed feelings with daughters to a greater extent than with sons. Since the relevant findings are inconsistent, no predictions involving this interaction were made.

A secondary focus of Study 1 was to examine the relationships among subjects' F and M scores on the PAQ and their tendencies to offer expressive

and instrumental responses, respectively. Studies which have explored the relationships between individual's F and M scores on the PAQ and their sex-role attitudes (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) and activity preferences (Helmreich et al., 1979) have utilized behaviors which are neither expressive nor instrumental in nature; as expected, only weak relationships were found. In contrast to past research, the present investigation examined judgments about behaviors which specifically involve expressiveness and instrumentality. Since the present studies directly explore expressive and instrumental behaviors, the PAQ may be a better predictor of subjects' judgments in this study, than it has been in the past.

METHOD

Development and Pretesting of Stimuli

The situation used in the pilot study (Dino & Barnett, Note 3) generated an approximately equal number of expressive and instrumental responses. In order to obtain additional interpersonal problem situations, in which both expressive and instrumental responses could reasonably be given, two pretests were conducted. The first pretest involved an open-ended response procedure identical to that utilized in the pilot study, with the exception that four additional interpersonal problem situations were employed. This pretesting yielded two situations which generated an approximately equal number of expressive and instrumental responses. These two situations, along with the situation used in the pilot study, constituted the three situations used in the present investigation.³ Based on subjects' open-ended responses, two expressive and two instrumental responses were constructed for each of the three situations. These responses contained "the gist" of the two most commonly given expressive and

instrumental responses for that situation. In order to verify that these responses were clearly expressive and instrumental, the second phase of pretesting was conducted (see Appendix A for a copy of the situations and responses used in the second phase of pretesting). In this testing, undergraduates were presented with each of the three situations used in Study 1 (plus the additional situation). The situations were presented as hypothetical parent-child interactions with the sex of the parent and sex of the child unspecified. Following each situation were the four responses designed for that situation. These responses were described as comments a parent might make to his/her child experiencing the particular problem. The subjects were asked to rate each response by indicating the extent to which they thought it was (1) expressive and (2) instrumental. An expressive response was defined for the subjects as one which contained reference to the feelings of the parent, child, or other(s) in the situation. An instrumental response was described for the subjects as a response which focused on what the child could actively do to solve the problem. Subjects made their ratings using 5-point scales ranging from 1 (not at all expressive/instrumental) to 5 (very expressive/instrumental).⁴ t-tests were computed to compare the mean expressive and instrumental ratings for each response. All t-tests were found to be significant in the desired direction ($p < .001$ for all tests). In summary, the pretesting yielded three situations, each with four responses. Of these four responses, two were verified as expressive and two as instrumental.

Subjects, Experimenter, and Confederate

Thirty-eight male and 38 female undergraduates at Kansas State University participated in Study 1. The subjects received experimental

credit for their participation. The subjects were divided evenly into two Sex of "Child" (son, daughter) conditions, with 19 males and 19 females in each. The primary investigator, a female graduate student, served as the experimenter. A 7-year-old female confederate described three interpersonal problem situations obtained from the pretesting. These descriptions were tape recorded and served as the primary stimuli in the study.

Materials

The materials consisted of the three interpersonal problem situations described by the confederate, a cassette tape recorder and a five-page questionnaire (see Appendix B for a copy of this questionnaire; the version used in the "daughter" condition is supplied). The first page of the questionnaire contained a set of instructions. For one half of the subjects, the instructions contained information about a 7-year-old girl; for the other half, the instructions referred to a 7-year-old boy. Pages two through five contained the three interpersonal problem situations used in the present study, plus the additional situation. Following each hypothetical situation were the two expressive and two instrumental responses designed for that situation. The order of the situations randomly varied in each experimental session. In addition, the order of expressive and instrumental responses also was randomly varied across the three situations.

Procedure

Obtaining the PAQ scores

At the beginning of the Spring, 1980 semester, students in the General Psychology classes at Kansas State University were given a packet of questionnaires, one of which was the 24-item version of the PAQ (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1974; see Appendix C). The M and F scores for most⁵ of the subjects who participated in Study 1 were obtained at this time.

Experimental Sessions

The experimental sessions were conducted in a small classroom at Kansas State University. The subjects were run in small mixed-sex groups of two to ten individuals. Each subject was given a questionnaire. For subjects in the son condition, the questionnaire contained information about a 7-year-old boy. For subjects in the daughter condition, the questionnaire referred to a 7-year-old girl. The experimenter began each session by introducing herself and the study, and then continued with the following instructions:

The first page of the questionnaire which you have on your desk is a set of instructions. I will read them aloud and please follow along.

The questionnaire attached to these instructions is part of a study that will hopefully expand our knowledge of the ways that adults, particularly parents, interact with young children. This study is just in the beginning stages and later studies will be conducted using actual parents and children. Since most of you are or will be parents in the future, the information that you provide will be useful in shaping the course of further investigations.

The questionnaire contains four hypothetical situations typical of the kind that parents are often confronted with. For each situation, I would like you to imagine that you are the parent of a 7-year-old girl (boy). In the various situations, you are to imagine that you are alone with your daughter (son). In each situation, you will hear a tape recording of your daughter (son) telling you of an

incident that just happened. The questionnaire also has a written version of what your daughter (son) will tell you in each situation so that you may read along with the tape recording.

Following each situation is a list of four responses that a parent might give to his or her child experiencing the particular problem. Below each response is a scale from 1 (not likely at all) to 5 (very likely). For each response, please indicate how likely you think you would be to give each particular response to your daughter (son). For example, if you think you would be very likely to give a particular response to your daughter (son), you would circle the "5". If you think that you would not be likely at all to give a particular response, circle the "1". If you think you would be somewhat likely to give a particular response, circle the "3", etc. Each response should be considered separately and not as part of an overall message that a parent may give.

Before we begin, let me assure you that there are no right or wrong answers on this task- we are just interested in what you think. After you have finished responding to the fourth situation, please wait for further instructions. Thank you, in advance, for your participation. Does anyone have any questions?

If there were no questions, the experimenter continued by reading background information pertaining to the first situation for that group. An

example of one situation is as follows:

Your daughter (son) comes inside the house while you are alone, sits down beside you and says the following:

At this point, the experimenter turned on the tape recorder, and the 7-year-old confederate stated:

I had a fight with my best friend, Terry, today. We were fighting about the rules of a new game. We yelled at each other and called each other names. Now I don't know if we're still best friends.

After hearing the confederate's description of the situation, the experimenter once again instructed the subjects to indicate how likely they believed they would be to give each of the responses listed below the situation. They were reminded to circle the appropriate numbers on the scales provided. When all the subjects had finished responding to the first situation, the experimenter continued with the remaining situations for that group, following the same procedure. After the subjects had finished responding to the fourth situation, the experimenter asked them to provide the following information on the back of the last page of the questionnaire: their sex, and whether or not they had any children.⁶ The questionnaires were then collected; the subjects were fully debriefed, thanked once again, and any questions regarding the nature or purpose of the study were answered. Finally, the experimenter requested that the subjects not discuss the experiment with any other students since they might be participating in later sessions.

RESULTS

A summary score for each type of response (E and I) was obtained for each subject. This was computed by summing the likelihood ratings for each

type of response over the three situations (possible range for E and I responses: 6-30). Mean summary scores for each treatment condition are provided in Table 1.

The summary scores were analyzed in a 2(Sex of "Parent") x 2(Sex of "Child") x 2(Type of Response: E/I) analysis of variance, with the latter variable a repeated measure. This analysis is summarized in Table 2. Since the primary focus of the data analysis was to examine the effects of Sex of "Parent" and Sex of "Child" on the reported likelihood of offering expressive and instrumental responses to "sons" and "daughters", the interactions involving Type of Response with either or both of the between-subjects variables were of special interest. Further analysis of significant interactions was conducted using tests of simple main effects (Weiner, 1973).

As predicted, the analysis of variance revealed a significant Sex of "Child" x Type of Response interaction, $F(1,72)=7.70$, $p < .01$ (see Table 1). Subsequent tests of simple main effects indicated that (1) "daughters" were more likely than "sons" to receive E responses, $t(74)=1.89$, $p < .05$ and (2) "sons" were more likely than "daughters" to receive I responses, $t(74)=1.71$, $p < .05$. In addition, while "daughters" were more likely to receive E than I responses, $t(74)=2.68$, $p < .01$, a trend in the opposite direction was found for "sons", $t(74)=1.24$, $p=.11$. No other significant main or interaction effects were found.

A secondary focus of the present study was to assess the relationships among subjects' E and I summary scores and their PAQ F and M scores. A matrix of these intercorrelations is presented in Table 3. A marginally significant positive relationship was found between subjects' E summary scores and their PAQ F scores $r(51)=.25$, $p < .07$.

Table 1

Mean Summary Scores for Expressive (E) and
Instrumental (I) Responses by Sex of "Parent"
and Sex of "Child" for Study 1

Sex of "Parent"	Sex of "Child"			
	<u>Daughter</u>		<u>Son</u>	
	E	I	E	I
Mother	21.32	19.26	19.79	21.21
Father	22.32	20.05	20.53	21.10
Total	21.82	19.66	20.16	21.16

Note. Number of subjects in each cell = 19.

Table 2

Summary of the 2(Sex of "Parent") x 2(Sex
of "Child") x 2(Type of Response) ANOVA
on Summary Scores for Study 1

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Between Subjects</u>	75			
SP	1	13.92	<1	<u>ns</u>
SC	1	.24	<1	<u>ns</u>
SP x SC	1	3.18	<1	<u>ns</u>
ERROR	72	16.97		<u>ns</u>
<u>Within Subjects</u>	76			
T	1	12.74	1.04	<u>ns</u>
T x SP	1	2.63	<1	<u>ns</u>
T x SC	1	94.73	7.70	.007
T x SP x SC	1	.09	<1	<u>ns</u>
ERROR	72	12.31		
<u>Total</u>	151			

Notes. SP = Sex of "Parent"
SC = Sex of "Child"
T = Type of Response

Table 3
Intercorrelations among Subjects' PAQ M and F Scores
and their Expressive and Instrumental Summary Scores for Study 1

	Expressive Summary Score (E)	Instrumental Summary Score (I)	PAQ M	PAQ F
E				
I	.11			
PAQ M	.16	.19		
PAQ F	.25*	.22	.11	

* $p < .07$

Note. The correlation between subjects' E and I scores based on an n of 76. The remaining five correlations are based on an n of 53 (see Footnote 5).

DISCUSSION

As predicted, differences were found in the types of responses given to hypothetical sons and daughters in the interpersonal problem situations. "Daughters" were more likely than "sons" to receive expressive responses as well as more likely to receive expressive than instrumental responses. In contrast, "sons" were more likely than "daughters" to receive instrumental responses and there was a tendency for "sons" to be more likely to receive instrumental than expressive responses. These results are consistent with previous findings suggesting that both parents and non-parents emphasize different values (Block, 1973), have stereotyped attitudes about (Atkinson & Endsley, 1976), and respond differently (M. Barnett, King, Howard, & Dino, 1980; Jones, Rickel & Smith, 1980; Seavey, Katz, & Zalk, 1975) to boys and girls in accordance with prevailing sex-linked stereotypes.

Contrary to prediction, there was no evidence that males and females differed in their tendencies to offer expressive and instrumental responses to their "children". Interestingly, in the pilot study described earlier, such sex differences were found. However, the present study differed from the pilot study in two important ways. First, Study 1 involved three situations; in the pilot study, only one situation was used. It is possible that in Study 1, males and females (a) responded differently on the one situation which had been used in the pilot study, but (b) may have responded similarly to one another on the two additional situations. If this were true, then the summary data from Study 1 might show no Sex of "Parent" x Type of Response effect. Examination of the individual treatment means for the three situations in Study 1, however, demonstrated that, for each of the three situations, males and females responded quite similarly to one another and were more likely to offer expressive than instrumental

responses to "daughters" and the opposite for "sons". This suggests that the contrasting pattern of Sex of "Parent" findings in the pilot study and Study 1 was not due to the presence of the two additional situations used in Study 1.

The second major difference between the pilot and present studies concerns the response measure. In the pilot study, subjects were asked to generate their own responses to a hypothetical situation. Perhaps when men and women are asked to provide their own responses, men find it "easier" to think of instrumental responses, while women are more facile at generating expressive responses. Study 1, in contrast, provided two expressive and two instrumental responses for each situation, and subjects were asked to indicate how likely they believed they would be to offer each response. Supplying both expressive and instrumental responses in Study 1 may have enabled subjects to consider (and rate) responses (i.e., expressive for males, instrumental for females) which they tended not to generate spontaneously (as in the pilot study). When the response alternatives are supplied, males and females do not appear to respond differently from one another in a sex-stereotyped fashion, suggesting that Sex of "Parent" differences may stem from the differing tendencies of males and females to spontaneously generate expressive and instrumental responses rather than from their estimated likelihood to respond in a particular way.

Although the methodology used in Study 1 may have served to attenuate the Sex of "Parent" x Type of Response findings, it is also possible that there are minimal Sex of "Parent" differences to be found with respect to the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style. Although several studies (e.g., M. Barnett, King, Howard, & Dino, 1980; Bearison, 1979; Noller, 1980) have demonstrated that mothers and fathers respond differently

to their children, other studies (e.g., Baumrind, 1974; Hermans, ter Laak, & Maas, 1972; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967; Lambert, Yackley & Hein, 1971) have reported no differences in the ways that males and females respond to children. For example, Hermans et al. (1972) and Lambert et al. (1971) have demonstrated that mothers and fathers respond similarly to one another in situations where the child has a task-oriented problem. The present findings may thus suggest that sex-linked stereotypes have a greater influence on the types of responses given to daughters and sons than on the types of responses given by mothers and fathers.

With respect to the PAQ, the only finding which approached significance was the correlation between subjects' scores on the PAQ F scale and their expressive summary scores. Although this finding was in the expected direction, it suggests that the predictive power of the PAQ in this study was relatively weak.

STUDY 2

Study 1 examined the relative amounts of expressive and instrumental responses given to a "son" or "daughter" experiencing interpersonal problems. Study 2 explored undergraduates' evaluations of the appropriateness and helpfulness of expressive and instrumental parental responses offered to sons and daughters. One of the purposes of Study 2 was to examine whether sex-linked stereotypes influence how appropriate individuals believe it is for parents to respond to their children in an expressive or instrumental manner when the child has an interpersonal problem. In addition, the focus of Study 2 complements that of Study 1 by exploring whether the types of responses males and females say they would give to "sons" and "daughters" also tend to be the types of responses individuals believe should be given to sons and daughters by mothers and fathers.

In Study 2, male and female undergraduates listened to three tape recordings of a young child presented as being either a boy or a girl; the child was portrayed as describing the interpersonal problem situations used in Study 1 to either his/her mother or father. Each subject was in a particular Sex of Parent and Sex of Child condition. Following the description of each interpersonal problem, the subjects were presented with two expressive and two instrumental responses that a parent might offer to his/her child. These responses were identical to those used in Study 1. The subjects were then asked to rate how appropriate it would be for a mother/father to offer each response to a son/daughter. Based on his/her ratings, each subject received two scores indicating the extent to which they judged (1) expressive and (2) instrumental responses as appropriate. Of primary interest were the relationships among the appropriateness ratings of expressive and instrumental responses and the sex of the parent and sex of the child.

Research on sex-linked stereotypes indicates that females are expected to be expressive while males are expected to be instrumental (Elman et al., 1970; Gilbert et al., 1978; Wesley & Wesley, 1977). Parsons and Bales (1975) and Johnson (1963) suggest that gender roles within the family are consistent with these sex-linked expectations in order to insure the continued filling of expressive and instrumental roles necessary for the society to function. Given these expectations, there may also be sex-linked stereotypes concerning the appropriateness of responding to sons and daughters in an instrumental or expressive manner. Therefore, a significant Sex of Child x Type of Response interaction was predicted. It was expected that subjects would rate it more appropriate for (1) daughters than sons to receive E responses, (2) sons than daughters to receive I

responses, (3) daughters to receive E than I responses, and (4) sons to receive I than E responses.

Parsons and Bales (1955) and Johnson (1963) contend that the roles of mothers and fathers are consistent with those of women and men in general. They maintain that in the family, the mother serves the expressive function while the father performs the instrumental role. Although recent evidence (Weeks and Thornburg, 1980) suggests that parents may tend to view their roles today as more egalitarian than in the past, this may be the case only for general areas such as employment and child care; some sex-stereotyped role perceptions may still prevail. Based on the theories of Parsons and Bales, and Johnson, as well as the findings reviewed earlier concerning sex and sex-role stereotypes, a significant Sex of Parent x Type of Response effect was predicted. It was expected that subjects would rate it more appropriate for (1) mothers than fathers to give E responses, (2) fathers than mothers to give I responses, (3) mothers to give E than I responses, and (4) fathers to give I than E responses.

As in Study 1, the three way interaction among Sex of Parent, Sex of Child, and Type of Response was of interest although no predictions were made. In addition, no predictions were made for the effect of sex of subject.

In the second part of Study 2, subjects were asked to indicate how helpful it would be for a mother/father to give each of the expressive and instrumental responses to a son/daughter. By obtaining helpfulness ratings it was possible to examine whether sex-linked stereotypes influence how helpful individuals believe it is for parents to respond to their children in an expressive or instrumental manner. Each subject received

two scores indicating the extent to which they rated (1) expressive and (2) instrumental responses as helpful. Based on the results of earlier pretesting (see Footnote 4), it was expected that, in general, I responses would be rated as more helpful than E responses.

In addition, these helpfulness judgments were made in order to examine whether the types of responses adults believe are the most helpful also tend to be the types of responses that individuals say they would give "sons" and "daughters". The relationships among the helpfulness ratings of E and I responses and the sex of the parent and sex of the child were of particular interest. The two-way interactions involving Type of Response and (1) Sex of Parent and (2) Sex of Child were explored although no predictions were made. In addition, the three-way interaction involving Sex of Parent, Sex of Child, and Type of Response was examined; once again no predictions regarding this interaction were made.

The relationships among subjects' F and M scores on the PAQ and their appropriateness and helpfulness ratings of E and I responses, respectively, were also explored. Spence and Helmreich (1979b) contend that individuals' F and M scores on the PAQ should be unrelated to their attitudes about behaviors which do not involve expressiveness or instrumentality. Prior research (e.g., Spence & Helmreich, 1978; 1979b) has examined the relationships between subjects' PAQ F and M scores and their judgments about behaviors which were neither expressive nor instrumental in nature; as expected, only minimal relationships were found. In contrast to these investigations, Study 2 explores judgments about behaviors which specifically involve expressiveness and instrumentality. Since the appropriateness and helpfulness ratings in Study 2 are directly concerned with expressiveness and instrumentality, the PAQ may be a better predictor of these judgments than it has been in past research.

METHOD

Subjects, Experimenter, and Confederate

Sixty-two male and 61 female undergraduates at Kansas State University took part in the study; the subjects received experimental credit for their participation. The experimenter and the confederate were the same as in Study 1.

Materials

The experimental sessions were conducted in a small classroom at Kansas State University. The situations were the same as in Study 1. A few minor changes in the questionnaire were made and are described in greater detail in the following section (see Appendix D for a copy of the questionnaire used in Study 2;⁸ the mother-daughter version of the questionnaire is supplied).

Procedure

Obtaining the PAQ Scores

At the beginning of the Fall, 1980 semester, students in General Psychology classes at Kansas State University were given the 24-item version of the PAQ. Thus, the scores of most⁹ of the students who participated in Study 2 were obtained at this time.

Experimental Sessions

The subjects were run in small mixed-sex groups with seven to twelve subjects in each. Each group was randomly assigned to one of four parent-child conditions: mother-daughter, mother-son, father-daughter, father-son. There were 15 or 16 males and females in each condition (see Table 4 for the number of males and females in each experimental condition). Each

Table 4
Number of Subjects in Each Cell for Study 2

Sex of Subject	<u>Daughter</u>		<u>Son</u>	
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father
Male	16	15	16	15
Female	15	16	15	15

subject was given a questionnaire containing the interpersonal problem situations involving the particular sex of parent and sex of child appropriate for that subject's condition.

The experimenter began each session by introducing herself and the study and continued with the same general directions as in Study 1. However, at the point where the hypothetical situations were introduced, the experimenter stated:

The questionnaire contains four hypothetical situations typical of the kind that parents are often confronted with. In each situation, you will hear a tape recording of a 7-year-old girl (boy) telling her (his) mother (father) of an incident that just happened. The questionnaire also has a written version of what the young girl (boy) is telling her (his) mother (father) so that you may read along with the tape recording.

Following each situation is a list of four responses that a mother (father) might say to her (his) child experiencing the particular problem. Below each response is a scale from 1 (not appropriate at all) to 5 (very appropriate). For each response, please indicate how appropriate you think it would be for a mother (father) to give that particular response to her (his) daughter (son). For example, if you think that a particular response is very appropriate, you would circle the "5". If you think that a particular response is not appropriate at all, you would circle the "1". If you think that a particular response is somewhat appropriate, circle the "3", etc.

The remainder of the instructions were the same as in Study 1, except that when the subjects were reminded of their task, they were told once again to indicate how appropriate they thought it would be for a mother (father) to give a particular response to a daughter (son).

When all of the subjects had finished responding to the final situation, the experimenter continued with the instructions for obtaining the helpfulness ratings. The subjects were instructed to use a 5-point scale similar to the one used for the appropriateness ratings. The experimenter drew the scale on the blackboard and continued with the following:

Now that you have finished indicating how appropriate you think each of the responses are, I'd like you to go back and make a second set of ratings. This time, I'd like you to indicate how helpful for the child in the story you think each response is. You'll see a blank next to each response. This is where you'll put your answer. Please use the following scale, where 1 is not helpful at all, 5 is very helpful, 3 is somewhat helpful, and so forth. In the blank next to the response, put the number which corresponds to how helpful to the child you think that response is. Does anyone have any questions?

If a subject asked what was meant by "helpful", the experimenter replied by stating: "Whatever that means to you." All other questions were answered; the experimenter allowed subjects to proceed at their own rate, and waited until all subjects had finished responding to the final situation before collecting the questionnaires. The remainder of the procedure was the same as in Study 1.

RESULTS

Appropriateness Ratings

Summary scores were computed for each subject's appropriateness ratings. These scores were obtained by summing the appropriateness ratings for each type of response (E and I) over the three situations (possible range for both E and I responses: 6-30). The mean appropriateness summary scores may be found in Table 5.

The appropriateness summary scores were analyzed in a 2(Sex of Subject) x 2(Sex of Parent) x 2(Sex of Child) x 2(Type of Response: E/I) analysis of variance, with the latter variable a repeated measure. Table 6 contains a summary of this analysis. The main effect involving Type of Response was explored. In addition, since the primary focus of the analysis was to examine the effects of Sex of Parent and Sex of Child on subjects' appropriateness judgments of expressive and instrumental responses, the interactions involving Type of Response with one or more of the between-subjects variables were of special interest.

A significant main effect for Type of Response, $F(1,115)=4.92$, $p < .05$ was found. I responses were rated as more appropriate ($\bar{X}=21.35$) than E responses ($\bar{X}=20.45$). However, none of the interactions involving Type of Response were found to be significant. Several between-subjects effects were also found. The main effect for Sex of Subject was found to be significant, $F(1,115)=4.39$, $p < .05$; females gave significantly higher appropriateness ratings ($\bar{X}=21.36$) than males ($\bar{X}=20.25$). In addition, a significant Sex of Subject x Sex of Parent interaction, $F(1,115)=4.78$, $p < .05$, and a significant Sex of Subject x Sex of Parent x Sex of Child interaction, $F(1,115)=6.08$, $p < .05$, were also found (see Appendix E for a summary of treatment means for the two between-subjects interaction effects).

Table 5

Mean Appropriateness Summary Scores for Expressive (E)
and Instrumental (I) Responses by Sex of Subject, Sex of Parent
and Sex of Child for Study 2

Sex of Subject	<u>Daughter</u>				<u>Son</u>			
	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>		<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>	
	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Male	20.38	21.44	17.80	20.67	19.94	21.82	20.67	20.73
Female	20.20	19.60	21.80	22.93	21.73	21.87	21.06	21.69
Total	20.29	21.52	19.80	21.80	20.83	21.85	20.86	21.21

Table 6

Summary of the 2(Sex of Subject) x 2(Sex of Parent)
x 2(Sex of Child) x 2(Type of Response) ANOVA on
Appropriateness Summary Scores for Study 2

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Between Subjects</u>				
SS	1	53.34	4.39	<.05
SP	1	.14	<1	<u>ns</u>
SC	1	21.10	1.73	<u>ns</u>
SS x SP	1	58.09	4.78	<.05
SS x SC	1	1.07	<1	<u>ns</u>
SP x SC	1	7.46	<1	<u>ns</u>
SS x SP x SC	1	73.99	6.08	<.05
ERROR	115	12.16		
<u>Within Subjects</u>				
T	1	49.25	4.92	<.05
T x SS	1	20.13	2.01	<u>ns</u>
T x SP	1	4.73	<1	<u>ns</u>
T x SC	1	2.98	<1	<u>ns</u>
T x SS x SP	1	4.77	<1	<u>ns</u>
T x SS x SC	1	4.69	<1	<u>ns</u>
T x SP x SC	1	22.62	2.26	<u>ns</u>
T x SS x SP x SC	1	5.40	<1	<u>ns</u>
ERROR	115	10.01		
Total	123			

Notes. SS = Sex of Subject
SP = Sex of Parent
SC = Sex of Child
T = Type of Response

Any interpretation of findings involving only between-subjects effects, however, would be highly speculative; moreover, since these effects do not involve Type of Response, they are unimportant with respect to the purpose of Study 2.

Helpfulness Ratings

Summary scores were computed for each subject's helpfulness ratings. These scores were obtained by summing the helpfulness ratings for each type of response (E,I) over the three situations (possible range for both E and I responses: 6-30). The mean helpfulness summary scores may be found in Table 7.

The helpfulness summary scores were analyzed in a 2(Sex of Subject) x 2(Sex of Parent) x 2(Sex of Child) x 2(Type of Response) analysis of variance, with the latter variable a repeated measure. Table 8 contains a summary of this analysis. The main effect involving Type of Response was of interest. Once again, the interactions involving Type of Response with one or more of the between-subjects variables were also of special importance.

As predicted, a main effect for Type of Response was found, $F(1,115)=43.89$, $p < .01$. I responses were rated as considerable more helpful ($\bar{X}=21.35$) than E responses ($\bar{X}=17.78$). No interactions involving Type of Response with any of the between-subjects variables were found. Two significant effects involving only between-subjects variables were also found. The main effect for Sex of Child was significant, $F(1,115)=4.81$, $p < .05$; sons received higher helpfulness ratings ($\bar{X}=20.14$) than daughters ($\bar{X}=18.98$). The Sex of Subject x Sex of Parent interaction was also significant, $F(1,115)=4.75$, $p < .05$ (see Appendix F for a summary of the treatment means for this interaction. Once again, any interpretation of findings

Table 7

Mean Helpfulness Summary Scores for Expressive (E)
and Instrumental (I) Responses by Sex of Subject, Sex of Parent,
and Sex of Child for Study 2

Sex of Subject	<u>Daughter</u>				<u>Son</u>			
	<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>		<u>Mother</u>		<u>Father</u>	
	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Male	17.19	21.25	14.60	20.53	17.56	21.81	18.80	20.87
Female	17.00	20.07	19.27	21.87	18.60	21.33	19.13	23.00
Total	17.10	20.66	16.94	21.20	18.08	21.57	18.97	21.94

Table 8

Summary of the 2(Sex of Subject) x 2(Sex of Parent) x 2(Sex
of Child) x 2(Type of Response) ANOVA on Helpfulness
Summary Scores for Study 2

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Between Subjects</u>				
SS	1	56.12	3.23	<u>ns</u>
SP	1	10.12	<1	<u>ns</u>
SC	1	83.56	4.81	<.05
SS x SP	1	82.51	4.75	<.05
SS x SC	1	2.50	<1	<u>ns</u>
SP x SC	1	2.84	<1	<u>ns</u>
SS x SP x SC	1	28.73	1.66	<u>ns</u>
ERROR	115	17.36		
<u>Within Subjects</u>				
T	1	784.54	43.89	<.01
T x SS	1	15.65	1	<u>ns</u>
T x SP	1	.13	1	<u>ns</u>
T x SC	1	7.19	1	<u>ns</u>
T x SS x SP	1	.93	1	<u>ns</u>
T x SS x SC	1	20.50	1.15	<u>ns</u>
T x SP x SC	1	5.74	1	<u>ns</u>
T x SS x SP x SC	1	30.78	1.72	<u>ns</u>
ERROR	115	17.88		
Total	123			

Notes. S = Sex of Subject
P = Sex of Parent
C = Sex of Child
T = Type of Response

involving only between-subjects effects would be highly speculative. In addition, these effects are unimportant with respect to the purpose of Study 2.

Relationships Among PAQ M and F Scores and
Appropriateness and Helpfulness Summary Scores

Intercorrelations were obtained for subjects' M and F scores on the PAQ and their appropriateness and helpfulness summary scores for E and I responses. A matrix of correlations involving these variables is shown in Table 9. A significant positive correlation was found between subjects' PAQ F scores and their helpfulness summary scores for E responses, $r(85) = .22$, $p < .05$. Significant positive correlations were also obtained between subjects' appropriateness and helpfulness summary scores for E responses, $r(121) = .58$, $p < .01$, and their appropriateness and helpfulness summary scores for I responses, $r(121) = .64$, $p < .01$. Finally, a marginally significant correlation was found between subjects' M and F scores on the PAQ, $r(85) = .20$, $p < .06$.

DISCUSSION

The results of Study 2 indicate that college undergraduates believe it is more appropriate for parents to give instrumental than expressive responses to their children when they encounter interpersonal problems. The findings of several studies (Hansson, O'Connor, Jones & Mihelich, 1980; Jones, Chernovek, & Hansson, 1978; Kelly & Worrel, 1977) suggest that, in our culture, masculine, or instrumental, attributes and behaviors are generally valued more than feminine, or expressive, attributes and behaviors in a variety of circumstances. This bias toward instrumentality may have also been present in the appropriateness judgments in Study 2. That is,

Table 9

Intercorrelations among Subjects' PAQ M and F scores and their Appropriateness and Helpfulness Summary Scores for Study 2

	Appropriateness Summary Scores: Expressive Responses (AE)	Appropriateness Summary Scores: Instrumental Responses (AI)	Helpfulness Summary Scores: Expressive Responses (HE)	Helpfulness Summary Scores: Instrumental Responses (HI)	PAQ M	PAQ F
AE						
AI	.14					
HE	.58***	.11				
HI	.05	.64***	.03			
PAQ M	.04	.03	.11	.03		
PAQ F	.17	.07	.22**	.03	.20*	

* $p < .06$

** $p < .05$

*** $p < .01$

Note. The six correlations involving only appropriateness and helpfulness summary scores are based on an n of 123. The remaining nine correlations are based on an n of 87 (see Footnote 9).

since instrumental behaviors are generally valued more than expressive ones, they may also tend to be seen as more appropriate than expressive behaviors.

In addition, instrumental responses were rated as more helpful than expressive responses. This finding is consistent with the results of earlier pretesting (see Footnote 4) in which subjects were presented with the same hypothetical situations and responses used in Study 2 (with the sex of the parent and sex of the child unspecified) and were asked to indicate how helpful they believed each response would be for the child in the situation. A possible explanation for these findings is that, although expressive responses may be seen as helpful in alleviating the child's distress through acknowledgement and concern with feelings, the child is still left with the problem. Instrumental responses, by suggesting direct courses of action, provide potential resolutions of the problem. There may be a general belief that the most helpful advice to offer someone with a problem, even a young child, is a solution. In addition, the strong positive correlations between subjects (1) appropriateness and (2) helpfulness summary scores for both expressive and instrumental responses suggests that individuals tended to rate as helpful those responses which they also believed were appropriate.

It is important to note that instrumental responses were viewed as both more appropriate and more helpful than expressive responses regardless of the sex of the parent or sex of the child. This contrasts with the prediction that subjects would judge it more appropriate for mothers to give, and daughters to receive, expressive than instrumental responses, and for fathers to offer, and sons to receive, instrumental than expressive responses. With respect to the sex of the child, previous studies have demonstrated that both parents and non-parents tend to differentially

respond to boys and girls along stereotyped lines (e.g., M. Barnett, King, Howard & Dino, 1980; Baumrind, Note 2; Bearison, 1979; Fagot, 1978; Seavey, Katz & Zalk, 1975). However, these studies examined adults' actual behavior toward their own, or hypothetical, children. In Study 2, in contrast, subjects were asked to judge the behavior of other parents. Perhaps when subjects are taking this "outsider" or "observer" perspective, they rely less on sex-linked stereotypes and are more egalitarian than when they are asked to "put themselves" in the role of parents (as in Study 1, for example). The distinction between these two orientations is discussed in greater detail in the General Discussion.

With respect to the sex of the parent, previous investigations have shown that mothers and fathers tend to respond differently to their children in accordance with prevailing sex-linked stereotypes (e.g., M. Barnett, King, Howard & Dino, 1980; Bearison, 1979; Noller, 1980). Once again, however, these studies examined parents actual responses to their own children, a perspective which differs from the "outsider" focus in Study 2. This "outsider" perspective, as mentioned above, may have lessened the effects of sex-linked stereotypes on the appropriateness and helpfulness ratings in Study 2. It may also be the case that undergraduates do not generally possess strong sex-linked stereotypes concerning the appropriateness and helpfulness of expressive and instrumental responses emanating from mothers and fathers. This is suggested by recent evidence (Weeks & Thornburg, 1977; Wienraub & Brooks-Gunn, Note 4) which indicates that perceptions regarding the differential roles of mothers and fathers, in general, may be becoming more egalitarian than in the past. Thus, when undergraduates are asked to evaluate the behaviors of parents toward their children in interpersonal problem situations, they may believe that the

main focus of the parent should be in providing the child with a solution whether that parent be a mother or father (and regardless of the child's sex).

With respect to the PAQ, the only significant finding obtained in Study 2 was a positive relationship between subjects' helpfulness ratings of expressive responses and their PAQ F scores. This suggests that an individual's dispositional measure of expressiveness as assessed by the PAQ may be related to his/her judgments about the helpfulness of parents' expressive responses offered to children in interpersonal problem situations. This statement is made with caution, however, since the predictive power of the PAQ, although statistically significant, appears relatively weak in this case.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present studies explored whether sex-linked stereotypes of an expressive and instrumental nature are found in the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style. The results of Study 1 demonstrated that in interpersonal problem situations, "daughters" were more likely than "sons" to receive expressive (i.e., feelings-oriented responses) as well as more likely to receive expressive than instrumental (i.e., action-oriented) responses. In contrast, "sons" are more likely than "daughters" to receive instrumental responses and more likely to receive instrumental than expressive responses. The results of Study 2 indicated that college undergraduates believe it is both more appropriate and more helpful for parents to offer instrumental than expressive responses to their children in interpersonal problem situations. This was the case regardless of the sex of the parent or sex of the child. Finally, subjects' PAQ F scores were shown to be moderately related to (1) their tendency to offer expressive

responses to hypothetical children, and (2) their helpfulness ratings of expressive responses in a hypothetical parent-child interaction. The findings with respect to the PAQ suggest that the trait of expressiveness as measured by the F scale may be related to judgments concerning behaviors of an expressive nature. In both cases, however, the relationships were relatively weak, indicating that the PAQ was not a powerful predictor of subjects' judgments in the present investigation.

Returning to the major findings, sex-linked stereotypes were found in the types of responses offered to "sons" and "daughters" in Study 1, but not in the appropriateness and helpfulness ratings in Study 2. This suggests that when individuals are responding to their own "children" they may be influenced by sex-linked stereotypes, but when they are making appropriateness and helpfulness judgments about the behavior of others, the influence of these stereotypes is attenuated. Perhaps in the latter instance, when undergraduates are employing the "outsider" or "observer" perspective, they rely on what may be an increasingly popular attitude (e.g., Weinraub & Brooks-Gunn, Note 4) that sex-role perceptions and expectations should be less stereotyped than they have been in the past. In contrast, when men and women are asked to put themselves in role of parent, as in Study 1, they may be more ego-involved, and this non-sex typed, egalitarian perspective diminishes. When responding to their own offspring, even a hypothetical one, the added ego-involvement may increase subjects' concern with preparing the child to meet the types of sex related demands (i.e., expressiveness in females, instrumentality in males) that may be placed on them as adults. Other areas of study, such as the exploration of sex-stereotypes in children's career choice (Zuckerman & Sayre, Note 5) and the examination of racial attitudes (Cambell & Pettigrew, 1959),

have indicated that stereotyped attitudes tend to be expressed more so when the consequences of one's judgment have direct personal relevance than when they do not.

Responses given to one's own children may also be generated in a more emotional and spontaneous manner than are judgments of the appropriateness and helpfulness of other parents' behaviors. Such responses may be similar to the types of advice that individuals remember their own parents giving them and their siblings, responses which may have been sex-stereotyped. Recollections of their own parents' behavior, however, may be less likely to influence judgments about the behavior of others since these judgments may be made in a relatively detached and intellectual manner. Thus, while it is appropriate and helpful for other parents to be non-traditional and egalitarian with their sons and daughters, for interactions with one's own child, even a hypothetical one, the perspective may be quite different.

The results of the two studies, taken together, suggest that (1) "sons" tend to be given more of the type of response (i.e., instrumental) which individuals believe to be more appropriate and helpful than its counterpart (i.e., expressive responses) and (2) "daughters" tend to be given a preponderance of expressive responses in spite of the fact that these responses tend to be viewed as less appropriate and helpful than their alternative. This pattern of findings illustrates the important effects that sex-linked stereotypes may have on subtle aspects of socialization such as parental responses given to children experiencing interpersonal problems. One consequence of these stereotypes may be to perpetuate the sex differences in interpersonal problem solving style found in adults (Heiss, 1962; Kelly, 1979) and possibly in children (Hoffman & Levine, 1976). Likewise, these differences in style may help to maintain the stereotype, and thus the

status-quo. If females encountering interpersonal problems are focusing on feelings much more than on ameliorative action, this may result in increased dependency on the decision making abilities of others relative to males. This is consistent with research findings indicating that helpseeking is reinforced more for girls than boys, both inside (Fagot, 1978) and outside the home (Crandall & Rabson, 1960), and that dependency is considered to be a desirable trait for females but not for males (Elman et al., 1970).

While the results of the present investigation may have important implications for the socialization of sex differences in interpersonal problem solving, some shortcomings of these studies should be noted. In Study 1, "daughters" were more likely to receive expressive than instrumental responses in spite of the fact that in Study 2, it was demonstrated that expressive responses are seen as less appropriate and less helpful than their instrumental counterparts. One difficulty in comparing the findings of the two studies is that they differed both in the roles subjects were asked to assume and in the questions they were asked. Although subjects deemed instrumental responses to be more appropriate and more helpful for other parents to give their children (Study 2), it is not clear whether they would have expressed the same attitudes if they had been considering responses for their own children. A future study might examine this more directly by presenting subjects with a task similar to that used in Study 1, with the exception that subjects would be asked to rate how appropriate and helpful it would be for them to offer each response to their own "children". In addition to this study, a second investigation might explore perceptions concerning parents' actual responses to their own children in interpersonal problem situations. Information provided from this study could be used to determine the perceptions undergraduates have about characteristic parental behaviors of an expressive

and instrumental nature. The format would be similar to that used in Study 2, with the exception that subjects would be asked to indicate how likely they believe it would be for a mother or father to offer each of the expressive and instrumental responses to their sons and daughters. In general, the addition of these two studies would help to "round-out" the picture provided by the present investigations by assessing whether subjects believe (1) it is appropriate and helpful to respond to their own children in sex-linked ways and (2) parents tend to respond in ways deemed appropriate and helpful.

Another potential difficulty with the present studies, particularly Study 1, is that childless adults were used instead of parents in examining the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style. Non-parents may have only minimal child-care experiences and, thus, sex-linked stereotypes may provide a guide to their responses. On the other hand, parents may be more likely to respond to the needs of the particular child (regardless of the child's sex) than would non-parents. However, the available evidence on adult-child interaction suggests that this may not be the case. Previous studies have demonstrated that parents (M. Barnett, King, Howard & Dino, 1980; Bearison, 1979; Noller, 1980) as well as non-parents (Condry & Condry, 1976; Fagot, 1974; Seavey, Katz, & Zalk, 1975) express stereotyped attitudes about, and respond differently, to boys and girls.

A major criticism of the present studies is that they provide only a static, "one-shot" view of a complex and multifaceted socialization process. The influence of sex-linked stereotypes on the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style may be the most prevalent in situations in which little information about the child is presented other than his or her sex. In the present studies, for example, no information about the child was presented

except for his or her age and gender. Future studies might explore whether providing background information about the characteristic personality and behaviors of the needy child serves to attenuate, or perhaps heighten, the effects of these stereotypes. Moreover, a parent may respond to his or her child in a stereotyped manner, but the child's reaction may or may not be consistent with the adult's expectations. The parent might change his or her approach in accordance with the child's behavior or may continue to respond in a stereotypic manner. Future research should take a more process-oriented approach to understanding the influences that sex-linked stereotypes have on the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style. Investigations employing confederate children might be useful in providing further information concerning the influence of sex-linked stereotypes on the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style. For example, a confederate child could be trained to behave in stereotypic and non-stereotypic ways, and the influence of the child's behavior on subsequent responding by adults could be assessed. In addition, studies involving the use of naturalistic observation and content analysis of parent-child dialogues may further enhance our understanding of such a dynamic, interactive process.

Sex and sex-role stereotypes will likely prevail as long as gender remains a pervasive status distinction in our society. The consequences of these stereotypes pervade many aspects of our lives on both an individual and a societal level, from career choice to interpersonal relations (Kelly, 1979; Russo, 1976). Consequently, it is important for psychologists to continue to investigate the effects of our society's sex-linked stereotypes on the socialization processes which affect the status and adaptive capacities of its members.

Reference Notes

1. Aries, M. Interaction patterns and themes of male, female and mixed groups. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, 1974.
2. Baumrind, D. Sex related socialization effects. Paper presented at the meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, San Francisco, 1979.
3. Dino, G. A., & Barnett, M. A. Undergraduates role playing parents: Sex differences in responses given to sons and daughters, unpublished manuscript, 1979.
4. Weinraub, M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. Declining parental sex-role stereotypes. Movement toward androgyny. Paper presented at the meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development, San Francisco, 1979.
5. Zuckerman, D. M., & Sayre, D. H. Changes and contradictions in children's sex-role stereotypes. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, 1980.

References

- Anthony, W. A. The relationship between human relations skills and index of psychological adjustment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1973, 20, 489-490.
- Atkinson, J., & Endsley, R. C. Influence of sex of child and parent on parental reactions to hypothetical parent-child situations. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1976, 94, 131-147.
- Bakan, D. The duality of human existence. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Barnett, L., & Neitzel, I. Relationship of instrumental and affectional behaviors in distressed and non-distressed couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47, 946-957.
- Barnett, M. A., Howard, J. A., King, L. M., & Dino, G. A. Empathy in children: Relationship to parents' empathy, affection, and emphasis on the feelings of others. Developmental Psychology, 1980, 16, 243-244.
- Barnett, M. A., King, L. M., Howard, J. A., & Dino, G. A. Antecedents of empathy: Retrospective accounts of early socialization. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1980, 6, 361-365.
- Baumrind, D. Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 1974.
- Bearison, D. L. Sex-linked patterns of socialization. Sex-Roles, 1979, 5, 11-18.
- Bem, S. L. Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhauzer-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. Journal of Social and Personality Psychology, 1979, 37, 1047-1054.
- Bem, S. L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

- Block, J. H. Conceptions of sex-role: Some cross-cultural and sociocultural perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.
- Borgatta, E. F., & Simpson, J. Sex differences in interaction characteristics. The Journal of Social Psychology, 1972, 60, 89-100.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosencrantz, D. S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosencrantz, P. S. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.
- Campbell, E. Q., & Pettigrew, T. F. Racial and moral crisis: The role of Little Rock ministers. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 509-516.
- Carkhuff, R. R. The art of helping. Amherst: Human Resource Development Press, 1972.
- Carlson, R. Sex differences in ego functioning. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37, 267-277.
- Condry, J., & Condry, S. The development of sex differences: A study of the eye of the beholder, in B. Birns, The emergence and socialization of sex differences in the earliest years. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1976, 22, 229-53.
- Constantinople, A. Masculinity and femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.
- Crandall, V. J., & Rabson, A. Children's repetition choices in intellectual achievement situations following success and failure. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1960, 97, 161-168.

- Del Boca, F. K., & Ashmore, R. D. Sex stereotypes throughout the life cycle. In L. Wheeler (Ed.) Review of personality and social psychology. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980, 163-169.
- Deutsch, H. The psychology of women: A psychoanalytic interpretation. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1944.
- Egan, G. The skilled helper. Montarey, Cal: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1975.
- Elman, J. B., Press, A., & Rosencrantz, P. S. Sex roles and self-concepts: Real and ideal. Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1970, 5, 455-456.
- Exline, R. B., & Winters, L. C. Affective relations and mutual glances in dyads. In S. S. Seigman & B. Pope (Eds.) Affect, Cognition, and Personality, New York: Springer, 1965.
- Fagot, B. I. The influence of sex of child on parental reactions to toddler children. Child Development, 1978, 49, 459-468.
- Fagot, B. I. Sex-related stereotyping of toddlers' behavior. Developmental Psychology, 1974, 10, 554-558.
- Feshbach, N. D., & Roe, K. Empathy in six and seven year olds. Child Development, 1968, 39, 133-145.
- Frances, S. J. Sex differences in nonverbal behavior. Sex Roles, 1979, 5, 519-534.
- Freud, S. Some physical consequences of the anatomical differences between the sexes. In J. Strachey, (Ed.) Standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud (Vol. 19). London: Hogarth Press, 1961.
- Gelatt, A. B. Decision-making: A conceptual frame of reference for counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1962, 9, 240-245.

- Gilbert, L. A., Deutsch, C. J., & Strahan, R. F. Feminine and masculine dimensions of the typical, desirable, and ideal woman and man. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, 767-778.
- Goldberg, S., & Lewis, M. Play behavior in the year old infant. Early sex differences. Child Development, 1969, 40, 21-31.
- Gordon, T. Parent effectiveness training. New York: Peter H. Widen, 1970.
- Guttman, D. L., Women and the conception of ego strength. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1965, 11, 229-240.
- Haas, A. Male and female spoken language differences: Stereotypes and evidence. Psychological Bulletin, 1979, 86, 616-626.
- Hansson, R. O., O'Connor, M. E., Jones, W. H., & Mihelich, M. H. Role deviant sex-typing and opportunity in agentic and communal domains. Journal of Personality (in press).
- Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Holahan, C. K. Psychological androgyny and sex-role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1631-1644.
- Heiss, J. S. Degree of intimacy and male-female interaction. Sociometry, 1962, 25, 197-208.
- Hermans, H. J., ter Laak, J. J., & Maas, P. C. Achievement motivation and fear of failure in family and school. Developmental Psychology, 1972, 6, 520-528.
- Hoffman, M. L. Sex differences in empathy and related behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 1977, 84, 712-722.
- Hoffman, M. L., & Levine, L. E. Sex differences in empathy. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 557-558.
- Hoffman, M. L., & Saltzstein, H. D. Parental discipline and the child's moral development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 45-57.

- Horowitz, L. M. On the cognitive structure of interpersonal problems treated in psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47, 5-15.
- Hoschild, A. R. A review of sex-role research. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 1011-1029.
- Johnson, M. Sex-role learning in the nuclear family. Child Development, 1963, 34, 319-334.
- Johnson, P. Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 99-109.
- Jones, W. H., Chernovetz, M. E., and Hansson, R. O. The enigma of androgyny and differential implications for males and females. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 298-313.
- Jones, D. C., Rickel, A. V., & Smith, R. L. Maternal child-rearing practices and social problem-solving strategies among preschoolers. Developmental Psychology, 1980, 16, 241-244.
- Karabetian, A. D., & Smith, A. J. Sex-role stereotypy in the U.S.: Is it changing? Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 193-198.
- Kagan, J. Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex-role identity. In Hoffman, M. L., & Hoffman, L. W., (Eds.) Review of Child development research, New York: Russel Sage, 1964.
- Katz, M. A model of guidance for career decision-making. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1966, 15, 2-10.
- Kelly, H. H. Personal relationships: Their structure and processes. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1979.
- Kelly, H. H., & Thibault, J. W. Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1978.

- Kelly, J. A., & Worell, R. New Foundations of sex-roles and androgyny:
A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,
1977, 45, 1101-1115.
- Koblinsky, S. G., Cruse, D. F., & Sugawara, A. I. Sex-role stereotypes
and children's memory for story content. Child Development, 1978,
49, 452-458.
- Lambert, W. E., Yackley, A. J., Hein, R. N. Child training values and
English Canadian and French Canadian Parents. Canadian Journal of
Behavioral Science, 1971, 3, 217-236.
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't
he help? New York: Appelton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Lockheed, M. C., & Hall, K. P. Conceptualizing sex as a status
characteristic: Applications to leadership training strategies.
Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 111-124.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. The psychology of sex differences.
Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Mischel, W. Sex typing and socialization, In P. H. Mussen (Ed.)
Carmichael's manual of child psychology. New York: Wiley, 1970,
pp. 3-72.
- Morris, W. C., & Shaskin, M. Organizational behavior in action:
Skill building experiences. St. Paul: West Pub. Co., 1976.
- Moss, H. A. Sex, age, and state determinants of mother-infant
interaction. Merill-Palmer Quarterly, 1967, 13, 19-35.
- Moss, H. A., & Robson, K. S. Determinants of maternal stimulation
of infants and consequences of treatment of later interaction
with strangers. Developmental Psychology, 1960, 1, 29-46.

- Mussen, P. H. (Ed.) Carmichael's manual of child psychology.
New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Newman, B. M., & Newman, P. R. Development through life.
Homewood: The Dorsey Press, 1975.
- Noller, P. Cross-gender effects in two-child families.
Developmental Psychology, 1980, 16, 159-160.
- Parsons, T., and Bales, R. F. Family socialization and the interaction process. New York: Free Press, 1955.
- Pervin, L. A. Current controversies and issues in personality.
New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.
- Pierce, R. M., & Dragon, J. Teaching interpersonal functioning to psychiatric patients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 295-298.
- Ross, D. M. Resistance of preschool boys to sex-inappropriate behavior. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1972, 63, 342-346.
- Rothbart, M. K. Birth order and mother-child interaction in an achievement situation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 113-121.
- Rothbart, M. K., & Maccoby, E. E. Parents' differential reactions to sons and daughters. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 237-243.
- Rothbart, M. K., & Rothbart, M. Birth order, sex of child and maternal help giving. Sex Roles, 1976, 2, 39-46.
- Russo, N. F. The motherhood mandate. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 133-153.
- Schwartz, S. H. Normative influences on altruism. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, (Vol. 10), 1977, 222-275.

- Seavey, C. A., Katz, P. A., & Zalk, S. R. Baby X: The effects of gender labels on adult responses to infants. Sex Roles, 1975, 2, 103-110.
- Shepard, W. Mothers and fathers, sons and daughters: Perceptions of young adults. Sex Roles, 1980, 6, 421-433.
- Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. Problem-solving techniques in child rearing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Shure, M. B., & Spivack, G. Means-end thinking, social class, and adjustment in elementary school aged children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1972, 38, 348-353.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. The many faces of androgyny: A reply to Locksley and Colten. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1979, 37, 1032-1046, a.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. Comparison of masculine and feminine personality attributes and sex-role attitudes across age groups. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 582-583, b.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity, femininity: Their psychological correlates, demensions, and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press; 1978.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. The attitude toward women scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1972, 2, 66-67.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. The personal attributes questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypy and masculinity-femininity. JSAS Selected Documents in Psychology, 1974, 4, 127.
- Urberg, K. A. Sex role conceptualizations in adolescence and adulthood. Developmental Psychology, 1979, 15, 90-92.

- Urberg, K. A. & Labouvie-Vief, G. Conceptualizations of sex roles: A Life-span developmental study. Developmental Psychology, 1976, 12, 15-23.
- Weeks, N. O., & Thornburg, K. S. Marriage-role expectations of 5-year old children and their parents. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 189-191.
- Wertheim, E. G., Widom, C. S., & Wortzel, L. H. Multivariate analysis of career choice correlates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1978, 63, 234-242.
- Wesley, F., & Wesley, C. Sex-role psychology. New York: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1977.
- Williams, J. E., & Bennett, S. The definition of sex stereotypes via the Adjective Check List. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 327-337.

Footnotes

¹In spite of its name, the Sex-Role Questionnaire is a measure of sex stereotypes (i.e., stereotypes about the personality differences between males and females) and not a measure of sex-role stereotypes (i.e., stereotypes concerning the appropriate role behaviors for males and females).

²Hypothetical situations were used in Studies 1 and 2 as well as in the pilot. A number of other studies exploring sex-linked socialization practices (e.g., Atkinson & Endsley, 1976; M. Barnett, King, Howard & Dino, 1980; Hoffman & Saltzstein, 1967; Lambert, ter Laak & Maas, 1971) have also utilized such situations. A recent study (Noller, 1980), focusing on cross-gender effects in the parent-child interaction, has provided evidence for the validity of using hypothetical situations. In her study, Noller cites an earlier investigation by Rothbart and Maccoby (1966) which used hypothetical situations to examine cross-gender effects in socialization; parents were asked to write down how they thought they would respond to a taped voice labeled "boy" for parents of boys and "girl" for parents of girls. Rothbart and Maccoby found that parents responded more permissively with children of the opposite gender. In contrast to this simulated study, Noller's methodology involved the use of naturalistic observation; she found similar results to those of Rothbart and Maccoby despite the procedural differences. Thus, Noller's findings . . . "add support for the validity of using hypothetical situations" in studies exploring sex-linked socialization (Noller, 1980, p. 116).

³In addition to these three situations the pretesting yielded a fourth situation (designated situation 2 in Appendix A). This additional situation was presented to subjects in Study 1 along with the three situations designed for the present study. The fourth situation was part of a larger investigation

and was not considered as one of the stimuli for Study 1. Furthermore, the results obtained from this situation were not included in the data analysis for Study 1.

⁴Following their expressiveness and instrumentality ratings, subjects were asked to rate how helpful they believed each response would be to the child experiencing the interpersonal problem. It was found that instrumental responses were rated as significantly more helpful than expressive responses, $t(28) = 4.93, p < .01$.

⁵PAQ scores were not obtained for 23 of the subjects participating in Study 1; these subjects either were absent or chose not to take the PAQ when it was administered.

⁶Only three of the subjects in Study 1 had any children; thus, the results from these individuals were not analysed or discussed further.

⁷All tests of simple main effects were one-tailed.

⁸The same additional situation which was used in Study 1 was also presented to subjects in Study 2, along with the three situations designed for the present study. This additional situation is part of larger investigation; it is not considered as one of the stimuli for Study 2, and the results obtained from it were not included in the data analysis for Study 2.

⁹PAQ scores were not obtained for 36 of the subjects who participated in Study 2. These subjects were either absent or chose not to take the PAQ when it was administered.

(Print name) _____

SITUATION 1Child's statement:

"The kids on the block were playing together and I went to see if I could play with them. They said they had enough kids already and besides they said they didn't even know me. Now I have no one to play with."

Parent's response:

(I) _____ (1) "Ask the kids to come over here to play with some of your toys."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(E) _____ (2) "You don't look very happy. I know it's no fun to feel lonely."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(E) _____ (3) "I'm sure the other kids didn't mean to hurt your feelings."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(I) _____ (4) "Try again when there are fewer kids playing."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

SITUATION 2

Child's statement:

"Today in school our teacher put us into small groups to work on a class project. She told us we'd be working in groups for a week. Well, today, when I gave my ideas about what we could do, the other kids wouldn't listen to me. Instead they just kept on talking about what they wanted to do. They just wouldn't pay attention to my ideas."

Parent's response:

(E) _____ (1) "I'm soory that the other kids made you unhappy but you know I think your ideas are important."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(I) _____ (2) "Tomorrow, explain your ideas in a different way to the other kids in your group."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(E) _____ (3) "You know sometimes people are so wrapped up in their own ideas that they don't think about the feelings of others."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(I) _____ (4) "Tell the kids in your group to take turns giving ideas."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

SITUATION 3

Child's statement:

"I had a fight with my best friend, Terry, today. We were fighting about the rules of a new game. We yelled at each other and called each other names. Now I don't know if we're still best friends."

Parent's response:

(E) _____ (1) "I know it makes you unhappy when you have a fight with one of your friends."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(I) _____ (2) "Ask terry to come over after school tomorrow."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(E) _____ (3) "It sounds like you and Terry were just pretty upset at the time."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(I) _____ (4) "Have a talk with Terry tomorrow about what happened."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

SITUATION 4

Child's statement:

"I think that maybe I'm not like the other kids. See, there are these four kids in my class that I always play with. Sometimes I just don't like to do some of the things that they like to do. Like on the playground or after school, they always want to play these games that I don't really like that much. I guess I'm just different from the other kids."

Parent's response:

(I) _____ (1) "Tomorrow, play with some of the other kids in your class."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(E) _____ (2) "It's O.K. to feel that way. There are times when we all feel different."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(E) _____ (3) "Maybe some of the other kids don't like those games either but they just don't show their feelings."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

(I) _____ (4) "Try to get those four kids to play some other games."

	Not at all		Somewhat		Very
How expressive?	1	2	3	4	5
How instrumental?	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS

The questionnaire attached to these instructions is part of a study that will hopefully expand our knowledge of the ways that adults, particularly parents, interact with young children. This study is just in the beginning stages and later studies will be conducted with actual parents and children. Since most of you are or will be parents in the future, the information that you provide will be useful in shaping the course of further investigations.

The questionnaire contains four hypothetical situations typical of the kind that parents are often confronted with. For each situation, I would like you to imagine that you are the parent of a 7-year-old girl. In the various situations, you are to imagine that you are alone with your daughter. In each situation, you will hear a tape recording of your daughter telling you of an incident that just happened. The questionnaire also has a written version of what your daughter will tell you in each situation so that you may read along with the tape recording.

Following each situation is a list of four responses that a parent might give to his or her child experiencing the particular problem. Below each response is a scale from 1 (not likely at all) to 5 (very likely). For each response, please indicate how likely you think you would be to give each particular response to your daughter. For example, if you think you would be very likely to give a particular response, circle the "5". If you think you would not be likely at all to give a particular response, circle the "1". If you think you would be somewhat likely to give a particular response, circle the "3" etc. Each response should be considered separately and not as part of an overall message that a parent might give.

Before we begin, let me assure you that there are no right or wrong answers on this task- we are just interested in what you think. After you have finished responding to the fourth situation, please wait for further instructions. Thank-you, in advance, for your participation.

"I had a fight with my best friend, Terry, today. We were fighting about the rules of a new game. We yelled at each other and called each other names. Now I don't know if we're still best friends."

- (1) "I know it makes you unhappy when you have a fight with one of your friends."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

- (2) "Ask Terry to come over after school tomorrow."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

- (3) "It sounds like you and Terry were just pretty upset at the time."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

- (4) "Have a talk with Terry tomorrow about what happened."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

"I think that maybe I'm not like the other kids. See, there are these four kids from my class that I always play with. Sometimes I just don't like to do some of the things that they like to do. Like on the playground or after school, they always like to play these games that I don't really like that much. I guess I'm just different from the other kids.

(1) "Tomorrow, play with some of the other kids in your class."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

(2) "It's O.K. to feel that way. There are times when we all feel different."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

(3) "Maybe some of the other kids don't like those games either but they just don't show their feelings."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

(4) "Try to get those four kids to play some other games."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

"Some of the kids were playing together and went to see if I could play with them. They said they had enough kids already and besides, they said they didn't even know me. Now I have no one to play with."

(1) "Ask the kids to come over here to play with some of your toys."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

(2) "You don't look very happy. I know it's no fun to feel lonely."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

(3) "I'm sure the other kids didn't mean to hurt your feelings."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

(4) "Try again when there are fewer kids playing."

Not likely at all		Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5

"Today in school our teacher put us into small groups to work on a class project. She told us we'd be working in groups for a week. Well today, when I gave my ideas about what we could do, the other kids wouldn't listen to me. Instead they just kept on talking about what they wanted to do. They just wouldn't pay attention to my ideas.

- (1) "I'm sorry that the other kids made you unhappy but you know that I think that your ideas are important.

Not likely at all			Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5	

- (2) "Tomorrow, explain your ideas in a different way to the other kids kids in your group."

Not likely at all			Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5	

- (3) "You know sometimes people are so wrapped up in their own ideas that they don't think about the feelings of others."

Not likely at all			Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5	

- (4) "Tell the kids in your group to take turns giving ideas."

Not likely at all			Somewhat likely		Very likely
1	2	3	4	5	

Note. This is the additional situation which was presented to subjects in Study 1 (see Footnote 3).

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES QUESTIONNAIRE

The items below inquire about kind of person you think you are. Each item consists of a pair of characteristics, with the letters A-E between. For example,

Not at all Artistic A....B....C....D....E Very Artistic

Each pair describes contrary characteristics—that is, you cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic. The letters fall between the two extremes. You are to circle a letter which describes where you fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would circle A. If you think you're pretty good, you might circle D. If you are only medium, you might choose D, and so forth.

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| 1. Not at all aggressive | A....B....C....D....E | Very aggressive |
| 2. Not at all independent | A....B....C....D....E | Very independent |
| 3. Not at all emotional | A....B....C....D....E | Very emotional |
| 4. Very submissive | A....B....C....D....E | Very dominant |
| 5. Not at all excitable
in a major crisis | A....B....C....D....E | Very excitable in
a major crisis |
| 6. Very passive | A....B....C....D....E | Very active |
| 7. Not at all able to devote
self completely to others | A....B....C....D....E | Able to devote self
completely to others |
| 8. Very rough | A....B....C....D....E | Very gentle |
| 9. Not at all helpful to
others | A....B....C....D....E | Very helpful to
others |
| 10. Not at all competitive | A....B....C....D....E | Very competitive |
| 11. Very Home oriented | A....B....C....D....E | Very wordly |
| 12. Not at all kind | A....B....C....D....E | Very kind |
| 13. Indifferent to others'
approval | A....B....C....D....E | Highly needful of others'
approval |
| 14. Feelings not easily hurt | A....B....C....D....E | Feelings easily hurt |
| 15. Not at all aware of
feelings of others | A....B....C....D....E | Very aware of feelings
of others |
| 16. Can make decisions
easily | A....B....C....D....E | Has difficulty making
decisions |
| 17. Gives up very easily | A....B....C....D....E | Never gives up easily |
| 18. Never cries | A....B....C....D....E | Cries very easily |
| 19. Not at all self-
confident | A....B....C....D....E | Very self-confident |
| 20. Feels very inferior | A....B....C....D....E | Feels very superior |

21. Not at all understanding of others	A....B....C....D....E	Very understanding of others
22. Very cold in relations with others	A....B....C....D....E	Very warm in relations with others
23. Very little need for security	A....B....C....D....E	Very strong need for security
24. Goes to pieces under pressure	A....B....C....D....E	Stands up well under pressure

APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONS

The questionnaire attached to these instructions is part of a study that will hopefully expand our knowledge of the ways that adults, particularly parents, interact with young children. This study is just in the beginning stages and later studies will be conducted with actual parents and children. Since most of you are or will be parents in the future, the information you provide will be useful in shaping the course of further investigations.

The questionnaire contains four hypothetical situations typical of the kind that parents are often confronted with. In each situation you will hear a tape recording of a 7-year-old girl telling her mother of an incident that just happened. The questionnaire also has a written version of what the young girl is telling her mother so that you may read along with the tape recording.

Following each situation is a list of responses that a mother might give to her child experiencing the particular problem. Below each response is a scale from 1 (not appropriate at all) to 5 (very appropriate). For each response, please indicate how appropriate you think it would be for a mother to give that particular response to her daughter. For example, if you think that a particular response is not appropriate at all, you would circle the "1". If you think that a particular response is very appropriate, circle the "5". If you think that a particular response is somewhat appropriate, circle the "3" etc. Each response should be considered separately and not as part of an overall message that the mother might give.

Before we begin, let me assure you that there are no right or wrong answers on this task-we are just interested in what you think. After you have finished responding to the fourth situation, please wait for further instructions. Thank-you, in advance, for your participation.

Daughter's statement:

"I think that maybe I'm not like the other kids. See, there are these four kids from my class that I always play with. Sometimes I just don't like to do some of the things that they like to do. Like on the playground or after school, they always want to play these games that I don't really like that much. I guess I'm just different from the other kids."

Mother's response:

_____ (1) "Tomorrow, play with some of the other kids in your class."

Not appropriate at all			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate
1		2		3	4	5

_____ (2) "It's O.K. to feel that way. There are times when we all feel different."

Not appropriate at all			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate
1		2		3	4	5

_____ (3) "Maybe some of the other kids don't like those games either but they just don't show their feelings."

Not appropriate at all			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate
1		2		3	4	5

_____ (4) "Try to get those four kids to play some other games."

Not appropriate at all			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate
1		2		3	4	5

Daughter's statement:

"I had a fight with my best friend, Terry, today. We were fighting about the rules of a new game. We yelled at each other and called each other names. Now I don't know if we're still best friends."

Mother's response:

_____ (1) "I know it makes you unhappy when you have a fight with one of your friends."

Not appropriate at all		Somewhat appropriate		Very appropriate
1	2	3	4	5

_____ (2) "Ask Terry to come over after school tomorrow."

Not appropriate at all		Somewhat appropriate		Very appropriate
1	2	3	4	5

_____ (3) "It sounds like you and Terry were just pretty upset at the time."

Not appropriate at all		Somewhat appropriate		Very appropriate
1	2	3	4	5

_____ (4) "Have a talk with Terry tomorrow about what happened."

Not appropriate at all		Somewhat appropriate		Very appropriate
1	2	3	4	5

Daughter's statement:

"Some of the kids were playing together and I went to see if I could play with them. They said they had enough kids already and besides, they said they didn't even know me. Now I have no one to play with."

Mother's response:

_____ (1) "Ask the kids to come over here to play with some of your toys."

Not appropriate at all		Somewhat appropriate		Very Appropriate
1	2	3	4	5

_____ (2) "You don't look happy. I know it's no fun to feel lonely."

Not appropriate at all		Somewhat appropriate		Very Appropriate
1	2	3	4	5

_____ (3) "I'm sure the other kids didn't mean to hurt your feelings."

Not appropriate at all		Somewhat appropriate		Very appropriate
1	2	3	4	5

_____ (4) "Try again when there are fewer kids playing."

Not appropriate at all		Somewhat appropriate		Very appropriate
1	2	3	4	5

Daughter's statement:

"Today in school our teacher put us into small groups to work on a class project. She told us we'd be working in groups for a week. Well today, when I gave my ideas about what we could do, the other kids would listen to me. They just kept on talking about what they wanted to do. They just wouldn't pay attention to my ideas."

Mother's response:

_____ (1) "I'm sorry that the other kids made you unhappy but you know that I think your ideas are important."

Not appropriate at all			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate		
1		2		3		4		5

_____ (2) "Tomorrow, explain your ideas in a different way to the other kids in your group."

Not appropriate at all			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate		
1		2		3		4		5

_____ (3) "You know sometimes people are so wrapped up in their own ideas that they don't think about the feelings of others."

Not appropriate at all			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate		
1		2		3		4		5

_____ (4) "Tell the kids in your group to take turns giving ideas."

Not appropriate at all			Somewhat appropriate			Very appropriate		
1		2		3		4		5

Note. This is the additional situation which was presented to subjects in Study 2 (see Footnote 9).

APPENDIX E

Mean Appropriateness Summary Scores by Sex of Subject, Sex
of Parent, and Sex of Child for Study 2

Sex of Child	<u>Sex of Subject</u>			
	<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>	
	Mother	Father	Mother	Father
Daughter	20.91	19.23	19.90	22.37
Son	20.88	20.70	21.80	21.38
Total	20.89	19.97	20.85	20.87

APPENDIX F

Mean Helpfulness Summary Scores by Sex of Subject and Sex of Parent for Study 2

Sex of Parent	<u>Sex of Subject</u>	
	Male	Female
Mother	18.70	20.21
Father	19.45	19.25
Total	19.08	19.58

THE SOCIALIZATION OF SEX DIFFERENCES IN
INTERPERSONAL PROBLEM SOLVING STYLE

by

GERI ANNE DINO

B.S., Ramapo College, 1977

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Psychology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1981

Effective interpersonal problem solving is considered to be a crucial factor in healthy psychological adjustment (e.g., Anthony, 1973); it involves several stages including the exploration of feelings and values (requiring expressive skills) and active planning of solutions and ameliorative action (requiring instrumental skills). This implies that the individual who possesses both types of skills would be the most adept problem solver. Yet, research indicates that, in interpersonal problem situations, women tend to show predominately expressive behaviors while men are primarily instrumental. These findings are consistent with the prevailing sex-linked stereotypes that females are and should be expressive, and males are and should be instrumental.

The present two studies explored whether these stereotypes are also found in the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style. Study 1 involved male and female undergraduates as hypothetical parents and explored the relative amounts of expressive and instrumental advice given to a "son" or "daughter" experiencing interpersonal problems. Each subject was asked to imagine that he/she was the parent of a young boy or girl and listened to tape recordings of his/her "child" describing three interpersonal problems. Subjects were presented with four responses for each situation (two expressive and two instrumental) that a parent might offer to a child experiencing the particular problem. Subjects indicated how likely they believed they would be to offer their "child" each of the responses. Sex-linked differences were found in the types of advice given to "sons" and "daughters". "Daughters" were more likely than "sons" to receive expressive responses and more likely to receive expressive than instrumental responses. "Sons" were more likely than "daughters" to receive instrumental responses; "sons" also tended to receive more instrumental than expressive responses.

Study 2 examined undergraduates' perceptions concerning the sex-role appropriateness and helpfulness of expressive and instrumental parental responses given to children experiencing interpersonal problems. Undergraduates listened to three tape recordings of a young child presented as being either a boy or a girl; the child was portrayed as describing the interpersonal problem situations used in Study 1 to either his/her mother or father. Each subject was in a particular sex of parent and sex of child condition. The subjects were given the four responses designed for each situation (as in Study 1) and were asked to indicate how appropriate and how helpful they believed it would be for a mother or father to offer the particular response to a son or daughter. It was found that instrumental responses were considered more appropriate and more helpful than expressive responses regardless of the sex of either the parent or child. A secondary focus of the present investigation was to explore the relationships among subjects' dispositional measures of expressiveness (F scale) and instrumentality (M scale) as assessed by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1974) and their judgments in Studies 1 and 2. Subjects' PAQ F scores were found to be positively associated with their (1) tendencies to offer expressive responses to their "children", and (2) helpfulness ratings of expressive responses. Both relationships, however, were relatively weak. The consequences and implications of sex-linked stereotypes on the socialization of interpersonal problem solving style was discussed; it was also suggested that future research take a more process-oriented approach to understanding this important area of socialization.