Attitude Towards Androgynization of Roles

Payal Mahajan, Neeru Sharma and Shallu Sharma

INTRODUCTION

The term ‘Androgyny’ comes from the Greek word ‘Andros’ meaning “man” and ‘gyne’ meaning “woman”. An androgynous person is therefore, one who has both masculine and feminine characteristics. Androgyny refers to sex role flexibility and adaptability. The major underlying assumption of this perspective of sex roles is that the individual may act in either a traditionally masculine or traditionally feminine manner, depending upon situation constraints and needs.

Attitude towards androgynization of roles is a belief that male and female human being should not be differentiated in role-play on the basis of sex and should be provided with equality of opportunity and freedom to develop in whatever direction their activities and interests dictate.

In Indian culture, it is the assumption that a woman’s primary identity is that of “home maker or housewife”. Assigned to her is not one, but three roles – as a wife, housework and child bearer. They are given stereotypical jobs such as that of teachers, secretaries, nurses, hostesses and men are given jobs like engineers, doctors etc. A very less percentage of women work outside their houses. A girl’s identity is often stamped with “feminine roles”. Her role in the parental home is bringing up the younger siblings as a second mother, in charge of fetching water, sweeping floor, collecting firewood. It was also found that traditional roles are expected from sons and daughters. Social change has brought about change in parents beliefs especially in urban areas. Based on these findings, a study was conducted with the following objectives: (i) to find out attitudes of males and females towards androgyny of roles; (ii) to find out attitudes of males and females towards models, prescription of behaviour, reinforcement of behaviour and exposure to varied occupations; (iii) to find out difference in attitudes of males and females regarding the above.

METHODOLOGY

The sample of the study consisted of 75 adolescent female students ranging in the age group of 15 – 25 years. Purposive random sampling technique was used to select the sample. The tools used for data collection was ATARSSCALE – Attitude Towards Androgyny of Roles Scale. This scale was devised by Bhishit, which comprises of 60 items in total and is divided into 4 dimensions – Models (M) which consists of items related to role model like examples of female role models should be given only to girls; Prescription of behaviour (PB) include items which prescribes the behaviour of boys and girls. Example “Shyness is the quality of girls and boys should not behave like girls”; Reinforcement of behaviour (RB) consists of items like “boys should not be scolded if they shy like girls and if boys behave like girls, they should be teased”; Exposure to varied occupations (EVO) include items as – Boy’s work efficiency is more than girls, girls have stereotypical vocations like teaching.

Data was collected from the sample, which was randomly selected. After the collection and coding of data, it was systematically tabulated under different headings. Coding was done on, the basis of gender, total score, dimensional scores – Models, Prescription of Behaviour, Reinforcement of Behaviour and Exposure to Varies Occupations, Percentages, Mean and Standard Deviation were calculated. In order to know the differences in attitudes of males and females, T-test was applied.

RESULTS

Table 1 reveal that the mean age group of the sample was 18 years; 33% of the sample was from higher secondary, 33% were under graduates, 33% were post graduates and mean of religion was Hindu. The sample was equally spread over the three educational levels.

From the Table 2, it is found that Mean and Standard Deviation of Dimension-Model (M) of males is 12.24 and 4.617 and mean of females is 13.75 and S.D is 17.76. T value shows
insignificant differences between the males and females. Mean and S.D of Dimension-Prescription of Behaviour (PB) of males is 12.86 and 3.27 and mean & S.D of females is 13.40 and 3.91. ‘t’ value shows insignificant difference between attitudes of males and females.

The table 2 also shows that Mean and S.D of Dimension-Reinforcement of Behaviour (RB) of males is 6.55 and 0.815 and Mean of S.D of females is 7.34 and 3.239. Calculated value of ‘t’ is less than the tabulated values of ‘t’ at 5% level of significance which shows that the difference between attitudes of males and females is insignificant.

The table 2 reveals that mean and SD of dimension- exposure to varied occupation of females is 6.84 and 3.36 and mean and SD of females is 7.31 and 3.904. The calculated ‘t’ value is less than the tabulated value at 5% and hence the difference between the attitude of males and females is insignificant.

To find out the difference between the attitude of males and females, Mean and S.D was calculated and then ‘t’ test was applied to get accurate results. Calculated value of ‘t’ is 0.496, which was less than the table value thereby pointing towards insignificant difference between the two study groups.

**DISCUSSION**

The sample appears to be androgynisors because the results reveal that there is almost no significant difference between the attitude of males and females towards andrognization of roles. Both males and females have the same attitudes regarding the dimensions- models, prescription of behaviour, reinforcement of behaviour, and exposure to varied occupations where as a study carried out by Bhogle (1996) to examine the concept of gender typing in Indian adolescents revealed that there is a multidimensionality of gender role flexibility in Indian adolescents. The results prove the contention that findings with regard to one domain cannot be generalized to other domains. The variability shown among the different domains suggests that an individual may be very gender typed in one content area and flexible in another. Research indicates that gender role identity is a good predictor of psychological adjustment. Masculine and androgynous children and adults have a higher sense of self-esteem, whereas feminine individuals often think poorly of themselves (Alpert-Gills and Connell, 1989; Boldizar, 1991). Androgynous individuals show greater maturity of moral judgments than individuals with other gender-role orientations (Bem, 1977; Block, 1973; Spencer et al., 1975). Feminine women seem to have adjustment difficulties because many of their traits are not highly valued by society. Another study was conducted by Sharma (1999) on Dogras and found that parents believe in differences of gender. They believe that boys and girls are different from start & these differences are mostly physiological, cognitive and behavioral. Daughters and sons are expected to behave in sex-appropriate ways as such girls are restricted in their diet, dress and demeanor, whereas as boys are allowed to show individuality, but within certain limits. Even the toys & games boys and girls play are different. The sex role differences are learnt as a part of the socialization process. Girls learn to become feminine and boys masculine, identifying with the prescribed role models of the particular society.
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ABSTRACT Androgyny refers to sex role flexibility and adaptability. An androgynous person therefore is one who has both masculine and feminine characteristics. The present study aims to find out the attitudes towards androgynization of roles. The sample comprised of 150 students (75 males and 75 females) in the age group of 15 – 25 years. Attitude towards androgynization of roles scale (ATARS) devised by Bhisht was used for data collection. Data was systematically coded and tabulated and inferences were drawn through statistical analysis using a test of significance (t). Results revealed that there was no significant difference between the attitudes of male and female students. Due to increase awareness and modernization and changed child rearing practices, the attitude of male and female regarding androgynization of roles were found similar.
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