McGILL UNIVERSITY

SEX-ROLE EXPECTATIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR HUMAN ADJUSTMENT

A Research Report submitted to

The School of Social Work
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

In partial fulfillment of the Requirements

for

The Master's Degree in Social Work

by

Rosemary Caplan
Nathan Karmel

Montreal, October, 1971

Master of Social Work
McGill University
School of Social Work

Rosemary Caplan
Nathan Karmel

SEX-ROLE EXPECTATIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR HUMAN ADJUSTMENT

ABSTRACT

This report embodies an exploration into the area of sex-role expectations - male expectations of females and females expectations of males. Fieldwork with adolescents and subjective observations of people, generally, led the investigators originally to speculate that when males and females have doubts about what is expected of them by members of the opposite sex, respectively, then this lack of confidence, manifested in a poorly developed self-concept, leads to many forms of self-defeating behavior, marital discord, subjective feelings of unhappiness and certain kinds of psychopathology.

In order to understand the dynamics operating within the field of sex-role expectations the exploration embodied, not only an examination of the contemporary style of definition of sex-role expectations, but also a study of the origins of human sex-role expectations. During the course of this exploration it was necessary to delve into some of the literature in many distinct fields, including: anthropology, sociology, psychology, physiology and endocrinology.

The study of the origins of sex-role expectations traced the natural history of man and concluded by proposing that during the course of this early history, primordial sex-role expectations evolved. The expectation made of the male was that he would be confidently assertive. Correspondingly, the expectation made of the female was that she would be willing to effect comfort-utility.

The current style of definition of sex-role expectations was found to be manifested in the form of societal stereotypes of the desired or preferred male and female, respectively. It was apparent that not every male and female had the necessary prerequisites to be the successful embodiment of the societal ideals. Moreover, the persuasiveness of many cultural stimuli, the most influential of which appear to be advertising, by carefully utilizing the primordial expectations as the basis, act to convince males and females that in order to be a "real man" or a "real woman", respectively, they must strive for the appropriate components of the projected, ideal male and ideal female.

It was proposed that all that is required to be a "real" male or a "real" female is an adherence to the primordial, rather than the societal sex-role expectations. This proposition gave rise to further lines of questioning with a view toward formulating possible strategies for action.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere thanks are expressed to Dr. E. V. Shiner of the McGill School of Social Work, for his advice and guidance in the preparation of this report. In addition, to Miss Manon J. Gingras, for her precision and competent secretarial services in the typing of the manuscript.

R.C.
N.K.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

We cannot foresee which differences between the sexes will be identified, prescribed, and positively sanctioned in future cultural definitions of the masculine and of the feminine. Psychologists have a responsibility for the objective clarification of these concepts. One hopes that future cultural definitions, based on these objective studies, will include, as far as possible, only those traits which do not prevent the person who accepts this constraint from achieving his fullest possible development as a person.

- Vincent Nowlis, Psychologist. (Sex Research: New Developments)

CHAPTER I

SOCIETAL STEREOTYPES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SELF-CONCEPT

The basis for this study originally emerged from haphazard, and relatively subjective, observations of adolescent, and, to some extent, adult behavior, in a variety of settings. Various aspects of this behavior, specifically those concerned with sex roles, seemed to be explicable in terms of certain evidence, concepts, and theories from a number of disciplines.

After a considerable amount of speculation there appeared to develop what may be termed an "eclectic proposition" about some vital components of human behavior. It is felt that, if the various ideas and observations of this exploration could be further substantiated through more evidence and continued research, this proposition could contribute considerably to a theory of human behavior.

In terms of social work, this emerging theoretical position could prove its utility in the following way: by concommitantly accounting for maladaptive behavior, such a theory might suggest guidelines for preventive and corrective measures. New methods of social work intervention might be constructed, based on this theory of behavior.

One of the most crucial developmental tasks of adolescence is adjustment to the opposite sex, and establishment of sex role identity. The implications of the proper resolution of this task are far-reaching: an individual's whole future adjustment, in terms of marriage, friends, and relationships in general, depends on his ability to adjust in adolescence.[1]

An observation, which is also described in the literature concerning adolescence, is that a salient preoccupation of adolescents is concerned with the opposite sex, and learning the cultural norms which define social behavior with the opposite sex.[2] The adolescent girl spends considerable time wondering what adolescent boys think about her, and the adolescent boy similarly wonders what adolescent girls think of him.

The literature abounds with descriptions of the adolescent years as an insecure, unstructured, and ill-defined phase of development, during which a certain amount

---

[1] David Gotleib and Charles Ramsey, The American Adolescent (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964), p. 118.

[2] Ibid., p. 114.

of turmoil is not abnormal.[1] Considering the importance of male-female relations and adjustment at this time, it is likely that the amount of security enjoyed during adolescence is closely related to the degree to which the individual feels he (she) conforms to the standard role expectations that members of the opposite sex hold for him (her), and the degree to which they are well thought of by these members of the opposite sex. Furthermore, it is evident that this proposition also holds true for adults, particularly if they have not made a successful adjustment during adolescence.

The cultural standards which adolescents and adults strive to fulfill and which determine their concepts of masculinity and femininity depend highly upon the definitions provided by the particular society of which they are members.[2] In North American society, there exists a set of very clear stereotypes delineating the mutual expectations of males and females: these reflect commonly-held notions of what the ideal North American male and the ideal North American female represent, and are a highly crucial organizer of behavior

---

[1]See Hans Sebald, Adolescence: A Sociological Analysis (New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1968), p. 11-12, 161, 171, 191; Gotleib and Ramsey, The American Adolescent, p. 127, Stella Chess, An Introduction to Child Psychiatry, 2nd ed. (New York and London: Grune and Stratton, 1969), chap. 15.

[2]Hans Sebald, Adolescence: A Sociological Analysis, p. 189.

between the sexes. These societal stereotypes are certainly subject to some variation according to regional considerations and the contemporary state of rapid social change; however, it can be shown that, in general, a certain widespread set of stereotypes of males and females pervades the relations between the sexes in North American culture.

The traditional stereotype of the strong, silent man, who does not confess to doubts, uncertainties, or insecurities, is still considered the ideal North American male personality in contemporary society. This type of man is not supposed to express any awareness of psychological problems or feelings, or to engage in general overt introspection; indeed, these kinds of admissions on the part of men are taken as a sign of weakness, and even effeminacy.[1] The strength of this stereotypic character is illustrated by the fact that men do hesitate to describe themselves with attributes necessitating an open demonstration of personalized feeling or sentimentality.[2]

---

[1] H.M. Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," Marriage and Family Living, XIX, (1957), 227-228, passim.

[2] John P. McKee and Alex C. Sherriffs, "Men's and Women's Beliefs, Ideas, and Self-Concepts," American Journal of Sociology, (1959), 362.

Another characteristic of the ideal male in North America, and one which is closely related to the one already discussed, is that of dominance, not only over females, but also over other males. A man who leads other men is more culturally desirable than one who is led - a high-ranking executive who manages many other "more inferior" men typifies the North American stereotype, in terms of dominance and leadership, more than those who are managed. In discussing the interrelationship between economic wealth and masculinity, Grier and Cobbs recognize this close alliance between power and masculinity. They maintain that manhood, in our society, is closely and inextricably interwoven with "power -- power to control and direct other men, power to influence the course of one's own and other lives."[1] The North American stereotype demands independent, aggressive behavior on the part of males.[2]

---

[1]William H. Grier and Price M. Cobbs, with a foreward by U.S. Senator Fred R. Harris, Black Rage, New York: Bantam Books, 1968, p. 50.

[2]Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," 231-233, passim.

In interpersonal relationships as well, the male is characteristically expected to be strong and dominant,[1] particularly over females. As Megargee notes:

> In our society, it is generally considered appropriate for men to dominate women, but not vice versa. Most managerial or executive positions are held by men, and while women do not usually feel uncomfortable working for men, men may feel quite discomfitted working at the direction of women.[2]

In describing their ideal male, women choose adjectives such as dominant, forceful, aggressive, and independent, all of which form a cluster describing a man who has strength and personal force.[3] Grier and Cobbs aptly describe this facet of the North American masculine stereotype in their discussion of the problems of the American Negro.

---

[1]Richard M. Kurtz, "Sex Differences and Variations in Body Attitudes," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, XXXIII, no. 5 (1969), 626.

[2]Edwin I. Megargee, "Influence of Sex Roles on the Manifestation of Leadership," Journal of Applied Psychology, LIII, no. 5 (1969), 377.

[3]McKee and Sherriffs, "Men's and Women's Beliefs, Ideas, and Self-Concepts," 360.

> Manhood in this country has many meanings but a central theme is clear.... They are encouraged to pursue, to engage life, to attack, rather than to shrink back. They learn early that to express a certain amount of aggression and assertion is manly.... The popular heroes in this country are men who express themselves aggressively and assertively.[1]

As has been mentioned earlier, another important characteristic of the ideal male in North America is economic success. In the eyes of women, success in the financial and economic sphere is closely identified with masculinity; moreover, it is an important component of a man's sex appeal.[2]

> "The association of money, economic power, and prestige with sexual potency or bodily stature is notorious. Money is a common form of the vindication of manliness...[3]

The fact that the ideal male in North America, in the estimation of both men and women, is a good provider[4] attests to the centrality of this component, particularly since providing well for oneself and one's family presupposes a certain amount of economic and financial success. A

---

[1]Grier and Cobbs, Black Rage, p. 50.

[2]Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," 232.

[3]Abram Kardiner, Sex and Morality, (Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., 1954), p. 168.

[4]Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," 227.

further prerogative of the ideal male in our society is that he bear the primary responsibility for the support of his home and family, and this factor serves additionally to accentuate the potency of this stereotyped character. Not only must the male be a good breadwinner, but he must also provide adequately for his family without a too-significant contribution on the part of his wife.[1]

Another vital aspect of the stereotype of the North American male is self-confidence. He is characteristically expected to be strong in character, and to give a feeling of general all-pervading security to his wife, or female companion, and children, if he has any. The ideal male exudes a self-confident assertiveness in his dealings with the outside world.[2]

One of the most vital components of the North American masculine stereotype is sexual prowess, and sexual adequacy is extremely important for males, both in terms of their relationship to women and to other men. "Sexual contests may be important for standing in the peer group, and boys

---

[1] Ernest R. Mowrer, "The Differentiation of Husband and Wife Roles", Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI (1969), 536; and Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," 229.

[2] Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," 227-231, passim.

who have had no exploits to recount may feel constrained to counterfeit them." [1]

Not only is the male expected to be able to perform the sexual act, but he is also rated in degrees of virility according to whether or not he can evoke a full sexual response on the part of the female. As Masters and Johnson maintain:

> The husband's fear of performance when dealing with a nonorgasmic wife reflects anxieties directed as much toward his own sexual prowess as to his wife's inability to accomplish relief of sexual tensions. It is the influence of our culture, expressed in the demand that he "do something" in sexual performance, that gives the man responsibility for the woman's sexual effectiveness as well as his own.[2]

Thus, it is apparent that the stereotype of the ideal male in North America includes being a "good lover."

In addition to these prerogatives, expectations, and desired character traits of the ideal male, there are also certain physical or anatomical requirements of the male in North American culture. Many of these components of physique which are of crucial importance in the male stereotype gain their significance from association with the desired traits of dominance, aggressiveness, and self-assertion, all of which have been described earlier as vital in the make-up

---

[1] Ibid., 231.

[2] William H. Masters and Virginia E. Johnson, Human Sexual Inadequacy (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970), p. 13.

of the ideal North American male.

Certain attributes in terms of body size and form represent and are embodied in the ideal male standard, and these are used as physical indicators of the already-described ideal male personality traits. Muscular effectiveness is associated, in our culture, with aggression and dominance, also desired in masculine behavior.[1] This stereotyped characteristic is reflected in the finding that large mesomorphs (well-muscled "he-men") liked their bodies more than males with other body types.[2] This finding reinforces the strength of the cultural ideal of the "he-man",[3] which also comprises "ruggedness and roughness."[4]

Another physical characteristic included in the stereotype of the ideal male is that of height and large body size, both of which are associated, in North American society, with the desired traits of dominance, self-confidence, and leadership.[5]

---

[1]Richard M. Kurtz, "Body Image -- Male and Female," Trans-Action, VI, no. 2, (Dec., 1968), 25.

[2]Ibid., 25.

[3]Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," 230.

[4]Ibid., 230.

[5]Kurtz, "Body Image -- Male and Female," 26.

Furthermore, the ideal male in North America does not "take an obvious and active interest in his bodily appearances";[1] this is considered not to be a legitimate masculine preoccupation. Men are supposed to take their physical presences for granted, although, as has been illustrated, certain specific requirements in terms of physique are culturally evident. Any kind of over-interest in his appearance may condemn a male, who may merely be attempting to please the opposite sex and capitalize on his positives, to the label of effeminate.

In reviewing the cultural stereotype of the North American male thus delineated, a picture of the ideal masculine personality, in our society's terms, emerges: a "red-blooded, gentlemanly go-getter",[2] who looks like a "real man" and who possesses the character traits of strength, dominance, and self-confident assertiveness. He assumes the major responsibility for the financial support of his family, and he does not accept too much help, either of a psychological or material nature, from his wife. He is capable of leading his own life successfully and is economically wealthy. He also fulfills his masculine duties in the

---

[1] Ibid., 230.

[2] John Gillin, An Introduction to Sociology (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1944), p. 172.

sexual relationship capably, and bears the primary responsibility for the success of this relationship.

Having provided an outline of the North American male stereotype and its components, a similar examination of the stereotype of the ideal female by North American standards is offered.

An interesting survey of short-story heroines in several women's magazines in 1957 and 1967 provides a global picture of the North American female stereotype as an attractive, married women in the 26-35 age group, who lives in a house in the city, has one or two children, and who, although she has been to college, engages in housekeeping as her major occupation. Her goals are love-oriented; moreover, career women are portrayed as "unwomanly," and are never sympathetic characters.[1] Thus, it is possible to derive a clear picture of what is culturally expected of the ideal female on a general level; this broad stereotype in terms of its individual components, deserves further examination.

The ideal North American female does not possess the traditionally masculine characteristics of action, vigor,

---

[1]Margaret Bailey, "The Women's Magazine Short-Story Heroine in 1957 and 1967," Journalism Quarterly, XLVI, no. 2 (Summer, 1969), 364-366, passim.

and personal strength;[2] on the contrary, she is more submissive, and less geared to self-assertion and achievement.[2] Although North American women themselves desire a balance between family-oriented and self-achievement (outside the home) strivings, they agree that the North American male's ideal woman is one who is extremely nurturant in her family behavior, submissive in her relationship with her husband and other men, and uninterested in seeking activity outside her home.[3] This finding testifies to the strength, of the traditional female stereotype in contemporary society, despite its vast change in the social and economic spheres.

Another component of the stereotype of the ideal North American female is that she be relatively weak and submissive,[4] particularly in her relations with men. She is

---

[1]McKee and Sherriffs, "Men's and Women's Beliefs, Ideas, and Self-Concepts," 359-360, passim.

[2]Anne Steinmann and David J. Fox, "Male - Female Perceptions of the Female Role in the United States," Journal of Psychology, LXIV (1966), 268.

[3]Anne Steinmann and David J. Fox, "Specific Areas of Agreement and Conflict in Women's Self-Perceptions and their Perceptions of Men's Ideal Woman in Two South American Urban Communities and an Urban Community in the United States," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI, no. 2 (1969), 282-289, passim.

[4]Kurtz, "Sex Differences and Variations in Body Attitudes," 626.

not supposed to be "as dominant or as aggressive as men"[1] are; furthermore, aggressive behavior is not acceptable in women while it is encouraged in men.[2]

By the time a North American girl reaches puberty she learns that "in social situations involving the opposite sex, it is unacceptable for her to be 'forward,' to take the initiative, be it sexual or otherwise."[3] She learns that she must occupy a passive role in her dealings with males, and this stereotype has implications for all aspects of her behavior.

The potency and far-reaching effect of the female stereotype of non-dominance, particularly over males, was recently illustrated in an interesting study of leadership among men and women ranking low and high respectively in the trait of dominance. A low incidence of assumption of the leader role by highly dominant women when paired with low-dominant men "was not the result of greater assertiveness by the low-dominant men, but instead of the reluctance of the high-dominant women to assume overt leadership over a

---

[1]Mirra Komarovsky, "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles," American Journal of Sociology (Nov., 1946), 185.

[2]L. Lansky, V. Grandall, J. Kagan, and C. Baker, "Sex Differences in Aggression and Its Correlates in Middle-Class Adolescents," Child Development, XXXII (1961), 45-58.

[3]Kurtz, "Sex Differences and Variations in Body Attitudes," 626.

male partner."[1]

The strength of this component is further reinforced by the fact that both men and women agree that the ideal North American female is one who would only "want to marry a man she could really look up to";[2] moreover, in marriage, she would make more concessions to her husband than she would expect from him.[3]

Another personality trait of the North American female is her greater emotionality and sympathy[4] when compared with her male counterpart, and she is also more accepting and permissive.[5] Men describe the ideal North American female as "affectionate, lovable, sentimental, sensitive, and soft-hearted,"[6] and agree that her greatest contribution

---

[1]Megargee, "Influence of Sex Roles on the Manifestation of Leadership, 381.

[2]Steinmann and Fox, "Male-Female Perceptions of the Female Role in the United States," 269.

[3]Ibid., 269.

[4]Komarovsky, "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles." 185.

[5]Steinmann and Fox, "Male-Female Perceptions of the Female Role in the United States," 268.

[6]McKee and Sherriffs, "Men's and Women's Beliefs, Ideals, and Self-Concepts," 360.

to her husband is in the area of emotional encouragement.[1] The stereotype of the ideal North American female includes the task of providing emotional support for her husband (or male companion), but "such support is in the nature of ego-building rather than direct participation and counsel."[2] In the family, the expressive role is assigned to the ideal female: she is the human relations expert who mediates conflicts, and whose entire function is fashioned on personal and emotional lines.[3] As mentioned earlier, she is basically love-oriented, and her family and children are her major concerns.

Several specific physical traits are typically assigned to the ideal North American female. Basically, the standard ideal, according to two investigators, is that of the "blond, blue-eyed, white-skinned girl with regular features."[4]

---

[1]Steinmann and Fox, "Male-Female Perceptions of the Female Role in the United States," p. 269.

[2]Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," p. 228.

[3]Mowrer, "The Differentiation of Husband and Wife Roles," p. 536.

[4]Grier and Cobbs, Black Rage, p. 33.

Society places great emphasis on the female body, and is very conscious and admiring of particular types of female forms. For this reason, the ideal North American female is supposed to be highly aware of her bodily appearance and, in order to be attractive, she must expend a great deal of energy in attempting to focus attention on those parts of her anatomy that are well-proportioned and sexually stimulating.[1]

Certainly, particular shapes of the female figure are held in high esteem and represent the North American ideal. Thinner women are more desirable in our culture, a fact reinforced by the finding that large, thin leptomorphs like their bodies more than do other women.[2] Since they correspond to the North American stereotype in terms of body shape and size, they are more content and at ease with their physical appearance.

There also exists certain expectations of the ideal North American female in the sexual sphere. Not only must she be able to satisfy her partner, but, in recent years particularly, the expectation has become that she also have the capacity for personal sexual gratification.[3]

---

[1] Kurtz, "Body Image -- Male and Female," 25.

[2] Ibid., p. 26.

[3] Margaret Mead, Male and Female (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1949), p. 293.

> The popular magazines, with their constant consideration of the subject, have brought to the nonorgasmic female a realization that in truth she is a naturally functional sexual entity.... Her frequently verbalized anxieties when she does not respond to the level of orgasm (at least a certain percentage of the time) are: "What is wrong with me?" "Am I less than a woman?" "I certainly must be physically unappealing to my husband," and so on.[1]

Women who do not have orgasms from the simple act of copulation are considered frigid in contemporary society.[2] This component of the ideal North American female character is further reinforced by the fact that the stereotype of the ideal male includes being capable of producing an orgasm in the female. As Mead so aptly states: "They are faced with the demand that [the male] be simply and directly potent, and that [the female] experiences climactic satisfaction from his simple, unelaborated potency."[3]

Thus emerges a portrait of the ideal North American female: an attractive woman who is relatively submissive and passive, non-dominant, particularly in relation to her husband and other men, and who is understanding, sympathetic, and emotionally supportive. She takes an active interest in

---

[1] Masters and Johnson, Human Sexual Inadequacy, p. 12.

[2] Mead, Male and Female, p. 294.

[3] Ibid., p. 294.

her body and constantly strives to maximize her physical attractiveness in the terms which our society dictates. Her home and family are her most important areas of activity and she is not very anxious to realize her potentialities outside this arena. In addition, she is able to satisfy her husband sexually, and be sexually satisfied by him.

Mead provides a definitive picture of the stereotypes of the ideal male and female in North American culture as follows:

> To receive recognition - from both men and women - a man in America should be, first of all, a success in his business; he should advance, make money, go up fast, and, if possible, he should also be likeable, attractive, and well-groomed, a good mixer, well informed, good at the leisure-time activities if his class, should provide well for his home, keep his car in good condition, be attentive enough to his wife so that he doesn't give other women an opportunity to catch his interest. A woman, to receive equal recognition should be intelligent, attractive, know how to make the best of herself in dress and manner, be successful in attracting and keeping first several men, finally one, run her home and family efficiently so that her husband stays devoted and her children all surmount the nutritional, psychological, and ethical hazards of maturation, and are successful too; and she should have time for "outside things," whether they be church, grange, community activities, or Junior League.[1]

Having reviewed and analyzed the basic sex-role standards and expectations in North American society, it is

---

[1] Ibid., p. 306-307.

now possible to examine the consequences which follow when an individual fails, or subjectively feels that he has failed, to live up to these cultural stereotypes.

George Herbert Mead's social psychology, particularly the important segment dealing with the genesis and maintenance of the self-concept, is particularly useful for these purposes.[1] Basically, this theory of the self and personality maintains that:

> The individual experiences himself as such, not directly, but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same social group, or from the generalized standpoint of the social group as a whole to which he belongs.... and he becomes an object to himself only by taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself within a social environment or context of experience and behavior in which both he and they are involved.[2]

Thus, it is evident that the self is formed through the definitions made by others, which implies defining one's behavior and self in terms of the expectations of others.[3]

---

[1] See George Herbert Mead, On Social Psychology: Selected Papers, ed. and with an Introduction by Anselm Strauss, 1st Phoenix ed. (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 199-246.

[2] Ibid., p. 202-203.

[3] Bernard N. Meltzer, "Mead's Social Psychology," in Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology, ed. by Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967), p. 19.

The self or self-image is extremely crucial to an individual as he develops: "It is this self-structure that provides the individual with a stable sense of his own identity and a central reference point for his adjustive behavior."[1] Furthermore, the self-identity is shaped to a large extent by the social roles a person plays, and the values and attitudes expected of an individual in his position.[2] Similarly, these social roles are also learned through interaction with significant others in the individual's social environment, who supply the definitions and expectations of the particular role.[3] "Because primary sex differences are of such enormous importance, shaping so determinatively the child's experience of the world through its own body and the responses of others to its sex membership, most children take maleness or femaleness as their first identification of themselves."[4]

---

[1]James S. Coleman, Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1960), p. 63.

[2]Ibid., p. 64.

[3]Orvilee G. Brim, Jr., "Family Structure and Sex Role Learning by Children," in Marriage, Family, and Society: A Reader, ed. by Hyman Rodman, Merrill-Palmer Institute (New York: Random House, 1965), p. 159.

[4]Margaret Mead, Male and Female, p. 136.

Thus, since sex, or gender-identity, is one of the "master roles" in any society, it would follow that one's self-concept and evaluation of one's self largely depends on the extent to which he (she) is able to fulfill the societal expectations of his (her) sex role. As we have mentioned earlier, the salience of sex-role identity becomes increasingly important during adolescence, when "the adolescent's success or failure in winning social acceptance from both boys and girls is a major influence on his development."[1]

Conversely, acceptance or non-acceptance (a positive or negative label) has crucial implications for the further development of the self-concept or self-image, since the "self-idea... seems to have three principal elements: the imagination of our appearance to the other person; the imagination of his judgment of that appearance; and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification."[2]

---

[1]Coleman, Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior, p. 57.

[2]Charles Horton Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order, with an Introduction by Philip Rieff and a Foreward by George Herbert Mead (New York: Schocken Books, 1964), p. 184.

When an individual is unable, or subjectively feels he has been unable, or has been defined by others as unable to fulfill the expectations of his sex-role, he begins to evaluate himself as inadequate or unworthy. He develops what may be termed a negative self-identity, which is a form of maladjustment. On the other hand, if the individual does, or feels he has, or is defined as having lived up to the expectations that others hold for one in his position, he likewise defines himself as successful, adequate, and is secure.[1]

As Combs and Snygg indicate, these self-definitions, made in adolescence or even childhood, have a continuing effect on personality development and later adjustment:

> The more positive self definitions he acquires, the greater is the feeling of adequacy and need satisfaction; and, conversely, the more negative self-definitions he acquires, the more frustrated and unhappy he becomes.... The most basic of such self concepts may be so deeply rooted in the individual's organization that they cannot easily be changed even by the most drastic of later experiences.[2]

The North American sex role stereotypes which have been delineated earlier in this chapter are the cultural expectations assigned to the role of male or female. The

---

[1]Coleman, Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior, p. 65.

[2]Arthur W. Combs and Donald Snygg, Individual Behavior, rev. ed. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 136.

detrimental consequences, in terms of negative self-image or poor self-evaluation, as described above, accrue to the individual who, for some reason, is unable, feels he is unable, or is defined as not being able to fulfill these normative standards. Mead very aptly describes the results of an individual's inability to satisfy the sex-role stereotypes of the society to which he belongs; as follows:

> For the children who do not belong to these preferred types, only the primary sex characters will be definitive in helping them to classify themselves. Their impulses, their preferences, and later much of their physique will be aberrant. They will be doomed throughout life to sit among the other members of their sex feeling less a man, or less a woman, simply because the cultural ideal is based on a different set of clues no less valid, but different... and the small rabbit man sits sadly, comparing himself with a lionlike male beside whom he is surely not male, and perhaps for that reason alone yearning forever after the lioness woman. Meanwhile the lioness woman, convicted in her inmost soul of lack of femininity when she compares herself with the rabbitty little women about her, may in reverse despair decide that she might as well go the whole way and take a rabbity husband. Or the little rabbity masculine if he had been bred in a culture that recognized him as fully male, and quite able to take a mate and fight for her and keep her, may give up altogether and dub himself a female and become a true invert, attaching himself to some male who possesses the magnificent qualities that have been denied him.[1]

Other writers as well have found a relationship between ability to fulfill the sex-role expectations of one's

---

[1]Margaret Mead, Male and Female, p. 137-138.

culture and the genesis of maladaptive behavior and neurosis. For women in North America, the acceptance of the standard of a more passive role is viewed by psychiatrists as a prerequisite for sexual adjustment and marital satisfaction; similarly, for men in North America, reluctance or inability to fulfill the stereotype of assertiveness and activity is viewed as pathogenic in the formation of sexual impotence and homosexuality.[1] As Hacker indicates, further stressing the impact of sex-role stereotypes on maladjustment, "individuals who manifest personality traits ascribed to the opposite sex or who feel inadequate in fulfilling their part of the sexual division of labor may become confused in their sexual identification, and feel that they must also change their sexual object."[2] Thus, inability to live up to the North American sex-role stereotypes, which emphasize the differentiation between the sexes, may result in sexual maladaption and homosexuality.

An interesting study, illustrating the effect of inability to meet sex-role expectations on the development of mental illness, or neurosis, showed that females experi-

---

[1]Richard M. Kurtz, "Sex Differences and Variations in Body Attitudes," 626.

[2]Hacker, "The New Burdens of Masculinity," 232.

enced greater intracultural stress in the process of attempting to fulfill sex-role expectations and hence had a greater susceptibility to "susto," a folk illness closely resembling neurotic depression. In this particular culture, women, whose sex roles are more narrowly defined, showed a greater incidence of "susto," which was the result of having failed to meet, or feeling that there was a failure to meet the culturally established sex-role expectations of the society.[1] This finding supports the commonly held notion that individuals who perceive that they have been unable to satisfy the sex-role norms to which they have been socialized are more likely to develop maladaptive and neurotic behavior.

Furthermore, family breakdown and marital discord is another detrimental consequence of failing to have fulfilled the traditional and widely-held sex-role stereotypes. For men, the breadwinner role is an important source of self-respect and prestige from his family and from the outside world; on the other hand, women are supposed to be at home caring for the children. When these roles are reversed, and the societal stereotypes concerning sex-role

---

[1]Carl W. O'Neill and Henry A. Selby, "Sex Differences in the Incidence of Susto in Two Zapotec Pueblos," Ethnology, VII, no. 1 (Jan., 1968), pp. 95-105, passim.

are thus distorted, serious consequences follow.[1] This is most noticeable in the case of the Negro family, where status down-grading due to his unfavourable position in the job market is particularly ominous due to his originally tenuous position as head of the family. Investigators have pointed to the fact that "there is no way to strengthen family life among Negros until we find a way to give the father his rightful role as breadwinner and protector of his family."[2] Although this assumption may or may not, in fact, be valid, the finding of severe marital and familial problems in Negro families where the wives work, significantly testifies to the strength of the sex-role stereotypes just described.

In summary, there seems to be a direct correlation between clear sex-role identity, positive self-concept and favorable self-evaluation, and ability to meet the standard sex-role expectations embodied in the North American stereotypes governing the relationship between the sexes. Conversely, there seems to be also a relation between unclear

---

[1]Joan Aldous, "Wive's Employment Status and Lower-Class Men as Husband-Fathers. Support for the Moynihan Thesis," Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI, no. 3 (Aug., 1969), 469-476, passim.

[2]Edwin C. Berry, "Conference Transcript," Daedalus, XCV, (Winter, 1966), 29.

sex-identity, poor self-evaluation and negative self-concept, and inability to fulfill these cultural norms. Although this appears to be true in all societies, we have mainly limited ourselves to an examination of the North American society.

Since failure to establish a sex-role identity is apparently of such significance, it is important that these sex-role expectations be examined more closely. What are the roots of these expectations? In what forms are they manifest? What is the contemporary style of definition of these sex-role expectations? Assuming that definitive answers to these questions can be found, what possible strategies might be employed to help individuals achieve clear sex-role identities in North American society.

CHAPTER II

PRIMORDIAL SEX-ROLE EXPECTATIONS

Examining the early natural history of man greatly facilitates an examination of both the origin and the operation of these sex-role expectations. Evidence would indicate that such expectations exist as a result of the complex relationship between biology and the economics of survival: they have existed throughout all the history of man and within a large majority of human cultures - they are essentially universal. There are a number of points to consider, however, before engaging in such an examination. Firstly, the assumption being made is that given man's particular biological endowment or structure and its exposure to a particular ecological system, a specific form of bio-socio-functioning will occur. Organisms with highly similar biological structures will tend to function or behave in an approximately similar manner, given exposure to identical environmental conditions.

So for example, males, having a different biological constitution from females tend to behave differently from the latter, given exposure to the same ecological conditions. "Male role" as opposed to "female role" expresses this difference. That is, behavior that is widely engaged in by

males comes to be included in the male role; similarly, behavior that is widely engaged in by females comes to be known as the female role.

As a role becomes widely practiced and recognized this role becomes institutionalized and gives rise to role expectations. Thus, the role practiced by males comes to be the role expected of males and the role that females engage in, likewise, becomes the role that is expected of females.

These investigators would hold that male and female role expectations find their origin in the biology of males and females. Furthermore, to the extent that the biology of humans is relatively constant (evolutionary adaptations do occur through mechanisms such as mutations), male behavior (and role expectations of the male), by extension, is relatively constant, also, and occurs wherever human males exist. The same is true in terms of the female.

It would appear that the precursor of all differences between males and females originiated in the childbirth process. The more involved the childbirth-child rearing process became, the more the differences in male and female roles became accentuated. One might speculate that if humans did not need to reproduce their kind (either it was not a human responsibility or, if one could conceive of it thus, it was just not an issue), their would be no necessity for sexual dimorphism.

Examining man's early history (colloquially termed "caveman days") leads these investigators to believe that male and female roles and male and female role-expectations, respectively, evolved slowly throughout, at least, the last 12,000,000 years of hominid history. It appears unlikely that the components of the male role, for example, developed at exactly the same time in history. It is likely, for example, that one aspect of behavior became prevalent 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 years before or after any other aspect of behavior. These expectations can be termed "primordial."

We would propose that the sex-role expectations which will be discussed had evolved by the time modern man appeared - about 40,000 years ago. This proposal appears to find support from Washburn and Lancaster's observations that preagricultural societies (that is, hunting-gathering economies) have produced ninety-nine percent of human history.

> . . .the biology of our species was created in that long hunting and gathering period. To assert the biological unity of mankind is to affirm the importance of the hunting way of life. It is to claim that, however much conditions and customs may have varied locally, the main selection pressures that forged the species were the same. The biology, psychology, and customs that separate us from the apes - all these we owe to the hunters of time past. And, although the record is incomplete and speculation becomes larger than fact, for those who would understand the origin and nature of human behavior there is no choice but

to try to understand "Man the Hunter."[1]

This carries one to the next point: that any examination of the social behavior of caveman days will always be open to speculation and theorizing.

Every year more paleolithic sites are uncovered by archaeologists, anthropologists, and paleontologists, using increasingly more sophisticated methods and techniques. Yet, relatively speaking, we still know very little about early man. Furthermore, with more specific references to the social life of early man, we know considerably less. No matter how many sites and artifacts and fossils are uncovered, reconstruction of early social life will always remain, at best, highly speculatory.

Our conclusions, upon examining hominid life during the Pliocene and Pleistocence Epochs, are admittedly purely speculatory. The purpose of examining whatever is known about these times is to prevent errors in fact which would give rise to wild and, perhaps, uncalled-for speculation.

We have merely looked at the same set of "facts" as have other thinkers of early man's socio-economic life, and have attempted to theorize from a different point of view. It is possible that in our interpretation of the "facts" we have departed from the traditional interpretations.

---

[1]Sherwood L. Washburn and C.S. Lancaster, "The Evolution of Hunting," in Man the Hunter, ed. by Richard B. Lee and Irven De Vore, with the assistance of Jill Nash, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1968), p. 303.

It should also be noted that reconstructionists of early man's social life have made use of certain other indicators in attempting to piece together early life. Some anthropologists have assumed that customs and traditions, for example, that are found widespread throughout a number of modern cultures must have originated somewhere.[1] They likewise attribute the origins to our caveman predecessors.

Some investigators also place special significance upon the observation of modern "primitive cultures"[2] which are supposedly fixed at the Stone Age in their level of cultural development. Howell notes that "what most primitive modern societies do have in common with each other and with paleolithic societies is that they are all based on hunting and gathering as a way of life and not on agriculture."[3] De Vore and others make a similar observation.[4]

---

[1]Clark Howell and the Editors of Time-Life Books, Early Man, (New York: Time-Life Books, 1965), p. 100.

[2]Australian Aborigines; Bushmen of South Africa; Andaman Islanders; Shoshani of American Great Basin; Eskimos; Pygmy groups in Africa, Malaya, and Phillipines.

[3]Howell, Early Man, p. 171.

[4]Irven De Vore, Peter Murdock, and John W.M. Whiting, "Are the Hunter-Gatherers a Cultural Type?" in Man the Hunter, ed. by Richard B. Lee and Irven De Vore, p. 335.

Another indicator used is that of behavior of other mammals, especially other primate groups of which baboons and rhesus monkeys appear to be the most popularly observed. In utilizing this parallel, the underlying assumption holds that as we are structurally or biologically evolved from the ape-like primates, then our social behavior likewise has evolved from that of the apes.[1] Some investigators who postulate a collective human consciousness even go as far as talking of a primordial segment of this consciousness which includes those instincts which supposedly guided the behavior of our ape-like ancestors.

One should note very clearly that the indicators mentioned above are nothing more than just that - merely indications[2] of what paleolithic and pliocene social life must have been like. For all the investigators who make use of these indicators (some make far greater use than others), there are others who would apparently tend to piece together the social behavior of early man only on the basis of archaeological discoveries pertaining to those early cultures.

---

[1]Theodosius Dobzhansky, Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1962), p. 173.

[2]This point is supported by De Vore, Murdock, and Whiting, p. 335.

The point to be made is that whatever help can be obtained from these indicators (notwithstanding theorizing about the social life of early man) is highly speculatory and as yet still a rather academic exercise.

It would appear that for most of man's history (until relatively recent times) the chief activity of man was directed towards satisfying the basic physiological needs - the needs which must be met to ensure survival - food, water, and shelter.

Man's earliest hominid ancestors, the Ramapithecines, were apparently herbivorous. They were not yet meat eaters, and they resembled their primate ancestors in terms of diet. It was during the period of Ramapithecus' evident successor, Australopithecus, that meat began to find its way into man's diet.

It is not all that necessary to know why man's ancestors turned to meat as a dietary source. Pfeiffer notes simply that "meat eating had arisen mundanely enough as a way of exploiting new sources of food."[1] Desmond Morris, the zoologist, indicates that the climate of man's forest-dwelling ancestors began to work against him and he was

---

[1]John E. Pfeiffer, The Emergence of Man (New York, Evanston, and London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969), p. 132.

forced into the savanahs.[1] His options at this point were twofold: he could adopt a chiefly herbivorous diet or a meat-eating diet. Morris notes that at that point in man's evolution "specialized exploitation of the plant life in the open country was beyond the capacity of our early ancestors."[2] Moreover, the necessary digestive system was lacking. On the other hand, man, at this point, had descended from a stock to which proteins (which could readily be obtained from meat-eating) were undoubtedly of great importance.[3] Our major concern, however, in terms of the change to meat-eating, involves the other related biological changes which are related to this new adaptation.

Pfeiffer, again, notes that:

> Once this development gained momentum, man's ancestors were committed to activities which changed them physiologically, psychologically, and socially. In the process of meeting a simple need they created new conditions, new partly man-made environments, and a whole new complex of new needs.[4]

---

[1] Desmond Morris, The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), p.p. 19-20.

[2] Ibid., p. 20.

[3] Ibid., p. 20.

[4] Pfeiffer, The Emergence of Man, p. 131.

It appears that about this time man was beginning to make use of tools as an aid to his survival.[1] Without the use of tools, indeed without the ability to make tools, as Washburn and Avis note, man could not have survived as a hunter.[2]

This cultural development had extremely important biological consequences, for initially it resulted in a heightened development of the brain, especially in terms of increase in size.[3,4] Man's biological evolution was affected appropriately by this physiological change and the response was twofold.

The birth of a large-brained infant was permitted by the enlarging of the female pelvic opening and a widening of the hips. However, as great an increase as there was in these pelvic structures, it was not sufficient to allow for

---

[1]Widespread use of tools was probably not the case until the appearance of Homo erectus in the middle of the Pleistocence Epoch, about 250,000 years ago.

[2]Sherwood L. Washburn and Virginia Avis, "Evolution of Human Behavior," in Behavior and Evolution, ed. by Anne Roe and George Gaylord Simpson (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958), pp. 432-435.

[3]Ibid., p. 435.

[4]Pfeiffer, The Emergence of Man, p. 137.

the huge increase in the size of the human brain.[1] Had these changes in female anatomy taken place to the extent that the brain required, then there would have been a corresponding and dangerous decrease in the already relatively poor mobility of females.[2]

The brain, therefore, had to do most of its growing after birth, which meant, of course, extending the period of infant dependency. Not only were human infants helpless longer than infants of other primates but also they were more helpless since they could not literally cling to their mothers, as was the case in the other primates.[3]

It will now become apparent (as noted earlier) that this greatly more involved childbirth-child rearing process produced a much greater dimorphism between males and females. From this point on in man's evolution, the female was rendered, biologically, less adept at obtaining food, especially when there was a wholesale change to a meat-eating

---

[1] Rhesus monkeys are born with a brain that is about three quarters of its adult size but the brain of a newborn Homo erectus infant had probably completed only one third of its growth (see Pfeiffer, The Emergence of Man, p. 136.).

[2] Pfeiffer notes in The Emergence of Man, p. 138, that as far as speed is concerned, the ideal pelvis is a male one. Women cannot generally run as fast as men, a disadvantage in prehistoric times when flight was called for frequently.

[3] Ibid., pp. 138-139.

diet.

Because the human infant was much more dependent on the mother than was the case with other primates, further biological and social adaptations were needed. As female mobility was reduced (due to changes in female anatomy, length of time of infant dependency, and, it is reasonable to assume, because she was very likely pregnant most of the time), there was a growing dependency on the male to obtain all but the close-at-hand plant foods. Moreover, hunting was dangerous, as Howell notes:

> It became more and more unsuitable for females and young to tag along and expose themselves to the dangers of the hunt, and also probably impossible for them to keep up if the hunt was a long and arduous one.[1]

It appears that the more hostile the environment was the more the female was dependent upon the male.[2] One should note that modern day medicine has detailed the biological basis for this dependence. Naomi Wenner, a psychiatrist, begins by hypothesizing that:

> Mature dependence... corresponds to the social or interpersonal rather than the strictly biologically determined form, though still derived from it.

---

[1] Howell, Early Man, p. 172.

[2] Ibid., pp. 151-152.

> Pregnancy inevitably calls for a marked increase in dependence. It is on the basis of practical and biological factors, to some extent during the early stages with its endocrine readjustments and more particularly late in pregnancy, during delivery, and the early postpartum period. But it is also on the emotional and interpersonal level throughout, reflecting the woman's attitudes to, and expectations of, receiving the necessary help and support.
>
> One hypothesis is that when a woman accepts the need for dependence as part of "cooperative relations with differentiated objects," and is confident help will be forthcoming, pregnancy is not a crisis for her. When she is abashed by her needs or feels hopeless about having them fulfilled, pregnancy is a crisis calling forth regression to infantile longing for omnipotent protection and care. This may be explained in terms of general increase in anxiety, exacerbation of old patterns dealing with anxiety (e.g. increased symptomatology), increased demandingness or rage or exaggerated fears for herself or the fetus.[1]

The endocrine readjustments referred to above appear to refer mainly to the female sex hormone progesterone, and its increased production during pregnancy.[2] Apparently, progesterone enters the brain and affects brain function[3] in the following ways: general anaesthesia is produced where

---

[1]Naomi K. Wenner, "Dependency Patterns in Pregnancy," in Sexuality of Women, ed. by Jules H. Masserman (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1966), p. 95.

[2]F.R. Winton and L.E. Bayliss, Human Physiology (London: J. and A. Churchill Ltd., 1962), p. 308.

[3]David A. Hamburg, "Effects of Progesterone on Behavior," in Endocrines and the Nervous System, ed. by Rachmiel Levine (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1967), p. 42.

where there are large doses, and with moderate doses sedation is the result.[1]

Such changes in brain functioning would quite obviously reduce the capacity of the female for coping with her environment, thus increasing her dependency needs on the male. In fact, as one writer notes, "women were in the process of becoming 'the other sex' in a sense that is true for no other primates, the first females to be left behind and to fear being abandoned."[2]

The female, recognizing her potential dependence needs for the male, must have had well-defined expectations of what the male should be like. Life in this early hostile environment, without even the rudiments of technology, must have been unpredictable and quite likely very frightening. As much of earliest man's life was occupied with providing the basic needs (which in a hunting-gathering society meant killing animals), the all-pervading biological theme of "survival of the fittest" in a very real sense meant survival of the physically fittest.

---

[1] W. Merryman, "Progesterone Anaesthesia in Human Subjects," Journal of Clinical Endocrinology, XIV, no. 1, (1954), 567-569.

[2] Pfeiffer, The Emergence of Man, p. 141.

Where the necessities of life were relatively scarce[1,2] or at best, erratic[3], and sufficient technological devices for dealing with the more oppressive vicissitudes of the environment had yet to be invented, survival depended upon the prerequisites of physical strength and power. However, sheer brawn was not the only prerequisite, for a powerful man physically was of no use unless he was assertive. At this early stage in man's history he could not merely co-exist with his environment; on the contrary, he had to continually strike-out, to be "on the go" all the time, exploiting as often as he could. For, in these times, men could likely not yet predict environmental changes and their consequences with any degree of accuracy. He was, therefore, forced to take as much advantage as possible and as often as possible. The key male trait admired and wished for by females, then, was a kind of confident assertiveness - a kind of obtrusiveness, marked driving, forceful energy or

---

[1]Ibid., p. 134. Pfeiffer indicates that in prehistoric times twenty to sixty square miles were required to provide subsistence for one person, whereas only fifteen square miles are needed to support a troop of forty baboons.

[2]Washburn and Lancaster, "The Evolution of Hunting," in Man the Hunter, ed. by Lee and De Vore, p. 293. They have estimated that the most minor hunting expedition covers an area larger than that covered by most nonhuman primates in a lifetime.

[3]Washburn and Avis, "Evolution of Human Behavior," in Behavior and Evolution, ed. by Roe and Simpson, p. 434.

initiative.

It would follow that where commodities were scarce, male assertiveness would be directed in aggressive forms against other species[1] and likely, especially early in his hunting development, against other hominid competitors.[2] Even though cooperative behavior purportedly developed (only) when man began to hunt, one can conceive of occasions wherein a relative scarcity in food resulted in a struggle between precisely the same males who had formerly cooperated in the hunt. Moreover, as preferences developed for certain kinds or parts of the spoils of the hunt, it was hardly likely that the resulting conflict would be settled by "flipping a coin."

Although it appears that a hunting life necessitated cooperation between all the participating males, it is highly likely that cooperative behavior did not develop simultaneously with the change to hunting. Indeed, it is likely that the behavior of early man's primate ancestors had somewhat enduring effects with reference to early man's food-sharing behavior. "Among the vegetarian primates, adult

---

[1]This is particularly the case with other carnivores such as hyenas and jackals. See Howell, Early Man, pp. 64-65.

[2]Ibid., pp. 74-75. Howell speculates that the extinction of Paranthropus may have been due, partially, to the constant pressure from the Australopithecines, both of whom, apparently, lived side by side.

males do not share food. They take the best places for feeding and may even take food from less dominant animals."[1]

Washburn and De Vore note that among baboons, "a dominant animal may displace lesser members of the troop from a desired location in fruit trees.... Among baboons, digging with a tool would result in a surplus under the control of the larger animals."[2]

Washburn and Avis propose that as carnivores generally share their food, such a similar habit must have developed among early human hunters.[3]

It would appear, however, that:

> ... the human situation was far more complicated socially than that of other carnivores. If early men were living in troops that were as large as those of baboons, there would have been fifty or sixty individuals sharing the meat. No comparable situation exists among other carnivores, and the orderly distribution of food in human society must have presented a new social problem.[4]

---

[1]Washburn and Avis, "Evolution of Human Behavior," pp. 433-434.

[2]Sherwood L. Washburn and Irven De Vore, "Social Behavior of Baboons and Early Man," in Social Life of Early Man, ed. by Sherwood L. Washburn (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1961), p. 100.

[3]Washburn and Avis, "Evolution of Human Behavior," p. 434.

[4]Washburn and De Vore, "Social Behavior of Baboons and Early Man," pp. 100-101.

Invariably, then, the bigger (more mesomorphic) male would win out, as bigger size meant more muscle-power in terms of physical force which could be exerted. Perhaps, more significant was the fact that big size was often indicative of adequate nourishment, and adequate nourishment was typically a prerequisite for energetic, assertive behavior. Adequate nourishment also auggested that the male had in the past been capable of assertive, energetic behavior, as he obviously had been successful in acquiring food.

It is proposed that the big, powerful man was inevitably the most confident, for where the tools of supremacy (muscle power) were all his, he could take what he wanted, at will, and hence had a genuine confidence in his own ability to succeed and to beat-out competitors. When females were at a stage where they needed male support, that is, when they were most dependent (for example, during the latest stages of pregnancy and delivery), a confident male was much more valuable than one who was worried and insecure about his ability to provide for himself, his mate, and his children.[1]

It is likely that this feeling still exists in women and determines in what form their expectations of the male will be realized. An example of this association between physical size and expected traits is often heard when girls

---

[1]Note the beneficial effects of confidence in a person who is acting in a supporting role in modern therapeutic settings.

admit that they "feel safer and more secure with a bigger guy."

In short, a confident assertiveness was the trait admired and most expected of the male by the female and, indeed, was necessary if she and her offspring were to survive. The non-assertive male, regardless of his other attributes - physical or mental - could not survive.

There is some evidence that assertiveness may be determined by hormones. Young, Goy, and Phoenix[1] gave the male sex hormone, androgen, to a pregnant rhesus monkey. The result among the female offspring was masculinization. These masculinized females threatened, initiated play, and engaged in rough-and-tumble play more frequently than controls. Like normal males, these masculinized females also withdrew less often from the initiations, threats, and approaches of other subjects. They also showed a greater tendency toward mounting behavior than did the untreated females. This evidence indicates that role-expectations of male assertiveness have biological basis, that is, that male assertiveness is biologically predisposed.

Additionally, Hamburg and Lunde have postulated that:

> Early exposure to androgen would affect humans in more subtle ways. Perhaps the influence of

---

[1]William C. Young, Robert W. Goy, and Charles H. Phoenix, "Hormones and Sexual Behavior," Science, no. 143. (1964), 212-218.

> androgen during a critical period in brain development on the circuits destined later to mediate aggressive behavior would have CNS-differentiating effects that would facilitate ease of learning aggressive patterns and increase readiness to learn such patterns. For example, the hormone in a critical period might affect later sensitivity to certain stimulus patterns.[1]

Money goes further and ties this kind of assertiveness to sexual assertiveness. He postulates that the higher ratio of androgen to estrogen in males (as compared to that in females) accounts for differences in thresholds to erotically related behavior and activity.

> In the male... there is typically a greater expenditure of energy in the service of sexual searching, pursuit, and consummation. This energy extends also to adventurous, exploratory roaming, to assertiveness, and agression and to defense of territorial rights.[2]

Attracting a physically big man (tall, broad, well-muscled) gave the female the highest probability of finding the two desired male traits of confidence and assertiveness; however, big size alone did not automatically indicate assertiveness. It was, at best, a guide.

---

[1]David A. Hamburg and Donald T. Lunde, "Sex Hormones in the Development of Sex Differences in Human Behavior," in The Development of Sex Differences, ed. by Eleanor E. Maccoby (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1966), p. 14.

[2]John Money, "Psychosexual Differentiation," in Sex Research: New Developments, ed. by John Money (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), p. 15.

So too, at a later date, as proportionately more of man's hunting success depended upon the use of his brain - to innovate, adapt, improvise, and devise - and less on brawn, assertiveness was again the key. Keen perception and cognition were, in terms of the economics of survival, of no use unless the male confidently asserted the products of his ability against the environment.

It would seem, then, that arising from the female's economic-biological predisposition was her expectation about the social role that males ought to perform. What was the corresponding social role that our male ancestors expected of females?

Certainly it is obvious that there is no comparable biological predisposition which renders males dependent upon females in terms of physical survival. However, depending upon how strongly one postulates the strength of the male sexual urge, one might talk in terms of a primordial male gravitation towards females.

It would appear that the natural selection process - in searching for a mechanism to ensure the survival of female and infant humans - took this sexual urge into account. For, the biological factor that seems to have been employed is the more or less continuous sexual receptivity of the human female, that is, loss of the estrus cycle. This evolutionary step appears to have had other effects as well.

Pfeiffer proposes that:

> If all females in a primate troop were subjected to three days of sexual mania every month or so, their helpless infants would die of malnutrition or be killed by predators.[1]

With the higher, sub-human primates (which also have a relatively long infant dependency), a step towards loss of estrus is manifested to the extent that during the latter part of pregnancy and the early part of nursing estrus ceases. In mammals that have rapidly maturing offspring estrus is apparently suitable. Man can, however, maintain his numbers in a hostile environment, not by mass production, but by an extended gestation period and expanded and extended postnatal care.[2] Furthermore, the active part of an estrus cycle, as we have discussed, is incompatible with extended care of infants; the inactive part of the cycle is apparently not conducive to the attraction of males.

Among man's closest primate forebears — the vegetarian primates — it appears that the males roam freely (within a current feeding territory) apparently unconcerned about females except for periodic sexual activity. Males do not provide food for the females and, in fact,

---

[1] Pfeiffer, The Emergence of Man, p. 136.

[2] Bernard G. Campbell, Human Evolution: An Introduction to Man's Adaptations, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966), p. 249.

often take the choicest food sources for themselves.[1] After reading Zuckerman,[2] Margaret Mead concludes that unlike earliest man "the primate needs a female for immediate physical reasons and no other."[3] She also notes that the primate male may fight to possess her (if she will accept him[4]) or to protect her, but he does not nurture her.[5]

Even in the male's protection of the female, it is likely that there was no "sense of duty to the female," that is, no personal involvement (if one will pardon the anthropomorphism). It is possible that the female was, in terms of protection, merely regarded as part of territory and hence was subject to the primate male's territorial imperative, that is, his drive or instinct to protect what he considered to be his.[6]

---

[1]Washburn and Avis, "Evolution of Human Behavior," p. 433.

[2]Solly Zuckerman, Functional Affinities of Man, Monkeys, and Apes (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1933), p. 27.

[3]Margaret Mead, Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1949), p. 205.

[4]Ibid., p. 204.

[5]Ibid., p. 189.

[6]Robert Ardrey, African Genesis: A Personal Investigation into the Animal Origins and Nature of Man (New York: Atheneum, 1968), chapters ii-vi, passim.

So, in terms of tying human males in closer to the female-infant group, continuous female receptivity appears to have been the solution.[1]

If one can assume that, given loss of estrus, all the mature females in a hunting band were more or less receptive, than male preference for females was no longer strictly determined by which females were receptive sexually. Other considerations, affected by environmental, economic circumstances, must have entered into the male preference.

As cooperation among the males of a hunting band was apperently essential, any single male could not sexually monopolize the females at the expense of any other male or males and, at the same time, expect their cooperation. (This possibly provided the roots of monogamous relationships).

Furthermore, given the female expectation of confident assertiveness, it would follow that she preferred some males more than others. This had the effect of making her virtually more receptive to some males and less so to others. It is probably true, however, that there was very little choice for the female, and, at that, it may not even have been a conscious mechanism.

Especially earlier in the existence of humans, there were, to begin with, very few potential males to choose from -

---

[1]Pfeiffer, The Emergence of Man, p. 142.

perhaps a brother (before the development of incest taboos) or a cousin or two from a neighbouring family unit. In addition, those males who managed to survive were obviously successful at asserting themselves in some form against the environment. It could be concluded, then, that of those males potentially available to any given female, they all must have been, more or less, equally assertive.

As the male spent most of his time either hunting or preparing for the hunt, he was probably not able to accomplish other tasks, which were necessary for improving living conditions. Some of these tasks included storing surplus meat brought back by the hunters, erecting shelters, gathering firewood, collecting water, roots, nuts (which provided a supplement to the predominantly meat diet), cooking, and perhaps, sewing the skins together for shelter and crude garments.

It is likewise reasonable to assume that the male's preference for the female would quite probably be based on an expectation that she could perform these comfort-producing, utilitarian concerns. It should be reiterated that at this stage of man's existence the most salient motivating force was, perhaps, the drive to survive. An expectation of the female was, then, that she would perform comfort-utility tasks such that the male's survival was facilitated and enhanced, not, on the contrary, handicapped or endangered by having to

support a female that was unproductive economically.

It is speculated that, originally, a female who had a preference for a given male would perform these comfort-utility tasks and he, in turn, would be attracted to the female that enhanced his living conditions by demonstration of her participation in the sharing of the survival tasks.

As it is postulated that continuous sexual receptivity was the biological factor which induced males to stay close to the female-infant groups then, by extension, we can assume that some sort of expectation, in these terms, was held by the males, and also determined their preference for females. One could consider the male expectation of sexual satisfaction as merely one more in a constellation of comfort-utility tasks that the female was expected to perform.

One might imagine the hunter coming back from a long strenuous day (or many days) of hunting (either successful or unsuccessful) and expecting that the fire had not gone out so that there was still warmth and comfort, as well as the necessary means for repairing tools, cooking meats, providing light, et cetera; that the female would provide him with food and water, and that she would comfort him physically (which probably often culminated in sexual intercourse).

As the visual component is apparently the trigger for male sexual arousal[1], it is likey that expectations regarding

---

[1]John Money, "Psychosexual Differentiation," p. 20.

a female appearance that is sexually attractive were formed at this time. It is speculated that this expectation was molded in the following way: firstly, it has been assumed that sexual receptivity of all mature females was taken as given; secondly, male preference for females was based on the latter's ability to facilitate the economics of survival, and it is proposed that males were attracted to females who could perform these comfort-utility tasks; thirdly, it is likely that there was certain physical characteristics and personal attributes which predisposed a female to be able to perform successfully the comfort-utility tasks and thus satisfy the male. Simply, then, as many of the tasks required of the female were rather strenuous, it is reasonable to assume that the female with a robust, sturdy build could cope with these tasks - - and hence males were probably attracted to that form or physique. Furthermore, as we have discussed, a female was willing to perform these tasks for a male that she preferred. One could postulate that if she had a preference for the male for whom she was performing these tasks, then she was more likely to be able to cope with the carrying-out of these tasks. Her attitude might be described as an "I prefer you" attitude.

On the other hand, as we have also mentioned, the male was attracted to the female who willingly performed these tasks for him. It is very likely, then, that what became visually attractive to the male was highly coloured

by economic — that is, survival — considerations.

This relationship becomes more elaborate when one considers the place of children. From the fact that females bore children, by extension, one can conclude that there was an expectation that a mature female would bear children. However, the valence of this expectation most probably depended upon the prevailing economic conditions.

Anthropologists have speculated that there were, during certain periods of man's early past, high rates of infanticide, especially of female offspring. It seems that where the economic conditions were such that chances of survival were poor, small hunting bands could not accomodate extra mouths to feed. Where bands were strongly dependent upon hunting, it was supposed that, since females could not be trained to hunt, they were more of an economic liability in terms of survival than were male offspring.

On the other hand, we would speculate that, where food was relatively plentiful or the hunting band or family was more dependent upon gathering as a food source, infants were not killed but rather (and perhaps particularly in the latter case) they were valued for the increased productivity they provided to the family. It is apparent that in many primitive cultures children, and especially female children, accompany the adult females in gathering food.[1] It would

---

[1]Margaret Mead, Male and Female, pp. 51-241, passim.

seem that, given the right conditions, including adequate training, children could be quite productive economic units.[1]

Moreover, other discoveries lead to increased speculation. Howell proposes that during the period 40,000 - 23,000 years ago (Upper Perigordian Period) man was living a sedentary life. He further proposes that, as there was less moving from place to place following game, a greater importance was attached to food-gathering. He notes that "women were less dependent upon men for survival since the gathering was an important task which fell to them."[2]

Related to this, he explains that vast numbers of very similar statuettes displaying certain female characteristics — namely, breasts, bellies and buttocks, which have been greatly exaggerated and arms, legs, and faces which either lack detail or are missing altogether, and coming from this period — have been found widely distributed over Europe, as far as Siberia. He speculates that the apparently important position that women enjoyed in Upper Perigordian society may have stimulated interest in and veneration for the mysteries of fertility and birth such that the great abundance of these fertility figures are explained.[3] Other

---

[1]Washburn and De Vore, "Social Behavior of Baboons and Early Man," p. 99.

[2]Howell, Early Man, p. 151.

[3]Ibid., p. 152.

investigators have shown the increment in importance or popularity that was correspondingly accorded to primate females who were pregnant or considered to be potentially so.[1]

One could extend the theorizing to consider the likelihood that in periods when these hunting-gathering bands were more dependent upon gathering to provide necessary nourishment, children were more highly valued as economic units of production. Further, the Upper Perigordian Period is not the only period during the Pliocene and Pleistocence Epochs during which modern man's early ancestors lived a sedentary life. However, this period does lend more illumination because it occurs late enough in man's history so that artistic recreation of his life had become possible. Thus, one might speculate that during the periods when offspring were valued for their economic utility, then the male's preference for the female would be based on the expectation that she would bear healthy children (that is, children that would survive and be productive, not sickly children that would need extra attention and care in order to survive). It is postulated, again, that physical characteristics provided a crude indication for the male to guage the likelihood that a prospective female mate would produce healthy children.

---

[1] Dobzhansky, Mankind Evolving, pp. 196-197.

It is interesting that with rare exception all of these numerous statuettes show no interest in face, arms, or legs, but rather only show interest in those parts of the female anatomy which are associated with childbirth — abdomen, hips, breasts; furthermore, these anatomical structures appear in grossly exaggerated form.

One might further speculate that primitive man noticed the temporal relationship between a female's maturational development in terms of enlarged hips and breasts and the correspondingly acquired capacity to bear children (during the course of which a distended abdomen would be manifest).

The exaggerated anatomy in the statuettes probably illustrates a primitive cognitive association between size and capacity - that is, "a female with more of the 'things' that mothers have would be more likely to produce healthy infants more often." Specifically, early man, in observing infants feeding at their mothers' breasts, most probably assumed that larger breasts meant more nurturance. This conclusion was strongly shaped, undoubtedly, by early man's preoccupation with adequate food for every individual. Certainly a deciding factor in allowing children to live was based on abundance of food. Furthermore, probably all of early man's experience with food had taught him that larger size meant more food (for example, an ostrich egg provided more food than that of a heron).

The same is probably true in terms of size of hips. Without the benefits of modern medical technology, it is likely that the particular form of primeval female anatomy played a much greater part in determining the success of the childhood process than it would today. Ellis notes that it is an "unquestionable fact that such development [of hips] is the condition needed for healthy motherhood."[1] He further notes that:

> Among those secondary sexual characters, most of the indigenous people of Europe, Asia and Africa regard the large hips and buttocks of women as an important feature of beauty. This character represents the most decided structural deviation of the feminine type from the masculine, a deviation demanded by the reproductive function of women, and in the admiration it arouses sexual selection is thus working in line with natural selection.[2]

There is an additional component in the value placed on children which may have been active at this early point in man's history, although one cannot be certain. At whatever point in human development the male began to derive personal satisfaction from being able to beget and support a human being which was, to varying degrees, a reincarnation of himself, the male then must have placed some degree of positive value upon children.

---

[1] Havelock Ellis, Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students (New York: Emerson Books, Inc., 1964), p.69.

[2] Ibid., p. 68.

One could view this as a psychological comfort, or as having the effect of enhancing life and giving some added pleasure to life.

Because children, by aiding in food production (facilitating and enhancing survival), had comfort-utility, and because, at some point, they had ego-value for the male, then bearing and rearing children could be viewed as a part of the constellation of comfort-utility tasks that the male expected of the female.

Summarily, then the physical attributes which were associated with healthy and successful motherhood (whether correctly or incorrectly so) came to be valued because of their supposed necessity for childbirth and the ultimate economic utility of children. As males had a preference (as discussed) for females who would perform, willingly, comfort-utility tasks — thus aiding and enhancing their survival — then this preference became generalized to include those physical attributes which were commonly associated with such women and which, indeed, allowed these women to be more successful at performing these comfort-utility tasks.

CHAPTER III

THE RECIPROCAL, COMPLEMENTARY NATURE OF SEX-ROLE EXPECTATIONS AND BIOLOGICAL REINFORCERS

The previous chapter concluded by proposing that there are a set of sex-role expectations which, having their origin in the earliest development of man, might be termed, primordial. Furthermore, it was proposed that the major primordial expectation which females have of males is that of confident assertiveness. The corresponding primordial expectation which males have of females is that of willingness to effect comfort-utility, and willingness implies a preference for the particular male for whom she is performing comfort-utility tasks. This chapter elaborates the relationship between these sex-role expectations, demonstrating their complimentary and reciprocal nature, and examines a few of the mechanisms which have the effect of supporting or reinforcing these primordial sex-role expectations.

It should be emphasized that the assertiveness expected by females of males was a confident assertiveness. It is possible to conceive of assertive behavior that is perhaps the response of a hyper-energetic, yet frustrated male. This sort of assertiveness could be forceful and obtrusive and fully initiated by the male, yet in a certain sense

would be purposeless - not apparently, a deliberate effort to bring about a desired result.

Confident assertiveness, on the other hand, was an assertiveness engendered by very frequent success (in terms of deliberately bringing about a desired result) at exerting oneself upon external objects or situations. In effect, then, confident assertiveness was assertiveness that was the inevitable consequence of past success.

The male's primordial expectation of females, likewise, merits further discussion. The point of discussion centres around the concept of willingness to effect comfort-utility. The chief consideration is that willingness and preference for the male (for whom the female is "willing") are very closely bound together. In a sense the consideration is pragmatic. A female's preference for a male was manifested in her willingness to engage in comfort-utility tasks.

That preference for the male must be a major part of this willingness is strengthened, perhaps, when one considers the following points: firstly, "willingness to perform..." must be based on more than merely a strict economic exchange, that is "I am willing to perform these comfort-utility tasks in exchange for the meat which you provide and the protection you afford (especially when I'm pregnant and unable to gather food and fend for myself)." In order for early man to engage seriously in and pursue hunting, he had to be assured that his continuously receptive female would not be quarry to

roving male interlopers.[1] Accordingly, certain social customs and conventions developed to safeguard the monogamous unit,[2] which, as many anthropologists have observed, most likely developed around this time as a social-economic necessity.[3,4] However, it would seem that the best guarantee or assurance against multiple relations was the choice of a female who had a preference for a particular male and, hence, did not want to jeopardize the relationship with that male.

Secondly, preference for a male who was assertive, by definition, meant acceptance of his assertiveness, whereas, mere "willingness to perform" (say, as a straight economic exchange) did not, at all, indicate a willingness to embrace all the ramifications of male assertiveness.

This would appear to have been a highly critical area in terms of stability of the family unit and hence of survival. It was unlikely that such a unit could have supported two,

---

[1] Dobzhansky, Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species, p. 199.

[2] Marshall D. Sahlins, "The Origin of Society," Scientific American, CCIII, 1960, 80.

[3] Ibid., 80-83.

[4] Dobzhansky, Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species, p. 199.

more or less, equally assertive individuals, in this case, the male head and the female head. It is reasonable to assume that were both male and female equally (more or less) assertive, then there would have been, inevitably, a proclivity toward directing such assertion at each other. Thus, much of the energy, which could otherwise have been spent in negotiating the environment, would have been dissipated within the family unit.[1] That this attribute should be accorded primarily to the male would seem "natural" in terms of the previous examination of economic expectations made of the male, added to his particular physiological endowments.

A demonstrated preference (by willingness to perform comfort-utility tasks) for an assertive male, then, meant acceptance of his assertiveness by the female. This implies a form of compliance (not to be construed as "passivity"), which in these terms actually meant asserting or directing oneself to a set of essential, specialized (female) tasks necessary for the survival of the whole family unit.[2]

---

[1] Pfeiffer, in The Emergence of Man, p. 250, among others, notes that a similar concern is extended to the band, which could not have survived unless aggressiveness was controlled successfully. Protohumans effectively control it through the use of a "pecking order." The mechanisms which hunting-gathering humans evolved are discussed in the body of this paper.

[2] In the same sense, the male was also compliant. He engaged in a set of specialized tasks, which, as man evolved, became increasingly distinct from those tasks which females performed.

Thirdly, as discussed earlier, it was (one presumes) easier, and simply more satisfying, for a female to engage in comfort-utility tasks for a male for whom she had a distinct preference, rather than one for whom she was merely willing to share in the necessary survival tasks.

Summarily then, when one postulates "willingness to engage in comfort-utility tasks" as the male's sex-role expectation, then that female "willingness" implies a distinct preference for the male for whom she was engaging in comfort-utility tasks. Moreover, it would seem plausible that for the male, female preference, which was obviated by her "willingness," may have, indeed, assumed more importance than her precise skill at performing the actual comfort-utility tasks. One could further speculate (and it is more speculation) that the "I prefer you" attitude of females was a particular stimulus to which human males responded by incorporating the female into what he considered to be his territorial possessions. This proposition would certainly seem to support a remark made by Howell:

> ... modern man is sexually possessive. This trait is deep seated, and although the ethical and religious teachings of most (but not all) societies encourage it, it is still too much a part of our make-up to be explained as having been inculcated in man by historically recent concepts of morality. It obviously goes a long way back.[1]

---

[1]Howell, Early Man, p. 171.

A female who indicated her rejection of a male, essentially by demonstrating an unwillingness to give him comfort-utility would not, under usual circumstances, be incorporated into a male's perceived territorial possessions.

If it has not been obvious to this point, it should now be remarked that although male sexual satisfaction was one of the expectations embodied within the complex of comfort-utility expectations, it was not necessarily prepotent. As Sahlins notes - "the primitive human family unlike the sub-human primate group [was] not based simply on sexual attraction."[1] According to that anthropologist's guess - sex was easily available.[2]

It would seem that satisfaction of economic needs was most important and relations between primeval human males and females were shaped primarily by economics. Again Sahlin notes that:

> ... the customs of hunters and gatherers testify eloquently that society organized sex in the interest of the economic adaption of the group. ... economics, thus dramatically altered human mating and differentiated the human family from its nearest primate

---

[1] Sahlins, "The Origin of Society," p.82.

[2] Ibid. It is assumed that in saying that sex was easily available he is speaking relative to protohuman primates. By comparison, sex would be more easily available to humans, because, firstly, the human female was continuously receptive, and secondly, due to the necessity for cooperative relations, females were not hoarded by a few of the dominant males.

analogues.[1]

Thus, social roles developed which had the effect of accomodating these economic realities and suppressing or controlling the male sexual urge. Washburn and De Vore ably summarize this relationship.

> In the evolution of society, the most important rules are those that guarantee economic survival to the dependent young. ... that the resulting family bonds are much more than sexual is shown by the fact that custom in contemporary hunter-gatherer groups provides that new families may be formed only around males who have proved themselves as economic providers.... The human male matures sexually from about twelve to fourteen years, but he reaches full social and physical maturity much later, from about eighteen and twenty. The wide variety of customs that insure this delay in social maturity all have the same biological function: to delay the production of children until the male can provide for them.[2]

Mead makes similar observations[3] and aptly remarks that:

> ... each new generation of young males learn [sic] the appropriate nurturing behavior and superimpose [this] upon their biologically given maleness.[4]

---

[1]Sahlins, "The Origin of Society," pp. 80-83.

[2]Washburn and De Vore, "Social Behavior of Baboons and Early Man," p. 99.

[3]Mead, Male and Female, pp. 189-192.

[4]Ibid., p. 192.

The incest tabu is probably the most striking example of customs to which Washburn and De Vore make reference above.[1] The economic advantage of delaying reproduction until the male was capable of providing would be, quite apparently, nullified if brother - sister relations were permitted. Moreover, father - daughter relations would be economically undesireable (besides, perhaps, putting a psychological strain on the economic relationship between mother and father), where the father could not support, in effect, two wives.[2]

Most of the attention in this discussion has been focussed on control of the male sexual urge. However, many of the controls have the effect of forcing females, also, to subjugate their desires to economic considerations. Correspondingly, negative sanctions against transgressors of incest injunctions were enforced against both males and females. Mead, relatedly, notes that women, too, "have to learn to want children only under socially prescribed conditions.[3]

---

[1] Washburn and De Vore, "Social Behavior of Baboons and Early Man," p. 99.

[2] One should note, however, that economic conditions seem to be a major reason for monogamy, generally. Sahlins notes that among hunter-gatherers there are usually no rules againt polygamy. Rather, economic realities mitigate against multiple wives. See Sahlins, "The Origin of Society," p. 83.

[3] Mead, Male and Female, p. 230.

What was "socially prescribed" depended, ultimately, upon economic contingencies.

Sahlins further holds that marriage is an alliance between the two essential social elements of production. Supposedly, the male-female (and offspring) unit was as important to our earliest human ancestors as the corporate factory system is to capitalism. The primary division of labour in a hunting-gathering economy is that between males and females.[1] One should note that whatever biological dimorphism there is between males and females (which, as we have seen, originally determined the division of labour) is greatly enhanced once a well-defined division of labour becomes economically essential and the particular roles emanating therefrom, institutionalized.[2] Thus, we have a good example of sex-role expectations being reciprocally reinforced by economic adaption on the one hand and biological endowment, on the other.

As economics was the most salient preoccupation in ordering the male's comfort-utility expectations of the female, then, it is not surprising that Mead has found that:

---

[1] Sahlins, "The Origin of Society," 80-83.

[2] Washburn and Lancaster would add: that this factor produces a much greater dimorphism among adult humans than among non-human adult primates. See Washburn and Lancaster, "The Evolution of Hunting," p. 300.

> ... a wife is always, in all societies and under all circumstances, regarded as something more than the object or the means of satisfaction of physical desire.[1]

In line with this observation Sahlins records that:

> Many anthropologists have testified that in the minds of many natives the ability to cook and sew or to hunt are much more important than is beauty in a prospective spouse.[2]

Mead again supports this:

> While the primate needs a female for immediate physical reasons and for no other, a human male at the simplest social level of which we have even a hint needs a wife [female].[3]

One should understand, then, that comfort-utility is hardly synonymous with physical-sexual comfort and utility; other important features are considered under the rubric "comfort-utility tasks."

The ubiquity of the primordial sex-role expectations appears to find much of its omnipotence from the way in which biology, on the one hand and social behavior (emanating, primarily, from the economics of survival), on the other hand, reciprocally reinforce each other.

This intricate relationship, in turn, reinforces, and is reinforced by, the very complementary nature of male role expectations of females and female role expectations of males

---

[1]Mead, Male and Female, p. 215.

[2]Sahlins, "The Origin of Society," p. 82.

[3]Mead, Male and Female, p. 205.

(which has already been discussed).

Along with the evolution of continuous female receptivity, there were numerous ancillary and simultaneous biological developments. The latter were necessary if loss of estrus was to be considered as a "positive" evolutionary step.

Notably, there was no longer automatic control of sexual relations, but rather, what Campbell calls, an "individualization of sexual relations."[1] Ostensibly, this meant that there was an extension of the possibility of choice in timing sexual relations. Apparently, among non-human primates, estrus is beyond the individual's control.

> Its presence and absence are determined by the automatic turning-on and turning-off of sex-hormone secretions presumably by a kind of biological clock in the brain which keeps track of the passage of time and periodically triggers the activity of centres concerned with the arousal of sexual urges. Under such conditions the sex act among early hominids, as among contemporary monkeys and apes, tended to be relatively impersonal and mechanical.[2]

However,

> When sexual urges come under a measure of voluntary control (which automatically speaking, means by-passing the internal clock and "rewiring" the brain so that increased numbers of inhibitory fibers run from the highest control centre, the cerebral cortex, to sub-cortical arousal centers), it be-

---

[1]Campbell, Human Evolution, p. 260.

[2]Pfeiffer, The Emergence of Man, p. 142.

> came possible to select the time and the place for intercourse and, in a way, the mate. Personal preference became meaningful for the first time, and male-female relationships became more enduring.[1]

In addition to loss of estrus, there were extended periods of pregnancy and maternal care for offspring. Dobzhansky indicates that due to this fact, the size of the progeny that a female produces is, without doubt, limited. He asserts that a female, consequently, must "economize her resources."[2] To do this the female must be "discriminatingly passive." This implies a necessity for choice and reinforces the evolutionary task which was left to the female with the loss of estrus (as above). It should be noted that among other mammals which are governed also by a relatively extensive gestation and offspring-dependency period (although, usually, much less so than for humans), females tend to be, generally, "more choosy and demure, or less easily excitable (than the male)."[3]

For humans, however, the necessity for choice is even more acute for, in the first place, they cannot rely on an "automatic" mating sequence to execute reproduction and, moreover, among human females there is no guarantee (without choice) that any particular female will not receive the least

---

[1] Ibid., p. 142.

[2] Dobzhansky, Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species, p. 198.

[3] Ibid., p. 197.

genetically desireable males.[1]

> Accepting a wrong male (or male of another species, or a sterile, diseased or genetically inferior male) may diminish or eliminate her progeny. Natural selection favours, then, discriminative passivity in females.[2]

These observations show the biological necessity for female choice. Economic considerations, being equally as relevant for ultimate survival, meant that a female could not choose a non-assertive male.

Non-assertiveness in the female, on the other hand, was evidently functionally adaptive. Earlier, in this chapter, we speculated on the economic function that non-assertiveness serves. The biological component now becomes manifest. It seems that the low ratio of androgen to estrogen in human females[3] allow them a degree of assertiveness which, potentially, is less pronounced than that in the male. This

---

[1]Among other primates, the dominant males have a monopoly on receptive females often to the complete exclusion of other males (it is being assumed that the most dominant protohuman primate males are, in general, the most genetically fit). See Sahlins, "The Origin of Society," 81.

[2]Dobzhansky, Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species, p. 198.

[3]Supra, p. 47.

constitutional lack of assertiveness pervades the process of sexual attraction, where it is functionally adaptive in terms of survival.

Biology seems to have favored what might be termed a "dependent arousal system" in females. That is, the presence or initiative of some external factor - characteristically the male - is usually needed to stimulate or trigger female arousal. This appears to be true, not only in terms of sexual activity but also, perhaps more importantly, in terms of general female attraction to males.

One might imagine that if the primeval female was sexually assertive, the sexual initiator - and thus, concomitantly, was motivated primarily by drive for sexual gratification or release - her discriminatory powers, that is her proclivity to make a reasonable choice among males, would be severely subjugated to this persistent and urgent need for immediate sexual gratification. She would, most probably, be less likely to consider the prospective and appropriate sexual object (that is, the male) in terms of his ability to ensure her survival; thus, her decreased capacity to choose could be, ultimately, fatal.

The lack of assertiveness in females, then facilitated an unimpaired capacity to choose the male that would best

assure the female's (and her offspring's) survival.[1]

The process of female attraction to males (dependent arousal) was relatively simple and seems to depend, at every level, upon the male to "show his stuff."

Thus, we have speculated that the primeval woman was attracted to assertive-behaving males. She probably used size as a perceptual-cognitive indicator or index as to the degree of confident assertiveness with which any particular male was potentially endowed. If her supposition was born-out, after observing a particular male's behavior, then she would display her "I prefer you" attitude, by her willingness to effect comfort-utility for that particular male.

On the other hand, the male would be attracted at one of two levels to the female. At one level, she may not have noticed him yet; he having noticed her, was potentially attracted by her physical attributes as his perceptual-cognitive indicator for determining her potential for contributing to his comfort-utility. At the second level, the female who was already favorably disposed to that particular male would have displayed (as already noted) an "I prefer you" attitude. Therefore, at this level the male could be attracted, also, to her apparent "willingness" and implied preference for him, as well as to her physical attributes.

---

[1] A fitting analogy might be: two drivers, one driving at 90 m.p.h., the other driving at 25 m.p.h. The latter would have a much greater opportunity to observe the passing scenery.

So, a female having the kinds of physical features which we discussed earlier, would attract a male. If she preferred him, then her behavior and attitude would express that feeling (which would also have the effect of attracting the male). Perhaps she would express it directly by telling him or flirting with him. More likely she expressed it indirectly by simply demonstrating her utility.

Conversely, if she did not find him assertive and, therefore, was not attracted to him, then her attitude conveyed - "I don't prefer you" or "I am not attracted to you" - would have the effect of not attracting him. Accordingly, she would not perform the comfort-utility tasks for him[1] and he, correspondingly, would pass her in favor of a female by whom he was preferred.

One should note that the perceptual-congitive indicators for both males and females may have, at times, assumed greater importance than merely for use, as an indication of desired expectations. For the female particularly, it was difficult to display immediately her ability to perform comfort-utility tasks. In addition, it was potentially maladaptive to display, too soon, a "willingness"

---

[1]Also, she did not place herself in a position such that her proximity predisposed her to be potentially sexually aroused.

or preference for a particular male (unless she was absolutely certain that he was a good prospect in terms of her survival). However, her physical attributes were ever-present, and it is likely that this cue to potential comfort-utility (including bearing healthy children) came to be valued in itself and directly stimulated the male. This cue would become strengthened even moreso as a stimulus, once the visual component of male eroticism[1] not only developed, but also developed to the point where female physical attributes were relevant material for visual eroticism.[2]

Moreover, the more infallible that particular physical attributes became as an index of, the highly valued, comfort-utility, the more these physical attributes would be valued on their own merits.

The situation is similar with respect to the female's use of size as a perceptual-cognitive indicator of assertiveness.[3] The more reliable that size became as an index of

---

[1] Infra., p. 83.

[2] It was noted in the last chapter that the male probably became attracted (visually) to the female who most enhanced his living conditions. Supra., p. 52-53. Therefore, the kinds of physical attributes this woman had also came to be valued and likely these attributes became cues to what would potentially be a highly valued female.

[3] Supra., p. 47.

assertiveness, the more size, itself, would come to be admired by the female and expected by her, of the male.

On the other hand, it is perhaps likely that size in males held less value for females than female physical attributes held for the male. The reasons are twofold: in the first place, male assertiveness as a sex characteristic is much more readily demonstrable than is comfort-utility. Assertiveness, evidently, has more of a physiological basis than does comfort-utility per se[1]. Also being assertive, too early, in no way put the male at a disadvantage - as a rule, the male was generally an assertive being. Secondly, as man evolved, size probably became a less reliable index of effective assertiveness. Especially as man's brain developed, the male came to rely more upon other characteristics than upon bodily and muscular size and strength as a suitable medium for asserting himself upon his environment. Therefore, a female reliance upon male body size did not, necessarily, assure her of selecting an assertive male.

The point should also be made that, assuming these expectations to have been operating among primeval humans, then these expectations reinforced each other. Quite simply - the most assertive male had the best chances for attracting a female who could effect comfort-utility; the female who

---

[1] Supra., pp. 46-47.

could demonstrate her willingness to perform comfort-utility tasks (including those physical attributes associated with same and, also, implying preference for the male) had the best chances for attracting a most assertive male.

This sort of relationship between males and females is, by no means, limited only to humans. In fact, this process - that is males demonstrating or performing to attract females who choose - is found throughout the animal kingdom. Thus, the ubiquity of this process probably predisposed or strengthened its effect upon the social roles of primeval humans. Ardrey has observed that in many other species:

> Sex to the female, means choice: the choice of a male from the ranks of the propertied. It is the male who attracts and the female who chooses.[1]

Essentially, then, females choosing from among the males with status and territory (among the lower mammals) is a case of females choosing from among those males who have asserted themselves against their environment.

The "I prefer you" attitude of human females seems, correspondingly, to have an analogue in other female mammals. Zuckerman guardedly speculates that:

> It is possible that in all lower animals the attitude of the female is, in some way or other, a necessary

---

[1] Ardrey, African Genesis: A Personal Investigation into the Animal Origins and Nature of Man, p. 128.

factor in eliciting the full sexual response of the male.[1]

Biological mechanisms tend to support discriminatory passivity in females or are inclined, in general, to preclude the female from being the initiator or assertive one. This appears to be true, starting from the process of attracting an assertive male (as we have just examined), right up to, and including the process of sexual intercourse.

It is obvious that coitus, itself, is impossible without an initial, assertive response (stimulus) on the part of the male. That is, without the objective fact of male erection, sexual intercourse and the reproductive function was (is) impossible!

Masters and Johnson observe that in all cultures there is an expectation of (and a corresponding pressure upon) the male in terms of being capable of penile erection.[2] At the same time, they observe that little in the way of an expectation of ejaculation exists; ejaculation is taken for granted. Hence, no pressure is placed upon males, as there is for females (in modern, western cultures), in terms of ability to reach orgasm (ejaculation).[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 126.

[2] Masters and Johnson, Human Sexual Response, p. 218.

[3] Ibid., p. 217-218.

These observations are interesting because, once again, they demonstrate how assertiveness or initiating behavior, above all else, pervades the expectations which females hold for males. In this case of physiological behavior, within the most fundamental of all male-female relationships, the female is dependent upon the male to "make the first move."

Mead, of course, has made observations surrounding the process:

> When this shift is made from female readiness [which had occurred only during estrus] to male readiness, a responsibility for readiness is laid upon the male that he did not face at earlier animal levels. ... Man may be seen to have vis à vis the female, far greater powers of initiative than do the primates. ... receptivity requires so much less of her... and none of the specific readiness and sustained desire that is required of the male.[1]

Biological benevolence appears to have equipped the male with the necessary equipment to ensure his assertiveness in sexual behavior. Money's summary gives a good synopsis:

---

[1]Mead, Male and Female, p. 204-208, passim.

> ... there is strong clinical and presumptive evidence[1,2] that the libido hormone is the same for both men and women[3] and is androgen. Psychologically, the androgenic function is limited to potential regulation of the intensity and frequency of sexual desire and arousal.
>
> Sex differences in the androgen-estrogen ratio may conceivably account for some of the differences between men and women in their thresholds for erotically related behavior and activity. In the male, for instance, there is typically a greater expenditure of energy in the service of sexual searching, pursuit and consummation. This energy expenditure extends also to adventurous, exploratory roaming, to assertiveness and aggression and to the defense of territorial rights. Of course, the male does not have exclusive prerogatives in these respects, but there does indeed seem to be a sex difference in the frequency with which these patterns of activity are manifest.[4]

Money adds further support with his observations during studies on pseudohermaphrodites (in this case, with internal female reproductive organs and an excess production of androgenic hormones). He reports that "eroticism" in some of these patients tends to be more characteristic of the male in some respects. "... the unfeminine aspect of the experience

---

[1]Money,"Components of Eroticism in Man: I. The Hormones in Relation to Sexual Morphology and Sexual Desire," Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases, CXXXII (1961), 239-248, passim.

[2]Money, "Sex Hormones and Other Variables in Human Eroticism," in Sex and Internal Secretions, ed. by W.C.Young.

[3]See also Hamburg and Lunde, "Sex Hormones in the Development of Sex Differences in Human Behavior," p.7.

[4]Money, "Psychosexual Differentiation," p. 14-15. See also Chapter 2 of this paper.

applies only to the threshold and the frequency of arousal, and to the amount of sexual initiative that it might engender."[1]

Additionally, Young adds that the arousal mechanism is dependent upon hormones such as androgen.

> Androgens are assumed to raise the excitability of the central excitatory mechanism (c.e.m.), thus increasing the male's susceptibility to arousal, and to lower the thresholds in the neural circuits mediating the male copulatory pattern. Elevation of the c.e.m. is also related to the excitatory value of the stimulus objects; consequently, hormonal and psychologic factors are mutually compensatory in elevating excitability.[2]

Money, again, proposes that perceptual sex differences may well be related to neural components of human sexual behavior. He observes that:

> Men appear to be more responsive to visual and narrative erotic stimuli and images... . Their greater expenditure of energy in initiating erotic pursuit may bear some phylogenetic relationship to the defense of territorial rights, a type of behavior widely occurring in the mating patterns of mammals.[3]

---

[1]John Money, "Influence of Hormones on Sexual Behavior," Annual Review of Medicine, XVI (1965), 67-82.

[2]William C. Young, "The Hormones and Mating Behavior," in Sex and Internal Secretions, ed. by William C. Young, with a foreward by George W. Corner, vol. II, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: The William and Wilkins Co., 1961), p. 1207. See also Money, "Sex Hormones and Other Variables in Human Eroticism," in Sex and Internal Secretions, ed. by William C. Young, p. 1383.

[3]Money, "Psychosexual Differentiation," p. 20.

Women, on the other hand,

> ... appear to be ... more dependent on touch.[1] [Also] women have more smell acuity than men; and it varies with the menstrual cycle [with increased levels of estrogen].[2]

Females are not, evidently, erotically stimulated to the same degree that males are by visual qualities. The male body as a visual erotic stimulus apparently arouses only male inverts.[3] Whatever attraction it does hold for females, would seem to be perceived by the female in terms of potential tactility:

> ... while through vision men are sexually affected mainly by the more purely visual quality of beauty, women are more strongly affected by visual impressions which express qualities belonging to the more fundamentally sexual sense of touch.
>
> In a women the craving for visual expression of pressure energy is much more pronounced and predominant than in a man. It is not difficult to see why this should be so, even without falling back on the usual explanation that sexual selection implies that the female shall choose the male who will be the most likely father of strong children and the best protector of his family. The more energetic part in physical love belongs to the man... energy in a man furnishes a seeming index to the existence of the primary quality of energy which a woman

---

[1] P. Wolff, Unpublished paper presented at the Tavistock Conference on "Determinants of Infant Behavior," London (Sept. 1965), cited by Hamburg and Lunde, "Sex Hormones in the Development of Sex Differences," in The Development of Sex Differences, ed. by Maccoby.

[2] Money, "Psychosexual Differentiation," p. 20.

[3] Ellis, Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students, p. 72.

demands of a man in the sexual embrace.[1]

Apparently the erotic component in the female's sexual arousal depends, to a large degree on outside stimulus.[2] We have already speculated upon the economic necessity for such a dependent arousal system. One should, perhaps, reiterate that at every level the arousal system seems to demand a first move by the male - from the time the female first chose what she had predicted to be an assertive male, to the coital relationship.

Thus, at every stage the female was able to observe the male's assertiveness, and, consequently, to reject him whenever he was found to be lacking in that behavior. Hopefully, she could discover this lack "before it was too late," that is, before she was pregnant, and correspondingly, dependent upon the male. Furthermore, Masters and Jonhson note the necessity for male fulfillment of female expectations of the male if she is to enjoy sexual satisfaction.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 76-77; This would seem to correspond to one of the female's perceptual-cognitive indiactors of male assertiveness.

[2] Paul H. Gebhard, Jan Ranoch, and Hans Giese, The Sexuality of Women, translated by Colin Bearne. (New York: Stein and Day, 1970), p. 128.

[3] Masters and Johnson, Human Sexual Inadequacy, p. 241.

It is interesting that those senses which provide the greatest sexual arousal potential for the female (touch and smell) require - by definition - the close proximity of some other object, characteristically, the male. Whereas, the erotic components in male sexual drive do not necessarily depend upon close proximity of an actual, living female. Male threshold, as noted above, is much lower and more susceptible to many kinds of sexual suggestion - certainly erotic pictures and narrative stimuli (above), do not require the presence of an erotic, stimulating female.

An arousal system that has a low threshold for stimulation greatly facilitates assertive sexual behavior. Whereas, correspondingly, an arousal system which generally requires the close proximity of another human, mollifies the potential for assertive sexual behavior and this, in terms of the female's biological role, is adaptive.

Low threshold and frequency of arousal in males, is also biologically adaptive. One might imagine that with the changing to a hunting-gathering ethos from the vegetarian climate of the proto-hominids and infrahuman primates, the male, increasingly, had other preoccupations to do with hunting and providing enough food for his family[1] (perhaps complexities of mental problems increased geometrically as the

---

[1]Ardrey, African Genesis, pp. 125-126, and p. 131.

size of the brain increased arithmetically), and, together with the loss of automatic control of mating behavior, a greatly increased susceptibility to sexual suggestion was adaptive.

Other considerations act to reinforce the necessity for this aspect of male behavior. Add the evolutionary loss of automatic control of sex, to limited potential for a large number of offsprings (as noted earlier), and the fact that the male has a relatively high frequency of arousal is, again, biologically desirable. Additionally, one might speculate that the hunter having returned from a tiring hunting trip, being physically exhausted from tracking and chasing wild animals (and alternately being chased by wild animals[1]), was probably often not as enthusiastic, as he was at other times, to engage in sexual intercourse. However, a low threshold for sexual stimulation or arousal would greatly increase his propensity to engage in coital behavior.

Moreover, in view of the role demanded of males, that is hunting and protection (and concomitantly climbing, tracking, fighting), it is possible that a low threshold for tactile stimulation and distraction would have been biologically, maladaptive. Perhaps, relatedly, a highly-muscled

---

[1]Luis Pericot, "The Social Life of Spanish Paleolithic Hunters as shown by Levantine Art," in Social Life of Early Man, ed. by Sherwood L. Washburn (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961), p. 206-207.

body in some way precludes heightened tactile susceptibility.[1] Consequently, adequate male arousal would depend upon development of an alternate sense.

In summary to this point, the biological and social-economic determinants of sex-role and sex-role expectations[2] have been examined. Stated more precisely, these sex-role expectations are the ultimate manifestation of the operation (for 12,000,000 years[3]) of a complex relationship between the biological make-up of man and the conditions of the environment that impinge upon that biology.

One can certainly conceed that some of the foregoing arguments supporting particular role expectations are essentially speculative, especially where great reliance is placed upon reconstruction of early hominid history.

---

[1] Of course, this is pure speculation and demands further research.

[2] No attempt has been made to examine the origin and operation of all sex-role expectations. Instead, the concentration has been upon those major expectations which act to optimize chances of survival — this being the most basic of all animal drives.

[3] Perhaps even longer if one conceives as Morris does, that "the fundamental patterns of behavior laid down in our early days as hunting apes still shine through all our affairs no matter how lofty they may be." See Desmond Morris, The Naked Ape, p. 39.

On the other hand, much less speculative and, correspondingly, less deniable are the biological and specific physiological mechanisms which seem, not only to have supported these sex-role expectations but, moreso, to have strongly reinforced them.

In every situation where a role-expectation has been postulated upon the basis of social-economic conditions, there appears to be either direct or, at the least, indirect biological or specific physiological support for the sex-role behavior and sex-role expectation.

We would consequently argue that these sex-role expectations are ubiquitous and prepotent. Along with some of the human's physical characteristics, they have survived, relatively intact, since our primordial existence. They are essentially universal; hence, we would expect to find these basic primordial sex-role expectations - confident assertiveness and willingness (implying preference) to perform comfort-utility tasks - characterizing the ethos of numerous and diverse cultures throughout the world.[1]

Where basic economic exigencies have occurred, then, the preeminence of the biological components would act to maintain these sex-role expectations. As noted earlier- all cultures make expectations about male assertiveness in sex.

---

[1]Of course, more research is needed here.

That is, all males, universally, are expected to be capable of initiating coitus through penile erection.[1] We would, consequently, expect that even in cultures where male and female roles have been, ostensibly, reversed, males are still, in the final analysis, expected to be assertive (and females, correspondingly, dependent). However, in such cultures where the only remaining basis for the delineated sex-role expectations is coital behavior, we would suspect to find a corresponding disintegration or, at the very best, a loosely organized society, with very little mutual cooperation or symbiotic behavior. Mead, in her anthropological studies of South Pacific peoples, hints at this when she notes that:

> ... the Tchambuli system crumbled under a reversal in the ethos of men and women, and the Mundugumor system was invaded and disintegrated by an emphasis on a common hostile ethos that lacked counterpoint or any complementary character beyond the bare facts of sexual anatomy... .[2]

---

[1]Masters and Johnson, Human Sexual Inadequacy, p. 215.

[2]Mead, Male and Female, p. 101.

CHAPTER IV

FROM BROAD EXPLORATION TO SPECIFIC QUESTIONING

Originally, our exploration focussed on the societal sex-role expectations in North America, which were found to be embodied in a set of stereotypes regarding male and female roles. We accepted Mead's description of the masculine and feminine roles in North American society as follows:

> To receive recognition — from both men and women — a man in America should be, first of all, a success in his business; he should advance, make money, go up fast, and, if possible, he should also be likeable, attractive, and well-groomed, a good mixer, well informed, good at the leisure-time activities of his class, should provide well for his home, keep his car in good condition, be attentive enough to his wife so that he doesn't give other women an opportunity to catch his interest. A woman, to receive equal recognition, should be intelligent, attractive, know how to make the best of herself in dress and manner, be successful in attracting and keeping first several men, finally one, run her home and family efficiently so that her husband stays devoted and her children all surmount the nutritional, psychological, and ethical hazards of maturation, and are successful too; and she should have time for "outside things", whether they be church, grange, community activities, or Junior League.[1]

Add to this description, the expectations related to anatomy (such as body size and shape) and to sexual activity,[2] and one has a clear picture of the sex-role expectations and stereotypes of the male and female in our society.

---

[1] Margaret Mead, Male and Female, p. 294

[2] Supra., pp. 10-19.

Further exploration revealed that early man's particular relationship with his environment gave rise to certain male-female expectations which provided the roots for contemporary sex-role expectations. It would appear that the primordial sex-role expectations have survived essentially unchanged, and form an integral part of modern-day dynamics between males and females.[1] The female expectation of male confident assertiveness, and the male expectation of female willingness to effect comfort-utility, still underly the expectations which one sex has of the other today.

Whereas the economic and environmental conditions of contemporary life differ from those of early man, other factors, notably biological, have remained relatively constant. The exploration undertaken in Chapter III revealed that man's morphological, anatomical, and genetic endowment has not changed substantially over the last several million years. In terms of reinforcing and strengthening the primordial sex-role expectations — making them relevant and ubiquitous

---

[1]However, one should understand at the very outset, that it is theoretically unsound to take these intricate, primordial relationships between early man and his environment and attempt to apply them literally and directly, in all their manifestations, to North American man and his environment. Particular economic conditions which originally gave rise to a certain set of sex-role expectations are no longer the same, however, the sex-role expectations, themselves, have remained.

even today — the biological components are as preeminent in modern North American society as they were at the dawn of early man.

In terms of modern living, then, what are the implications of the primordial sex-role expectations which exist contemporaneously with societal sex-role expectations?

In Chapter I it was noted what implications a poorly-developed self-concept, stemming from an unclear sex-role identity, have for the personal adjustment of the individual.[1] Certainly, persistent doubts about oneself do not facilitate the crystallization of a healthy self-concept. These investigators would propose that doubt about, or lack of confidence in terms of what is expected of one as a male or as a female, leads an individual, essentially, to doubt his maleness or her femaleness.

It has been noted earlier that what is expected of the male and of the female is defined quite succinctly in the form of societal stereotypes embodying a set of very clear expectations about what the ideal male and the ideal female, respectively, should be like. An examination of the characteristics embodied within the stereotypes, make it abundantly clear that every male and female — in fact, the majority of males and females — cannot possibly live up to these

---

[1] Supra., pp. 20-28.

expectations.

One can observe plainly that, for example, not every male is born with a muscular body even remotely approaching the desired look. Similarly, for every female born with the requisite blond hair, blue eyes, and regular features (allowing for particular regional variations), there is, perhaps, at least one other female who is not so endowed at birth.

The lack of these appropriate characteristics, as embodied in the societal stereotypes, would seem to indicate that those males and females, so deprived, cannot be identified with out society's concept of the preferred masculine roles and the preferred feminine roles. Does this mean that <u>these</u> men are less male; <u>these</u> women less female?

It is apparent that, given the economic orientation of our society — which is, a capitalistic philosophy, not <u>every</u> male (or female) can "make it to the top" economically; some must make it and those who do not must <u>aspire</u> to make it (part of the supply and demand principle). That is, not every male has a chance to assert himself SUCCESSFULLY (thus fostering confidence) against his environment (which, in twentieth century North America, is a capitalistic environment).

If one turns, for a moment again, to our early history, one remembers that all males (who managed to survive) were essentially assertive. If this were not so, they would have died very quickly. Moreover, in those times, the

assertive behavior of virtually every male could be directed relatively successfully against the environment. Every male could run and hunt down animals, throw stones (and later), shape and throw a spear.

In North American society, the expectation that the male will be confidently assertive still lingers and, indeed, the physiological basis for his assertiveness is still equally pervasive. However, no longer are his bodily and personality attributes the medium for the the chief pre-requisites of assertive behavior.

On the other hand, in a capitalistic society, particular specialized skills and money became the media of, the prerequisites for, and the proof of (in the case of money) success. Paradoxically, the situation frequently arises in which, because of a male's accumulated wealth, which may have been obtained through inheritance or benevolence, he is judged to be successful[1], (which, as has been noted, is part of the requirements to be a "real male" in North American society). In actual fact, he could be relatively non-assertive: the exact antithesis of the successful male throughout all but (an infinitesmal part of) the last 12,000,000 years of hominid history.

---

[1] It is not being denied, however, that the man who works at a job to accumulate wealth is accorded more positive social sanction than one who does not work.

Similarly, one may observe that the very assertive male who, because he does not have the required medium (the correct specialized skills and/or money), never gets the chance to direct his assertiveness against his North American environment, to the degree (amassing a requisite level of wealth or status) that allows him to be labelled a "successful man."

One can, in these terms, begin to appreciate the position of minority-group males who, for whatever reason, are not able to direct their assertiveness successfully, that is, in such a way that allows them to become, to a greater degree, the cultural stereotype to which they aspire, and which, of course, is expected of them.

If the money and success components are added to the other components of the cultural expectations of the male which, as we have proposed, are not available to the majority of males, what are the ramifications?

If one were then to consider the male who is apparently lacking the means for successfully asserting himself against his capitalistic environment or the male who is equally lacking in terms of the other components of the desired societal expectation of the male, one would see that there are few alternatives open to him. On the one hand, he can recognize the societal stereotypes for what they are and say, in effect, "So what! These expectations are not me and I'll be 'damned' if I'm going to strive for an arbitrary,

though commonly-held, description of what the male should be like!" This sort of male does not, in effect, compromise his natural assertiveness by striving for a set of expectations which fits neither his life-situation nor his proclivity to behave independently. To reiterate, this is the sort of male who displays a confidence in himself while also manifesting a kind of obtrusiveness, marked driving, forceful energy or initiative.[1]

This type of male could very well conform to any or all of the other expectations embodied within the societal stereotype of the preferred male. The important point, however, is that this sort of male functions assertively, independent of whatever assets in terms of the societal stereotype he may also have.

Alternatively, if he is not able to discriminate between his primordial-based assertiveness and the more arbitrary societal sex-role expectations, that is, if he has doubts about what is really expected of him as a male, then, among other ramifications, he becomes a dupe for that vast array of products in the market — all of which purport to help him to be more like the cultural stereotype or help him emulate the stereotype of the societal ideal.

Often, very closely related to the latter alternative is the attempt to vindicate one's maleness in the other realm

---

[1] Supra., pp. 42-43.

(besides the one that requires asserting one's maleness against the environment), which is sexual prowess. One of the societal expectations of the preferred male, as we have noted, is that he be skilled at love-making, (whatever that may actually denote). Certainly, we have seen that some aspects of male sexual behavior are physiologically based — that is, assertiveness, which is partially facilitated by a lower threshold to erotic stimuli and greater susceptibility and frequency of arousal. Also, that there is an accompanying primordial expectation that the male will be assertive in a sexual way is also apparent. Therefore, with a primordial and universally-found basis for male desire for sexual satisfaction or release, combined with the societal expectation, one might conclude that he is highly susceptible to expectations involving "sexual success."

Sexual success would seem to include not only skills at allowing females to achieve full sexual satisfaction but, perhaps more importantly, smoothly and skillfully managing to engage in sexual intercourse (or to "score") with a high percentage of females with whom the male comes into social contact.

It comes as no surprise, then, that many of the marketing techniques (principally advertising), which purport to be able to make the male more like the ideal male, take into account not only the male's predisposed susceptibility to suggestions of sexual success, but more so, "play into

the hands" of those males who are particularly eager to vindicate their maleness — their male assertiveness — in the only realm left open to them.

Indeed, it would appear that this "sexual success" aspect of the societal expectation of the male is, if not fostered by, then, at least, strongly reinforced by "big business and advertising."[1]

In general, it seems that all of this apparently successful advertising has an appeal to the male or female in terms of a particular component of the appropriate societal sex-role expectations.

There are many examples of this phenomenon. One very popular magazine[2] features two obvious societal stereotypes — a very vivacious female, in a low-cut bathing suit, grinning widely and holding the hand of an equally impressive, athletic-looking, tall, broad-shouldered, well-built male. She is making him happy and he is also making her happy. They are, together, running out of the surf onto the beach, toward a hotel. The caption reads: "SHERATON MAKES IT HAPPEN... we make it happen with comfortable rooms, delicious food, a good time. Every time."

---

[1]This includes a wide assortment of culture-makers — newspapers, popular magazines, T.V., radio, many Hollywood movies, election campaigns, telephone sales, trade journals of, for example, the fashion industry — all produce the medium which provide COMMON society-specific stimuli.

[2]Time, Montreal: Time Canada Ltd., (May 17,1971), p. 4.

Quite obviously, the implication is that the male (or female) who goes to any of the Sheraton Hotels is likely going to "make it" with a highly desirable member (societal stereotype) of the opposite sex.

Another magazine [1] very frequently utilizes this genre of advertising: a layout shows a bottle of Canoe Cologne for men. The caption above reads: "Have you tried Canoe yet? No woman likes to be kept waiting." The line underneath the bottle reads, "Canoe.... for men who make it[2] everywhere."

The implications are clear: the desperate male reads the ad and is led to believe (consciously or through unconscious associations) that buying this brand of perfume will help him "make it" with women (there is also the implication in the term "make it" that those who are successfully "making it" in their occupational roles are also using Canoe.

Perhaps a more subtle, yet rather magnetic ad[3] is the one which shows a bottle of whiskey, set on a highly polished, dark wood surface. The tall bottle is flanked, very majestically, on either side, by a gift-wrapped container (for the bottle). Each container, which is wrapped in heavy white

---

[1] Playboy, Chicago: HMH Publishing Co. Inc., Vol.XVIII, no. 1 (Jan., 1971), p. 52.

[2] The underlining is ours.

[3] Playboy, Vol. XVIII, no. 1 (Jan., 1971), p. 50.

paper and gold and red ribbon, bears a silver, regal crest. The caption above reads, simply: "Some people[1] really know how to give." This sort of advertisement is often depicted as being one based on "snob appeal" — that is, being for "some people." Thus, this particular whiskey projects an image of success. The ad is saying, in effect: "People who can buy our bottle — some people — are successful people." Hence, "if you buy our product, YOU too will project that image," thus fulfilling a societal expectation of the male.

One particular shirt manufacturer's ad[2], which is especially useful for illustrative purposes, features a well-dressed, well-groomed, athletically-built, very confident, relaxed young man sitting in a small, expensive restaurant (there is an expensive bottle of wine on the table). He is wearing a boldly-coloured shirt and contrasting bow-tie. An extremely attractive girl (female societal stereotype) is leaning on one of his shoulders, rubbing against the shirt and grinning at him. Above the scene is the statement: "Some men can do anything... with great style!"

Briefly, then, various aspects of the advertisement display all those desired characteristics expected of the preferred (stereotyped) male. The implication in the ad is

---

[1]The underlining is ours.

[2]Playboy, Chicago: HMH Publishing Co. Inc., Vol. XVII, no. 4 (April, 1970), p. 204.

that these components of the cultural ideal are exactly what is expected of males by females. In the ad the young man has obviously satisfied the expectations of the women. One might speculate (which, of course, the ad is meant to promote, that this particular male has "made it" with this particular female).

Such ads "work" on females as well. A woman sees the female model — an obvious societal ideal of what is expected of females — whom she is expected to be like, and, by extension, desires to be like, and is led to believe that if she looks and behaves like, this model, then she too will attract a most-desired male.

The stage is now set for varying degrees of maladjustment. The average male reader looks at the advertisement, observes the characteristics of the male model, and in some form, tries to emulate him. Of course, the shirt manufacturer hopes that he will run out and buy a similar shirt. He could, however, which is just as likely, take a muscle-building course (this could easily be an ad for Charles Atlas or Vic Tanny), buy expensive wines, frequent tiny, expensive restaurants, or chase only vivacious long-haired, bosomy females.

If he can, by doing these things, successfully emulate the cultural ideal, he <u>is</u> likely to attract a societally-stereotyped, most-desired female. His behavior is, of course, reinforced by the behavior of the female who,

as noted, is susceptible to the same form of advertising. Firstly, she "does things" — to try and imitate, to a greater or lesser extent, the female who has apparently "got what it takes" — to attract the culturally desirable male. Additionally, she is "on the look out" for the man in such a shirt (or who buys such wines or who frequents such restaurants), being under the impression that such indications point to a culturally-desirable male.

The psychological crisis now occurs at one of two levels: at the first level, if the male goes out and buys a shirt, buys the cologne, stays at the Sheraton, drinks Seagram's whiskey, buys the car (with the gorgeous girl on the hood), and STILL does not manage to attract the most desired female, then at this point, the seeds of emotional stress are sown. We suspect that he turns inwards and begins to doubt himself — "What is wrong with me?" "I bought all these products and nothing happened!" "All around me 'guys' are doing the same thing and 'making it', and I'm not; therefore, there really must be something wrong with me." "I'm less male than most guys." "What must I do to be a real male?" A rather typical example is illustrated by a letter written to the editors of a Playboy-column:

> I must be a born loser. I've been trying to date some of the better-looking girls around and getting nowhere. I drive a new Porsche and have the latest clothes to match it and the money to go places with it. Naturally, it bothers me when I see some joker wearing blue jeans and driving a real clunk

> with a sharp chick sitting next to him. Any suggestions you can offer that would help put that girl next to me in the driver's seat would be appreciated.
>
> -L.F., Phoenix, Arizona.[1]

On the second level, he may, in fact, manage to attract a female who actually meets the requirements of the cultural stereotype. After some time, however, he may find that she does not live up to all his expectations. We would speculate that she does not meet his primoridally-based expectations of the female. This conflict is illustrated by the following letter from another worried male:

> I've had an argument with a friend about the value of beauty in a prospective wife. He maintains that it's way down the list of important attributes and I insist it's at the top - that to think otherwise is hypocritical.[2]

The editors' reply seems to manifest an understanding of the dynamics involved:

> ... men who place beauty high on the list of material values are primarily concerned with the social status that comes with being able to support a stunning mate [societal stereotype]. A man who marries for this reason will generally find that his wife is seeking something equivalent from him — comparable good looks, wealth, fame, or exceptional talent [societal stereotype, demonstrating the mutually-reinforcing nature of the societal stereotypes].... Most men realize this and look for other virtues, because

---

[1] "The Playboy Advisor," Playboy, Chicago: HMH Publishing Co. Inc., Vol. XVIII, no. 1 (Jan., 1971), p. 51.

[2] Ibid., p. 53.

> the qualities that wear well in the long run —— intelligence, warmth, ect. — relate to the personality, not to the face [essentially qualities relating to our concept of 'comfort-utility'].[1]

Advertising has convinced the male that with such a female who approximates the cultural ideal he should be blissfully happy: he has "made it." When he is not, crisis occurs once more, and again, he turns inwards: "What is wrong with me as a male?"

These investigators have observed in their field work that once a male arrives at this point, he becomes desperate to prove his masculinity and, in so doing, his behavior becomes self-defeating. He tries, repeatedly, to hold any woman or to "make it" with any woman. He engages in behavior which, in fact, is the exact antithesis of the confident assertiveness that is expected of him by females. The "hen-pecked, North American male" is a prevalent phenomenon; moreover, such results have a manifest basis. The male appears voluntarily to surrender hisprerogative to assert himself in order to win favour with females. However, in so doing, he obtains the opposite results, since it is assertive behavior that is much desired of males by females.

Novels, movies, and plays reflecting North American life seem to abound with themes, sub-themes, and references to the emasculated male and the dissatisfied North American

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 53-54.

woman who proclaims: "Show me a real man." In quest of this figure, she frequently removes herself to Europe. One modern writer described a New York party at which:

> Someone dedicated her seventh martini to the extinct American male... The toastmistress regretted the death of American peasants, game-keepers, and mourned the dependable cabdrivers, stable-boys, milkmen lost to analysts and psychological Westerns. Shell was not heartened by the general masculine failure.[1]

The crisis is similar for the female. She does all those things that advertising convinces her she must do in order to attract the desired male. If, similarly, she does not succeed in attracting the stereotyped ideal male, or, after attracting such a male, finds herself unhappy with him when he does not meet her expectations — not being confidently assertive — she also believes she is to blame, and doubts her femininity; doubts what is expected of her as a female. She may then try frantically to "do something" — she may then test more gimmicks and buy more products.

One particular ad seems to appeal particularly to women in this latter state. This ad for perfume[2] features a

---

[1] Leonard Cohen, The Favourite Game, New York: Avon Books, 1963, p. 122. The same kinds of observations are reflected by others, such as: Harold Robbins, The Adventurers, New York: Trident Press, 1966, and Mordecai Richler, Cocksure, New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

[2] Cosmopolitan, New York: Hearst Corporation, Dec., 1970, p. 7.

large head and bare shoulders of a very attractive young woman. The caption, in writing, under the shaded photograph, reads: "Want him to be more of a man? Try being more of a woman."

This particular form of advertising is, apparently, rather successful. It carefully employs a half-truth, that one "should be more of a woman to get more of a man." However, the ad purports that to be "more of a woman," one must buy "Emeraude" perfume. On the other hand, we would conclude that all "being more of a woman" requires is nothing more than a clear confidence in and lack of doubts about one's femininity or what connotes a "real woman."

Of course, part of the apprehension that women have at this point is REAL. The reader has seen that the male, being the victim of the SAME advertising is trying so desperately to be a male that in so doing he, paradoxically, sacrifices his natural maleness, which, in the absence of a female's confidence in her own femininity only heightens the female's dilemna.

She, too, becomes a self-defeating and defeated individual. She may, as noted above, strike out for Europe (or Miami) in search of a "real man," one who is confidently assertive, whatever else he may or may not have. She may also — like a blackboard — wipe her own uniqueness and personality clean, and — like a piece of plasticine — mold her personality, her likes, her dislikes, taste in clothes,

hair style, to whatever her current male beau, whom she is trying so desperately to keep,[1] may like (or what she supposes he will like, should she find this male). Her guide as to what the prospective male will like, of course, is furnished by, her 'old' nemesis, advertising. Contrary to popular myth, this is not what the male ultimately expects. As discussed earlier, the male's prime expectation of the female is "willingness to effect comfort-utility."

Further, she may become an "eager fan" of the "True Experience" variety of magazines, novels, television shows, and movies, wherein "real" males "love" stereotypes of the desired female.

The relationship between primordial and societal sex-role expectations can be further understood by another very brief illustration. Often advertisers will utilize an <u>obviously assertive</u> figure — frequently a well-known athlete (Bobby Hull, Angelo Mosca, Joe Namath) to provide the <u>essential</u> ingredient of male assertiveness ("We make panty hose for Joe Namath," says one ad). This provides the basis upon which the rest of the advertisement for a particular product (and, incidentally, the whole societal stereotype) is founded. The real endearing quality of the chosen model athlete is his

---

[1]Being able to hold or keep a male is, also, as discussed in Chapter I, a societal expectation of the female.

assertiveness, which has been demonstrated, time and time again, on the ice, on the football field, or in another segment of the environment. However, the attraction to this particular quality is generalized to include an attraction to other qualities which the assertive male ALSO displays. So, dark hair, straight teeth, broad shoulders, hairy chest, or Vitalis hair oil, a Brooks Brothers suit, Dodge Charger, et cetera, can all become attractive and potent in terms of sex-role expectations.

What advertising-prone people tend to miss is the point that what they are fundamentally attracted to is assertiveness (because it is a deeply-rooted, primordial expectation). If one were to substitute, for example, a non-assertive male, interior-decorator (that is not to say that interior decorators are not assertive, but rather that, in terms of North American society, interior decorators are not considered to be noted for their assertiveness), then, these investigators would propose, that Vitalis hair oil would, at best, lose sales; at worst, however, it is quite possible that Vitalis would become a negatively-valued product — people would ridicule it and joke about it.

Now, where a female manages to attract a male who conforms to the societal stereotype, who happens to be assertive also, then one might expect that those components of the societal stereotype of the preferred masculine type would

be strongly reinforced. Hence, Vitalis, Canoe Cologne, and Dodge Chargers would become even more highly valued.

On the other hand, where a female ultimately recognizes that the male's attractiveness is due to his "confident assertiveness" and not to these extraneous features, then, not only is assertiveness likely to be reinforced, but also, and more importantly, these investigators would hold that she is likely to be happier. It can be concluded, that whatever else the male does not have is of little consequence to the satisfaction of female role-expectations of the male, as long as he displays confident-assertiveness.[1]

These investigators would infer that a female's ability to recognize confident assertiveness as her strongest expectation of the male depends, directly, upon her degree of dependence upon the societal stereotype in order to define her own femininity. This, of course, is correspondingly true in the case of the male — his ability to recognize the primordial expectation of the female as being the one that will ultimately provide his satisfaction with a particular female depends directly upon his degree of dependence upon the societal stereotype to define his own masculinity.

---

[1]Of course, there are other "niceties" expected of both sexes such as kindness, consideration, generosity, and, in the final analysis, the expectation that the male will provide the economic basis for the basic necessities.

In fact, perhaps, one could consider true "sex liberation" in terms of one's ability to distinguish between, on the one hand, what society demands that one sex expect of the opposite sex, and, on the other hand, what part of those societal expectations are really indigenous to man, the most advanced of hominids.

It should be obvious at the outset that if all those who aspired to achieve the societal stereotypes were actually ABLE to realize and conform to them, then — the need being satisfied — there would be no dilemna, no resultant self-doubt, no poor self-concept, and resulting psychopathology and unhappiness. Unfortunately, as the reader will have become aware, this is NOT the case. This belief leads us to entertain the following propositions:

In broad general terms, if people were aware of the demonstrated preeminance of the primordial expectations — with their biological and socio-economic prepotence — and, further, understood how these primordial expectations comprise only a portion of the society-specific expectations, then such people could be freed from conflicts which apparently afflict vast numbers of North Americans.

This proposition necessitates further research of a conceptual nature into the kinds of relationships uncovered in this study. This paper represents an exploration which, at best, has only hinted at the far-reaching potential of a consideration of human adjustment in terms of sex-role

expectations; moreover, at some points within it, there are gaps, as might be expected in an area which has been reltively untapped.

A satisfactory level of research would cause people to consider more seriously the implications of sex-role expectations for human adjustment and happiness. This belief leads us to the second proposition:

Primordial sex-role expectations are universal. Further studies, particularly those of a cross-cultural nature, would facilitate the drawing of conclusions about this universality. Research done in cultures that have an apparent reversal of male-female roles would be particularly useful in assessing the prepotence and universality of primordial sex-role expectations.

A third proposition emerges: Since primordial sex-role expectations had not only survival value but also a biological basis, there may be implications and consequences accruing firstly, from artificially-induced biological changes in humans, and, secondly, from changes in terms of what is valuable for survival.

In order to investigate this proposition, further research is needed, particularly in terms of the effects of "the pill," — modern-day technique for dealing with pregnancy, and the effects of the aphrodisiac drugs. When pregnancy, for example, is no longer inevitable for mature females, as is the case nowdays, what are the implications for sex-role expectations? Hormonal additives ("the pill")

have the capacity to regulate biology; moreover, this potentially mitigates the basis for much of the female's expectation of the male. The sophistication of obstetric technology also weakens the foundation of the expectation that male behavior should have survival value. What, in addition, are the implications of present-day accessibility to drugs which have the effect of raising or lowering thresholds of sexual arousal: are they a threat to society's survival or do they, possibly, reflect a change in the values and the realities concerning survival? Further studies are undoubtedly necessary in order to investigate these social changes and, hopefully, to uncover their implications, and find viable answers to some of the questions they raise.

Undoubtedly, the question of sex-role expectations has implications for much larger questions which we have not attempted to broach. Further studies may find answers to the questions raised by the relatively recent presence of a public welfare system. How does it affect the primordial expectation that male behavior shall have survival value? Furthermore, if one postulates minority group - dominant culture relations in terms of "haves" and "have-nots," then what are the implications when the dominant culture ultimately regulates an individual's capacity for assertiveness and controls the media of advertising?[1]

---

[1] See Grier and Cobbs, Black Rage.

When the propositions listed above are validated and the questions they raise are answered, the information reflected in this kind of study may be transformed into effective action.

A next step, after the necessary research had been done, would involve widespread work with adolescents. Observations have shown that (with rare exception) a major preoccupation of adolescents concerns, "What do members of the opposite sex think of me?" "What do they expect me to be like?" For many, these questions are apparently never resolved, for they seem to extend into adulthood. From our own personal experience, we would speculate that for many young adults there is both relief and amazement to learn that what they thought was expected of them throughout adolescence, in retrospect, seems to have no basis. However, they seem to feel that such expectations were significant at the time because they were so closely bound-up with the pressures of the peer group.

Work might be done, quite strategically, with groups of adolescents. Such groups could foster shared discussion in terms of the adolescents' views and feelings about what they expect of opposite-sex members, and about what they perceive to be expected of them. Discussion at this level would have the effect of dispelling rumours, myths, half-truths, and preventing misconceptions in terms of societal expectations. The workers — equipped with the kind of

information which carefully-executed research studies can reveal — would contribute to the discussion by indicating the relationship between societal stereotypes and the ensuing sex-role expectations on one side, and the primordial, universal expectations, on the other.

Contributing to the adolescent's understanding of sex-role expectations could be beneficial to him in terms of personal adjustment. Moreover, it would be necessary to expose all his peers to the same set of facts. Unless this were the case, after individuals left the groups described above, they would be exposed to the same set of values, frame of reference, and the corresponding set of expectations of the larger peer group and the surrounding culture. What would then seem to be needed is some sort of programme aimed at ALL the young adolescents within a particular school or social system. A massive educational programme in terms of sex-role expectations, which would ultimately result in a re-education of society in terms of what the real and viable sex-role expectations are, might be suggested.

The chief obstacle to an effective educational programme, because of its pervasiveness and its particular genre, would be advertising. With the current forms of advertising, group discussions might not have the impact they might otherwise have, if the adolescent did not have to face the type of advertising which lead him (her) to believe, for example, that "if he (she) doesn't use Lavoris mouthwash,

then his (her) first date will be disastrous."

If the foregoing view is valid, action deserves to be taken to curb what may be labelled "phony advertising," or advertising which employs strategies other than utilizing the merits of the product only in order to attract consumers.

In terms of human adjustment vis-à-vis sex-role expectations, the only acceptable advertising is that which does not CREATE needs, utilizing the principle that humans are sensitive to phenomena which will affect their potential for realizing the expectations that they feel are being made of them.

Thus, acceptable advertising would feature a shirt worn by a model or models randomly selected from the population. Any written description of the shirt would include only factual information, such as: "This shirt, which comes in small, medium, and large, it made of nylon and fortrel, is fully washable and never needs ironing; it is available in blue, yellow, tan, and olive; price: $8.95."

Pressure exerted on advertising to use models that are randomly selected (or as nearly so as possible) from the population-at-large [1] might act as an effective <u>first step</u> towards complete rejection of all "phony advertising."

---

[1] One should note that randomly-selected models should not be confused with the psychological ploy that some "smart" advertisers use; that is, using, for example, a rather homely or ugly individual to advertise a particular product, with the carefully contrived implication being projected that "if a person like this can benefit, think what it will do for you (who has more to start with)!"

Another necessary step to facilitate an effective educational programme would mean eliminating the quasi-advertising which finds its way into school textbooks, particularly in the Guidance, Health, and Personal Development courses. So, for example, particular passages, such as those revealing that "beauty doesn't count" (in dating relationships) would need to be cut or, preferably, require much greater elaboration.

Finally, if further research and studies were to expose successfully the differences among the sex-role expectations and to demonstrate convincingly the strategic importance of one's realization of the primordial sex-role expectations in terms of his personal emotional adjustment and happiness, then many more methods and strategies would have to be devised to help individuals achieve these essential few sex-role expectations. This would require preventive and, ultimately, rehabilitative strategies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This report embodies an exploration into the area of sex-role expectations - male expectations of females and females expectations of males. Fieldwork with adolescents and subjective observations of people, generally, led the investigators originally to speculate that when males and females have doubts about what is expected of them by members of the opposite sex, respectively, then this lack of confidence, manifested in a poorly developed self-concept, leads to many forms of self-defeating behavior, marital discord, subjective feelings of unhappiness and certain kinds of psychopathology.

In order to understand the dynamics operating within the field of sex-role expectations the exploration embodies, not only an examination of the contemporary style of definition of sex-role expectations, but also a study of the origins of human sex-role expectations. During the course of this exploration it was necessary to delve into some of the literature in many distinct fields, including; anthropology, sociology, psychology, physiology and endocrinology.

The study of the origins of sex-role expectations traced the natural history of man and concluded by proposing that during the course of this early history, primordial sex-role expectations evolved. The expectation made of the male was that he would be confidently assertive. Correspondingly, the expectation made of the female was that she would be willing to effect comfort-utility.

The current style of definition of sex-role expectations was found to be manifested in the form of societal stereotypes of the desired or preferred male and female, respectively. It was apparent that not every male and female had the necessary prerequisites to be the successful embodiment of the societal ideals. Moreover, the persuasiveness of many cultural stimuli, the most influential of which appear to be advertising, by carefully utilizing the primordial expectations as the basis, act to convince males and females that in order to be a "real man" or a "real woman", respectively, they must strive for the appropriate components of the projected, ideal male and ideal female.

It was proposed that all that is required to be a "real" male or a "real" female is an adherence to the primordial, rather than the societal sex-role expectations. This proposition gave rise to further lines of questioning with a view toward formulating possible strategies for action.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aldous, Joan. "Wives' Employment Status and Lower-Class Men as Husband-Fathers. Support for the Moynihan Thesis." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI, No. 3 (Aug., 1969), 469-476.

Ardrey, Robert. African Genesis: A Personal Investigation into the Animal Origins and Nature of Man. New York: Atheneum, 1968.

Bailey, Margaret. "The Women's Magazine Short-Story Heroine in 1957 and 1967." Journalism Quarterly, XLVI, No.2 (Summer, 1969), 364-366.

Berry, Edwin C. "Conference Transcript." Daedalus, XCV (Winter, 1966).

Brim, Orville G. "Family Structure and Sex Role Learning by Children." Marriage, Family, and Society: A Reader. Edited by Hyman Rodman. Merrill-Palmer Institute. New York: Random House, 1965.

Campbell, Bernard G. Human Evolution: An Introduction to Man's Adaptations. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Chess, Stella. An Introduction to Child Psychiatry. 3rd ed. New York and London: Grune and Stratton, 1969.

Cohen, Leonard. The Favourite Game. New York: Avon Books, 1963.

Coleman, James C. Personality Dynamics and Effective Behavior. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, and Co., 1960.

Combs, Arthur W., and Snygg, Donald. Individual Behavior. Revised Edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

Cooley, Charles Horton. Human Nature and the Social Order. With an Introduction by Philip Rieff and a Foreward by George Herbert Mead. New York: Schocken Books, 1964.

De Vore, Irven; Murdock, Peter; and Whiting, John W.M. "Are the Hunter-Gatherers a Cultural Type?" Man the Hunter. Edited by Richard B. Lee and Irven De Vore, with the assistance of Jill Nash. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

Dobzhansky, Theodosius G. Mankind Evolving: The Evolution of the Human Species. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1962.

Ellis, Havelock. Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students. New York: Emerson Books, Inc., 1964.

Freedman, Lawrence Z., and Roe, Anne. "Evolution and Human Behavior." Behavior and Evolution. Edited by Anne Roe and George Gaylord Simpson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

Garn, Stanley M. "Culture and the Direction of Human Evolution." Symposium on Culture and the Direction of Human Evolution. Arranged and Edited by Stanley M. Garn. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1964.

Gebhard, Paul H.; Raboch, Jan; and Giese, Hans. The Sexuality of Women. Translated by Colin Bearne. New York: Stein and Day, 1970.

Gillin, John. An Introduction to Sociology. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1944.

Gotleib, David and Ramsey, Charles. The American Adolescent. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1964.

Grier, William H., and Cobbs, Price M. Black Rage. Bantam Books. Toronto: Bantam Books of Canada Ltd., 1968.

Hacker, H.M. "The New Burdens of Masculinity." Marriage and Family Living, XIX (1957), pp. 227-233.

Hallowell, A. Irving. "The Procultural Foundations of Human Adaptation." Social Life of Early Man. Edited by Sherwood L. Washburn. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961.

Hamburg, David A. "Effects of Progesterone on Behavior." Endocrines and the Nervous System. Edited by Rachmiel Levine. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Co., 1967.

_____. "Relevance of Recent Evolutionary Changes to Human Stress Biology." Social Life of Early Man. Edited by Sherwood L. Washburn. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961.

Hamburg, David A., and Lunde, Donald T. "Sex Hormones in the Development of Sex Difference in Human Behavior." The Development of Sex Differences. Edited by Eleanor E. Maccoby. California: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Howell, F. Clark, and the Editors of Time-Life Books. Early Man. New York: Time-Life Books, 1965.

Howells, William. Mankind in the Making: The Story of Human Evolution. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1959.

Jones, H. "Strength and Physique." American Journal of Physical Anthropology, Vol. 5, 1947.

Kardiner, Abram. Sex and Morality. Indianapolis and New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., 1954.

Komarovsky, Mirra. "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles." American Journal of Sociology, (Nov., 1946), pp. 184-189.

Kurtz, Richard M. "Body Image — Male and Female." Trans-Action, VI, No.2 (Dec., 1968), pp. 25-27.

_____. "Sex Differences and Variations in Body Attitudes." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, XXXIII, No. 5 (1969), pp. 377-382.

Lansky, L.; Grandall, V.; Kagan, J.; and Baker, C. "Sex Differences in Aggression and Its Correlates in Middle-Class Adolescents." Child Development, XXXII (1961), pp. 45-48.

Lee, Richard B. "What Hunters Do For a Living, or, How To Make Out on Scarce Resources." Man the Hunter. Edited by Richard B. Lee and Irven De Vore, with the assistance of Jill Nash. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

_____., and De Vore, Irven. "Problems in the Study of Hunters and Gatherers." Man the Hunter. Edited by Richard B. Lee and Irven De Vore, with the assistance of Jill Nash. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

McKee, John P., and Sherriffs, Alex C. "Men's and Women's Beliefs, Ideas, and Self-Concepts." American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (1959), pp. 356-363.

Maccoby, Eleanor E. "Sex Differences in Intellectual Functioning." The Development of Sex Differences. Edited by Eleanor E. Maccoby. California: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Masters, William H., and Johnson, Virginia E. Human Sexual Inadequacy. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.

_____., and Johnson, Virginia E. Human Sexual Response. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.

Mead, George Herbert. On Social Psychology: Selected Papers. Edited and with an Introduction by Anselm Strauss. 1st Phoenix ed. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Mead, Margaret. "Cultural Determinants of Behavior." Behavior and Evolution. Edited by Anne Roe and George Gaylord Simpson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

_____. "Cultural Determinants of Sexual Behavior." Sex and Internal Secretions. Edited by William C. Young, with a Foreward by George W. Corner. Vol. II, 3rd ed. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Co., 1961.

_____. Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1949.

Megargee, Edwin J. "Influence of Sex Roles on the Manifestation of Leadership." Journal of Applied Psychology, LIII, No. 5 (1969), pp. 377-382.

Meltzer, Bernard N. "Mead's Social Psychology." Symbolic Interaction: A Reader in Social Psychology. Edited by Jerome G. Manis and Bernard N. Meltzer. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

Merryman, W. "Progesterone Anaesthesia in Human Subjects." Journal of Clinical Endocrinology, XIV, No. 1 (1954), pp. 567-569.

Money, John. "Psychosexual Differentiation." Sex Research: New Developments. Edited by John Money. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

_____. "Sex Hormones and Other Variables in Human Eroticism." Sex and Internal Secretions. Edited by William C. Young, with a Foreward by George W. Corner. Vol. II. 3rd ed. Baltimore: The Williams and Wilkins Co., 1961.

Morris, Desmond. The Naked Ape: A Zoologist's Study of the Human Animal. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Mowrer, Ernest R. "The Differentiation of Husband and Wife Roles." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI (1969), pp. 534-540.

Oakley, Kenneth P. "On Man's Use of Fire, with Comments on Tool-Making and Hunting." Social Life of Early Man. Edited by Sherwood L. Washburn. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961.

O'Neill, Carl. W., and Selby, Henry A. "Sex Differences in the Incidence of Susto in Two Zapotec Pueblos." Ethnology, VII. No. 1 (Jan., 1968), pp. 95-105.

Pericot, Luis. "The Social Life of Spanish Paleolithic Hunters as Shown by Levantine Art." Social Life of Early Man. Edited by Sherwood L. Washburn. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961.

Pfeiffer, John E. The Emergence of Man. New York, Evanston and London: Harper and Row, 1969.

Playboy. Chicago: HMH Publishing Co., Inc. XVII, No. 4 (April, 1970).

Playboy. Chicago: HMH Publishing Co., Inc. XVIII, No. 1 (Jan., 1971).

Richler, Mordecai. Cocksure. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

Robbins, Harold. The Adventurers. New York: Trident Press, 1966.

Schultz, Adolph H. "Some Factors Influencing the Social Life of Primates in General and of Early Man in Particular." Social Life of Early Man. Edited by Sherwood L. Washburn. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961.

Sebald, Hans. Adolescence: A Sociological Analysis. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Simpson, George Gaylord. "Behavior and Evolution." Behavior and Evolution. Edited by Anne Roe and George Gaylord Simpson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

Steinmann, Anne, and Fox, David J. "Male-Female Perceptions of the Female Role in the United States." Journal of Psychology, LXIV (1966), pp. 265-276.

Steinmann, Anne, and Fox, David J. "Specific Areas of Agreement and Conflict in Women's Self-Perceptions and their Perception of Men's Ideal Woman in Two South American Urban Communities and an Urban Community in the United States." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXI, No. 2 (1969), pp. 281-289.

Symposium on Culture and the Direction of Human Evolution. Arranged and Edited by Stanley M. Garn. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1964.

Time, Montreal: Time Canada Ltd., May 17, 1971.

Washburn, Sherwood L., and Avis, Virginia. "Evolution of Human Behavior." Behavior and Evolution. Edited by Anne Roe and George Gaylord Simpson. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.

_____., and De Vore, Irven. "Social Behavior of Baboons and Early Man." Social Life of Early Man. Edited by Sherwood L. Washburn. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1961.

_____., and Lancaster, C.S. "The Evolution of Hunting." Man the Hunter. Edited by Richard B. Lee and Irven De Vore, with the assistance of Jill Nash. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1968.

Wenner, Naomi K. "Dependency Patterns in Pregnancy." Sexuality of Women. Edited by Jules H. Masserman. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1966.

Winton, F.R., and Bayliss, L.E. Human Physiology. London: J. & A. Churchill Ltd., 1962.

Young, William C. "The Hormones and Mating Behavior." Sex and Internal Secretions. Edited by William C. Young, with a Foreward by George W. Corner. Vol. II 3rd ed. Baltimore: The William and Wilkins Co., 1961.

_____.; and Goy, Robert W.;and Phoenix, Charles H. "Hormones and Sexual Behavior." Science, CXLIII (1964), pp. 212-218.

Zubek, John P., and Solberg, P.A. Human Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1954.

Zuckerman, Solly. Functional Affinities of Man, Monkeys, and Apes. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1933.