

Parental Influence on Children's Gender Roles and Future Job Aspirations

Özüm Kübra Yıldız

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Developmental Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University
July 2019
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Shenel Hüsnu Raman
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar

3. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Shenel Hüsnu Raman

ABSTRACT

Gender roles are defined as roles which are related to one's gender. Children's gender roles are shaped by many factors such as family, peers, school, etc. and can change based on culture. Parents play a great influence on children's gender roles and future job aspirations. The aim of the current study was to investigate the influence of parental ambivalent sexism and traditional gender role ideology on children's traditional gender stereotyped attitudes, non-conforming peer preferences, toy preferences and gender typed aspirations. Seventy-two Turkish-speaking children (31 boys and 41 girls, $M=8.90$) and their parents (112), including 65 mothers and 47 fathers participated in the study. Children and their parents were recruited from both North Cyprus and Turkey. Results showed that, fathers and mothers had the same amount of scores on benevolent sexism, however fathers' hostile sexism was higher than mothers'. Hostile sexist fathers' daughters were more likely to show gender stereotypical beliefs. In non-conforming peer preferences, boys preference for play with masculine girl peers was related with parental ambivalent sexism, parental flexibility and age. In girls however it was related to maternal benevolent sexism and marginally related with fathers' flexibility. Also, preference for play with feminine toys in boys was related to fathers' flexibility. There was no significant finding of the influence of parental ambivalent sexism on children's flexibility in occupation. Limitations and future directions of research are discussed.

Keywords: Gender Roles, Parental influence, Peer preferences, Toy preferences, Ambivalent Sexism Theory

ÖZ

Cinsiyet rolleri bireyin cinsiyetine bağılı olarak gelişmektedir. Çocukların toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri aile, akranları, okulu vb gibi bir çok faktör tarafından cinsiyete uygunluk için bir kültürü temel alarak şekillendirilmektedir. Ebeveynler çocuklarının toplumsal cinsiyet rolleri ve gelecekteki meslek seçimleri üzerinde daha yüksek etkiye sahiptirler. Yapılan çalışmanın amacı ebeveynlerin çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik tutumlarının ve geleneksel toplumsal cinsiyet rol idelojilerinin çocuklarının geleneksel toplumsal cinsiyet stereotip tutumları, cinsiyete uymayan akran seçimleri, oyuncak seçimleri ve gelecek meslek seçimleri üzerindeki etkisini ölçmektir. Araştırmaya, Türkçe konuşan 72 çocuk ve 65 anne ve 47 baba dahil olmak üzere 112 ebeveyn katılmıştır. Çocuklar ve ebeveynleri çalışmaya Kuzey Kıbrıs ve Türkiye'den örneklemdirilmiştir. Yapılan çalışmanın sonucuna bağılı olarak, anneler ve babalar korumacı cinsiyetçilik üzerine eşit puan alırken, babaların annelere kıyasla düşmanca cinsiyetçilikte daha fazla olduğu saptanmıştır. Ayrıca, düşmanca cinsiyetçilik gösteren babaların kızları yüksek oranda toplumsal cinsiyet stereotipik düşünceler göstermeye eğilimli bulunmuştur. Cinsiyete uymayan akran seçiminde, maskülen kız akranıyla daha çok oynamaya eğilimli erkek çocuklar ile ebeveynlerinin çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçiliği, ebeveynlerin cinsiyet esnekliği ve çocuğun yaşı arasında anlamlı bir ilişki bulunurken maskülen kız akranıyla oynamayı daha çok tercih eden kız çocukları ile anneleri arasında ise yüksek oranda korumacı cinsiyetçilik ve marjinal oranda babaların cinsiyet esnekliği arasında ilişki bulunmuştur. Ayrıca, feminen oyuncaklarla oynamayı tercih eden erkek çocukları ile babalarının cinsiyet esnekliği arasında yüksek bir ilişki bulunmaktadır. Ancak, ebeveynlerin çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik

tutumlarının çocukların gelecekteki meslek seçimleri üzerinde bir etki saptanmamıştır.

Çalışmanın sınırlılıkları ve gelecek çalışmalar için önemi son kısımda tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Cinsiyet rolleri, Ebeveyn etkisi, Akran etkisi, Oyuncak seçimi,
Çelişik Duygulu Cinsiyetçilik

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Shenel Hüsni Raman for her guidance, support and being part of this work. If I had to speak clearly about my feelings here, my greatest chance in my life was to meet with my supervisor. She always brightened my way with her experiences, knowledge, education and farsightedness. She always answered my questions with smiley face, spent the greatest effort and gave motivation to me to do my work. I am thankful to her patience, encouragement and the way she taught and motivated me. It was an enjoyable experience to work with my supervisor.

Also, I am thankful to all of my instructors whom have been a part of my education process. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar for his support, effort and guidance during the lectures and it was good opportunity to learn from his knowledge.

Lastly, I would like to thank one of my friends for his motivation, support and efforts. He was always by me in the hardest of situations and shared my happiness.

Of course, I am grateful to my family for their unconditional love. Especially my sisters, and my parents, thank you for being next to me in all hard times. And my lovely small sister Aylin, maybe you are too small to support me but your beautiful face was the best thing which made me forgot all the troubles.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	iv
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Theories of Gender Role Development.....	2
1.1.1 Cognitive Developmental Theory.....	2
1.1.2 Gender Schema Theory.....	3
1.1.3 Social Learning Theory.....	5
1.2 The Role of Parents in the Development of Gender Roles in Children.....	6
1.2.1 Parental Ambivalent Sexism and Gender Role Ideology in Children.....	10
1.3 Children’s Gendered Play and Toy Preference.....	13
2 METHOD.....	17
2.1 Participants.....	17
2.2 Materials.....	17
2.2.1 Demographic Questions.....	17
2.2.2 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory.....	18
2.2.3 Gender Flexibility in Occupational Perceptions.....	18
2.2.4 Demographic Questions.....	18
2.2.5 Gender Stereotyped Attitude Scale for Children (GASC).....	19
2.2.6 Openness to Playing with a Non-conforming Peer.....	19

2.2.7 Toy Preference	19
2.2.8 Gender Flexibility in Occupational Perceptions	20
2.3 Procedure.....	20
3 RESULTS.....	22
3.1 Descriptive Statistics.....	22
3.1.1 Gender Differences between Parent’s Hostile-Benevolent Sexism, Gender Flexibility in Occupation.....	22
3.1.2 Gender Differences between Children.....	22
3.1.3 Correlation Analysis.....	24
3.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis.....	26
3.2.1 Gender Stereotyping.....	26
3.2.1.1 Gender Stereotyping in Boys:.....	26
3.2.1.2 Gender Stereotyping in Girls:.....	27
3.2.2 Feminine Toy Preference.....	29
3.2.2.1 Feminine Toy Preference in Boys.....	29
3.2.2.2 Feminine Toy Preference in Girls.....	30
3.2.3 Masculine Toy Preferences.....	31
3.2.4 Children Flexibility on Occupation.....	31
3.2.5 Counterstereotypical Peer Preference.....	31
3.2.5.1 Masculine Girl Peer Preference in Boys.....	31
3.2.5.2 Masculine Girl Peer Preference in Girls.....	33
3.2.6 Feminine Boy Peer Preference.....	34
4 DISCUSSION.....	35
4.1 Limitations and Future Research.....	40
REFERENCES.....	43

APPENDICES.....	57
Appendix A: Demographic Questions.....	58
Appendix B: Ambivalent Sexism Inventory	59
Appendix C: Gender Flexibility in Occupational Perceptions	60
Appendix D: Demographic Questions.....	62
Appendix E: Gender Stereotyped Attitude Scale for Children (GASC)	63
Appendix F: Openness to playing with a non-conforming peer	65
Appendix G: Toy Preference	66
Appendix H: Gender Flexibility in Occupational Perceptions.....	67
Appendix I : Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology Department’s Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter.....	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Independent samples t-test for mother vs. father scores on ambivalent sexism and gender flexibility in occupation.....	22
Table 2. Gender differences between study variables for children.....	23
Table 3. Correlations between parental attitudes and children’s measures.....	25
Table 4. Hierarchical regression model of study predictors for gender stereotyping in girls.....	28
Table 5. Hierarchical regression model of study predictors for feminine toy preference in boys.....	30
Table 6. Hierarchical regression model of study predictors for masculine girl peer preference in boys.....	32
Table 7. Hierarchical regression model of study predictors for masculine girl peer preference in girls.....	34

LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Doi	Digital Object Identifier
EMU	Eastern Mediterranean University
e.g.	Example Given
Et al.	And others
F	F-statistics
i.e.	That is
M	Mean
N	Population Size
n	Sample Size
p	Probability
r	Correlation Coefficient
SD	Standard Deviation
t	Critical Value
vs	Versus
&	And

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Society expects different roles from men and women which may be based upon yet different from one culture to another. Individual's perceptions of gender roles can be shaped by such expectations. Gender roles are defined as behaviors or roles which are related with a person's gender, based on cultural norms and children's attitudes and behaviors are shaped in terms of gender-appropriate behaviors, first at home then by peers, the school and also from the media (Witt, 1997). In almost every society, gender-based behavioral patterns are given to girls and boys through socialization process (Dökmen, 2009). In this process of socialization, family is the place which gender identities as well as gender-based inequalities are reproduced. The child first learns from her/his family what is male and female, and this raises the foundation for gender stereotypes (Güder & Yıldız, 2016).

Children are like gender investigators which is looking for gender cues to understand difference between boys and girls and decide whether play with whom or join activity. Children generate gender cues from their environment which is what they see and what they hear. Children use these gender cues to respond to expectations of society (Martin & Ruble, 2004). Children start to learn about gender differentiation since their birth such as when they are wrapped in gender-specific colored blankets or when girls are dressed in soft colored clothes while boys bold colored clothes (Fagot & Lienbach, 1993).

Children start to develop gender roles at around 2 years of age because, awareness of gender differences start at this age (Boe & Woods, 2018). Also, younger children's and adult's body shape, hair style, voice type, outfits etc. are kind of cues which can be able to discriminate from others for understanding gender differentiations (Fagot & Lienbach, 1993). Around 5 years old children develop gender stereotypes and use these stereotypes for interpretations of others and regulate their own behaviors (Martin & Ruble, 2004). Also, when children's gender typed behaviors are supported by their environment, it increases awareness of gender differences on children (Adler, Kless & Adler, 1992). According to Martin, Wood and Little (1990), all children are exposed to gender-stereotypes while growing up and developing their gender identity. Moreover, societal stereotypes create appropriate gender roles and preferences for girls and for boys including occupational choices such as girls wanting to become a nurse and boys become police officers (Garret, Ein & Tremaine, 1977). In order to assess how children develop gender roles a number of theories have been offered. These will be covered in the next section.

1.1 Theories of Gender Role Development

1.1.1 Cognitive Developmental Theory

Kohlberg's (1966) cognitive developmental theory underlined the role cognitions or how we are thinking about gender. It consists of cognitive development and organizing learned information from simple to complex depend on aging. There are three stages, namely: Gender identity, gender stability and gender constancy. Gender identity is children's ability to be aware of their own gender and other's gender age between 2-3. Children discriminate behaviors of others and classify those behaviors dependent on others' gender via modelling. Children have awareness about what is his or her gender however, they believe that it might change in the future. Gender stability occurs

around 4-5 years of age which is when children learn that gender is stable but it might change depend on conditions around them. For example, a boy would think that his gender will change if he wears a skirt. When children are around 6 years old, they have sufficient cognitive capacity to understand that gender is permanent.

According to Bem, gender typing is a natural process and unavoidably based on cognitive development. Frey and Ruble (1992) examined ninety children, aged between 5 to 10 years. All the children watched a video that included boys and girls playing with different kinds of attractive toys and they were asked to play with the same toys in a different room at the end of the video. Researcher found that gender constant boys were more likely to play with gender labelled toys than pre-constant boys. Also, gender constant boys played with the labelled toys more than neutral toys even though it was not as attractive as the girls' toy. Children who have developed gender constancy are able to categorize activities and objects based on their own gender identity. Children internalize being male or being female and constantly act in line with his or her gender (Bem, 1983). However, children's understanding of social environment is not only based on sex, but more complex cognitive processes to perceive and organize the social world (Bem, 1983).

1.1.2 Gender Schema Theory

Gender schema theory gives an explanation about gender-typing or how children regulate their behaviors for being male or female (Bem, 1993). Gender schema theory examines children's cognitive schemas based on the readiness of children's encoding and organizing information including cultural traits about being male or female. Schema shapes a person's understanding of the world and the child learns to internalize information which is appropriate for one's gender (Bem, 1993). Also, Bem (1983)

suggested that, children create their self-concept according to internalization of gender-typed information, behaviors and objects of gender schemas.

Children selectively join actions from their environment such as being with peers, family or school settings and utilize these information for developing their schemas (Endendijk et al., 2018). In summary, children select situations which are more similar and interesting to their gender from their environment. Gender schema theory accepted the Kohlberg's cognitive developmental theory only difference between Bem and Kohlberg is about development of gender identity. Bem (1981) and Martin and Halverson (1981) suggest that gender identity is developing much more earlier than Kohlberg's theory.

Gender schemas explain sex typing and gendered learning into two ways: First of them including in-group and out-group schemas which contains categorization of objects, behaviors and roles based on one's femaleness and maleness. The other one is called own sex schema's of children which is much more detailed and particular type of first categorization and contains how children categorized these objects, behaviors and roles to their own sex (Martin & Halverson, 1981). Schemas regulate behaviors based on expectations about future goals, behaviors, and habits. Schemas give the opportunity to a person to achieve his or her goals and use the appropriate behaviors while achieving the goals. During play-and non-play activities and toy preferences children who are aged around 2 years old, prefer to play with gender-labelled toys and same-sex peers (Jacklin & Maccoby 1978; Maccoby & Jacklin 1974). Also, schemas lead children to know which behaviors they should avoid. Ross and Ross (1972) suggest that when teachers force children to play with opposite gender typed toys, boys

and girls refuse to play with forced toys because it is inappropriate to their gender. The structure of schemas provides an organization of the attended information.

1.1.3 Social Learning Theory

Alternatively, social learning theory suggest that, children learn gender roles via modelling or imitating others' behaviors (Bandura & Bussey, 1999). According to Bandura and Bussey (1999), children are social agents and their gender development is based on modelling or reinforcement of gender appropriate behaviors by others. Environmental factors have greater influence on children's gender socialization which shows gender appropriate attitudes or behaviors via socialization. Related with the socialization process, children learn how to differentiate sex and gender stereotyped behaviors from society which is culturally defined as gender appropriate. Gender stereotypes are visible in all life settings such as family, peers, schools, neighbors which can easily affect children's perceptions of gender stereotypes (Halim et al., 2013).

According to social learning theory, another influencer is parental socialization in which parents' knowledge about gender influences their children and parents influencing their children via their own behaviors, interests and occupational choices etc. (Endendijk et al., 2018). Family is the one of important setting which allows children to experience concept of gender and contains more gendered knowledge than children's environment. Family members are present role models and children observe differences between their parents and learn how to behave as a male or female via observation and imitation (Endendijk et al., 2018). Furthermore, children have a tendency to model same-sex behaviors than opposite-sex such as boys modelling their father's behavior more and girls modelling their mother's behaviors (Perry & Bussey, 1979). Children imitate behaviors of their parents based on how the parents treat their

sons and daughters by creating them more gendered environments and use direct communication about gender or using punishment or reinforcement. (Endendijk et al., 2018).

1.2 The Role of Parents in the Development of Gender Roles in Children

Although there are a number of factors that influence a child's gender role development including the media, school environment, teachers and peers, relevant to the current study is the role of parents. According to Bronfenbrenner's (1986) ecological system theory, individuals are active agents on their own development. The theory examines the effects of society, school, socio-economic status, politics or media on children's perception of the world (Cook et al., 2005). Ecological model consists of four systems which are called microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem and macrosystem. Microsystem focuses on the development of children while growing up which includes their interactions with their environment such as the family, school, peers, neighbors etc. and these factors influence children's development. Second is the mesosystem which is focusing on the influence of relationships of two or more microsystems on children such as relations between school and peers or parents. Third is the exosystem which influences children in an indirect way such as neighbors, media, parental job status, etc. Lastly, is the macrosystem which includes cultural norms and values of society (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). At the application of occupation based on gender concept, macrosystem includes appropriate and inappropriate gender stereotypes, gender discrimination, gender ideology and gender typing on occupational perceptions based on specific culture. Microsystem is give information about how others treating women depending on gender. Mesosystem contains interactions of two or more microsystems such as parents and teachers have influence on young girl's

occupational aspirations and lastly exosystem is linked subsystems and influence indirect way such as girls or women learns gender appropriate occupations from the media (Cook et al., 2005). This theory helps to explain from a wider perspective the decision to include parental influence on children's gender role development.

Parental influences have a great importance for better understanding of gender typed attitudes (Dawson et al., 2016). According to Thorne (1993), parents treat their children differently related with their gender also dressing their babies with gender-specific colors, offering different kind of toys and expecting different behaviors depending on child's gender. A meta- analysis of 43 articles that investigated the relation between parents' gender schema and cognitions about their children's gender found that parents do have an impact, especially on the formation of their children's self-concept and on their attitudes toward gender (Tenenbaum & Leaper, 2002), hence making it a critical factor to examine.

In one such study, Fagot (1978) examined parental reactions toward children's sex or specific behaviors. She found that, parents give significant and appropriate reactions to their children's same sex behaviors however, parents show more negative reactions toward their children when they show cross-sex behaviors. Similarly, the relationship between child and parent is very critical in developing children and influences children's perception of sense of self and toy selection of children is highly related with the parental gender-typing (Witt, 1997). Parents support their children to join gender-typed activities such as girls playing with dolls and housekeeping objects, as well as boys playing with lorries and playing sports (Eccless, Jacobs, & Harrold, 1990).

There are a number of studies examining the link between influences of mothers and fathers on their son's and daughter's behaviors, attitudes and preferences by transferring their gender stereotypical beliefs. Halpern and Perry-Jenkins (2016) examined parental gender role ideology and gender typed behaviors to anticipate children's gender roles development with 6 years old children by using longitudinal data. Researchers found that, girls showed more feminine stereotypical attitudes such as house work and child caring when their mothers acted with more traditional gender stereotyping. Moreover, boys show less masculine stereotypical attitudes and knowledge when their mothers engaged with more feminine stereotyped issues with six year old children. Also, research findings suggest that boys showed less knowledge about feminine stereotypes when their father show more traditional gender role ideology and boys who show more knowledge about feminine stereotypes when their father more egalitarian (Halpern & Perry-Jenkins, 2016).

Similarly, McHale, Crouter and Whiteman (2003), suggest that parents might affect their children's socialization of gender roles with transition of own gender roles, behaviors or teaching gender stereotyped activities by supporting or not supporting their children's activities or actions. Children are more likely to model or learn their parent's gender-typed behaviors in terms of household labor works in home (Turner & Gervai, 1995). Authors (1995) found that, four years old children's knowledge about gender concept was shaped by their parental gender roles. Furthermore, they found that children who were less aware of gender stereotypes had father's showing non-traditional household labor in home and child care. Children also showed less gender typed schemas and higher flexibility on their behaviors when their parents had more

egalitarian attitudes. Similarly, egalitarian fathers had both daughters and sons who were more likely to engage with feminine play.

The parental influence not only involves gender roles, but particularly affects children's future job aspirations. Occupational settings are also shaped by socio-cultural norms. According to Liben, Bigler and Krogh (2002), children prefer to choose traditional jobs which are culturally defined as masculine jobs and feminine jobs. Children as early as age of six, might limit their job preferences to choose gender appropriate jobs (Gottfredson, 1981).

Researchers have examined the link between future job aspirations and gender flexibility. Fulcher, Sutfin and Patterson (2008) suggest that children have similar activities, stereotypical beliefs and job interests related with their parents. Selkow (1984) for instance examined link between children occupational preferences and their mother's occupation based on sex-typing. Researcher found that, mother who works their girls age between 5-7. more likely to preferred traditionally more feminine jobs. Also, boys tend to preferred many jobs which is less-traditional if their mother are working. In general, both girls and boys are less likely to prefer traditional jobs if their mother's occupation is non-traditional.

In another study, Jacobs, Chin and Bleeker (2006) conducted a longitudinal study on children's occupational choices and actual occupations based on parental gender-typed expectations. Researchers asked children's own occupational choices at age 15 and their parents expectations based on their own gender typing looking at how it was involved in the future of the children's actual occupations at age 28. Initially they found that boys sample had more traditional jobs than girls in comparison. Critically,

they also found strong relationships between parental gender typed expectations and adolescence occupational expectations. Also, two years later, father's gender typed occupational expectations and their daughters occupations matched but not with their sons. However, mothers' gender typed occupational expectations matched with both sons and daughters.

1.2.1 Parental Ambivalent Sexism and Gender Role Ideology in Children

As stated above, parental attitudes, beliefs and emotional responses can shape children's social and gender roles, and parental stereotypical beliefs have an effect on children's occupational aspirations, education, social and emotional development (Lipowska, Lipowski & Pawlicka, 2016). It is therefore critical to examine the role of parental sexism levels, i.e. ambivalent sexism. Social psychological studies suggest that, in male-dominated societies there exist negative attitudes toward the female sex and these attitudes can lead to discrimination in social, cultural, political and economical areas which can lead to sexism (Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2008).

According to ambivalent sexism theory (Glick & Fiske, 1996), sexism involves beliefs that are polarized and mixed towards women. Sexism, teaches one how to distribute social roles, and prescribes certain behavior patterns and values based on one's gender as a being male or female. Recent studies have shown that, it is deceptive to evaluate traditional attitudes toward women only with negative aspects, because sexism can include negative attitudes and stereotypes as well as positive attitudes and stereotypes (Ayan, 2014). Glick and Fiske (1996) suggest that, structural power of men and dyadic power of women creates an ideology of ambivalent sexism. Ambivalent sexism is a multidimensional construct which covers two sexist attitudes, hostile and benevolent sexism.

Hostile sexism is defined as a negative view toward women which is including women have perceived as a seeking control of men (Glick & Fiske,2001), women are substandard which is accepting stereotypes and negative perspective compared with the men (Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2013). Also according to Glick and Fiske (1996), hostile sexism equals the classic definition of prejudice toward women. Ayan (2014) suggest that, men sees women as a sexual object and justify abusive behavior toward women.

Benevolent sexism is categorizing women as being morally superior, weaker creatures who need to be protected, supported and adored and have to complete men (Glick & Fiske, 2001). It is seemingly positive since it suggests women have a purer and more ethical stance, however it is equally derogating since it claims women need protection, usually by a man.

Hostile and benevolent sexism while differing from each other, there is also similarities between them which is that they both reinforce traditional gender roles and try to justify and maintain a patriarchal social structure (Ayan & Gökkaya, 2016). In a cross-cultural examination of ambivalent sexism conducted by Glick and colleagues (2000), Turkey was found to be high in ambivalent sexism. Relevant to thesis, in comparison of Northern Cyprus sample and Turkey both share similar amount on sexist beliefs, so there is no significant difference between two samples (Hüsni & Mertan, 2015). Relatedly and reflecting high levels of sexism, Kağıtçıbaşı (1982) found male decision making was higher and communication and role sharing between spouses in Turkey was low. The Turkish societal make up has also been found to generally encompass a traditional gender ideology (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982; Van Rooij, Van Balen, & Hermanns, 2006), be of patriarchal nature (Glick et al. 2000; Sakalli, 2001)

and its family structure one of traditionality (Kağıtçıbaşı & Ataca, 2005). More recent findings have consistently found men to be considered as the head of the family, in charge of carrying out the traditional roles, including child rearing in conservative and traditional fashion (Bolak-Boratav, Okman-Fişek, & Eslen-Ziya, 2017; Yalcin & Tanriverdi, 2018).

To the researcher's knowledge, to date there is no research that has examined the link between parents own sexist attitudes using contemporary sexism scales and their elementary children's gender roles. One such study by Garaigordobil and Aliri (2013) analyzed the differences in mother's and father's parenting styles (i.e., authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, neglectful) in relation to their children's gender and looked at whether there were differences in ambivalent sexism as a function of the parents' socialization styles, as well as the effects of parental educational level on their children's sexism levels in Spain. Their results showed no differences in father's parenting style but that mothers used a more authoritarian style with the daughters. Interestingly they found that parental style had little influence on their children's sexism scores, however they found that it played a more important role on their son's sexism scores. As for the father's style, it was found to have less impact compared to the mother with regards to the son's sexism, and it had no impact on the daughters' sexism. Lastly, they found that a mother's higher education level promoted the lowest sexist attitudes in their adolescent children.

1.3 Children's Gendered Play and Toy Preference

In the current study toy preference and play with a non-conforming peer was assessed as a markers of gender role ideology (see Spinner, Cameron, & Calegro, 2018), therefore this section will outline evidence on the role of toy preference, peer preferences in play and parental influences. Reich, Black and Foliaki (2018) suggest that, children learn via socialization from their environment and play is very common and important way to learn and it is beneficial for healthy development among children. Dinella, Wiesgram and Fulcher (2017), examined traits and colors of toys and how it influences boys and girls stereotypes and decisions for play. They colored the masculine toys with masculine colors and feminine toys with feminine colors. Researchers found that, boys were more likely to play with masculine toys and girls less likely to play with masculine toys whereas paid more attention to feminine toys (Dinella et al., 2017). It is evidenced that traits and colors of toys significantly affects boys and girls while playing (Reich, Black & Foliaki, 2018).

Parental toy selection is a very important issue for children especially before school age. When children are too young to go to school, they play with toys which choice of their parents. Caldera, Huston and O'Brien (1989) examined parents participation and involvement in sex-typed toy or avoidance on cross-sex typed to identify the link between masculine or feminine toys, its influence on different patterns of parent-child interaction, regardless of gender. They found that parents were more likely to respond positively and become involved in the same-sex typed toys than cross-sex typed toys. Children were shown more excitement while noticing same-sex toys. Also, children modelled their parent's involvement of same-sex toys which traditionally gender typed

while playing. Importantly, results clarify that sex- stereotyped toys have influence on parent-child interaction without consideration of parent's or child's gender.

Fisher-Thompson (1993), examined the parents promotion on their children's gender-typed plays with buying them toys from toy shop. The researcher found that, parents buy more gender-typed toys than neutral-typed toys and cross-gendered toys. Boys received more gender-typed toys than girls from their parents. Also, customers requested more gender-typed toys than neutral typed of toys.

Another recent study done by Kollmayer, Schultes, Schober, Hodosi and Spiel (2018), examined the parental judgment on fascination of different types of toys for their own children and link between these judgments and parents gender roles, gendered-types of toys and other demographic variables. Parents reported that they prefer to choose same-gender typed toys and neutral types of toys more than cross-gendered toys. Similarly, Freeman (2007) suggested that, parents are more likely to decide more gender stereotyped toys and neutral typed toys for their sons than girls.

For the better understanding of parental influence, Raag and Rackliff (1998), collected 61 preschool children from the local population and put children in a play room which prepared for research. Researchers added gender-typed toys (such as tool and dish sets) and neutral typed toys in play room environment. Researchers asked children 'if you play with this toy, what would your mother/father (or who is primary care giver) be likely to say?' and asked about possible answers from children to know playing with kind of toy defines as a bad or good or not important for their parents. Also, parental interview questionnaires were given to parents which asked them which toy they would prefer for their children such as toy for boys or toy for girls or both. The results

showed that, most of the preschoolers (girls and boys) reported that, if they play with the gender typed toys, their parents or primary care givers would say this is good or neutral play. Boys reported that playing with cross-gender typed toys would be defined as bad play by their fathers. Moreover, boys group reported that, they were aware that playing with cross-gender typed toys seemed bad by their parents perspective. As a result, dish sets defined as a girl toys, tool set defined as a boys toy. Boys who think that playing with the girls toy would be seems bad from their father perspective, boys never touch the dish set (Raag & Rackliff,1998).

As for peer play, children at an early age choose to play with same gender friends, also known as gender segregation (Hoffman & Powlishta, 2001). This preference starts around the age of 2 when girls start to move towards playing more with other girls, boys preference for playing with boys tends to be a little later, generally at age 3. Research has found that by age 4.5 90% of play time is with same gender peers (Martin & Fabes, 2001). It has been theorized that children choose to play with peers who have compatible play styles, so boys who have on average a higher activity level than girls (due to biology) may prefer to play with others who are as active as they are, boys. Girls on the other hand may prefer peers with equal sharing and communication skills (Moller & Serbin, 1996). Shields & Shields (2002) stated that this might be why boys think girls' games are slow and boring, and girls think boys play is pushy and too dominating. Serbin, Connor, Bruchardt and Citron (1979), examined preschoolers (26 girls and 36 boys) aged between 3-4 in three conditions, these are playing alone, playing with same sex peers and playing with cross-sex peers for understanding influence of peer on gender typing in children's play. They suggested that, children have awareness about whether they would be rewarded or punished if they play with

a non-conforming or conforming peers and toys in pre-school periods. That's why, presence of peers might restrict their gender-appropriate playing. Researchers found that, presence of cross-sex peer, decreased the possibility of playing with cross-sex toys.

Gender segregation and differences in interaction style are not necessarily concrete. In an observational study of elementary school children Thorne (1993) showed that there was a lot of variety in play in playgrounds and that nonstereotypical and unsegregated play often occurred.

In line with the literature mentioned above, the current study aimed to investigate the link between sexist attitudes of parents and its influence on their children. It was hypothesized that those parents who exhibit high levels of ambivalent sexism and more traditional gender ideology will have children who report more traditional gender stereotyped attitudes, choose traditional matching for occupations, report more gender-typed job aspirations and be less likely to want to play with a gender non-conforming peer. The difference between fathers and mothers were explored, in order to assess the differential influence of fathers and mothers on their daughter or sons.

Chapter 2

METHOD

2.1 Participants

Seventy two Turkish-speaking children (31 boys and 41 girls) and their parents, including 65 mothers and 47 fathers participated in the study. Children and their parents were recruited from both North Cyprus and Turkey using a convenience sampling recruitment strategy. The ages of children ranged from 6 to 11 ($M=8.90$, $SD=1.61$), whereas parental age ranged between 28-47 for mothers ($M=37.75$, $SD=.53$) and 33-56 ($M=41.02$, $SD=.63$) for fathers.

Out of the participants, 108 were Turkish and 4 participants were Turkish Cypriot, due to the small difference in numbers between the two groups' ethnicity and nationality, also because past studies (e.g., see Husnu & Mertan, 2015) found non-significant differences on sexist beliefs between Northern Cyprus and Turkey's Turkish speaking samples, both samples were combined in the current study.

2.2 Materials

Parents and children received different scales, only gender flexibility on in occupation scale was used in both group. Parental scales received are as follows:

2.2.1 Demographic Questions

This included questions to parents about their children, including how many children they had, their ages, etc. as well as information about their self such as age, gender, nationality, marital status, education level and their jobs (see appendix A)

2.2.2 Ambivalent Sexism Inventory

The ambivalent sexism inventory was developed by Glick and Fiske (1996) aimed at measuring hostile and benevolent sexism. The Turkish version of the scale was adapted and translated by Nuray Sakallı Uğurlu (çelisek duygulu cinsiyetçilik ölçeği; 2002). The inventory has 22 items and is a likert type scale which ranges from 1 (I completely disagree) to 6 (I completely agree). There are two subscales of the measure; benevolent sexism (example item: "Every woman should have a man to whom she can turn for help in times of trouble") and hostile sexism (example item: "The world would be a better place if women supported men more and criticized them less"). The Cronbach alpha for each subscale was found to be sufficient whereby benevolent sexism was $\alpha = 0.65$ and hostile sexism scale was $\alpha = 0.82$ (see appendix B).

2.2.3 Gender Flexibility in Occupational Perceptions

Parental gender flexibility for occupations was assessed by the Job Check List (Ashby & Wittmaier, 1978). This is a measurement tool that assesses how children perceive a number of occupations based on gender. Each occupation was translated to Turkish by the researcher and back translated. It consists of 30 jobs in which parents were asked whether each job can be done by 'males', 'females', or 'both male and female'. The coding for this scale was such that only 'both male and female' would receive a scoring of 1 point (other two options received '0'). Scores could range from 0 to 30. Higher scores indicated a high flexibility in occupational perception of the parents (see appendix C). Scales children received are as follows:

2.2.4 Demographic Questions

It had basic questions to children about their age, gender and date of birth (see appendix D)

2.2.5 Gender Stereotyped Attitude Scale for Children (GASC)

This scale was developed by Signorella and Liben (1985) for measuring children's gender flexibility based on gender stereotypes. It has 34 items of activities from daily life and children were asked whether they thought these activities could be done 'only by men' (coded as 1), 'only by women' (coded as 1), or by 'both men and women' (coded as 0). Scores could range from 0 to 34 and higher scores indicated more gender stereotyping. Before implementing the scale children were shown a picture of a male, female and both a male and female together in order to improve the child's understanding of the categorization (see appendix E).

2.2.6 Openness to Playing with a Non-conforming Peer

This scale was developed by Martin and Little (1990) for measuring the children's concept of gender, sex-typed preferences and gender stereotypes. Six pictures were shown to the children and asked how much they would prefer to play with the child in the picture. Three pictures of boys and three pictures of girls were used in which the pictured child was holding and seemingly playing with a stereotypically masculine toy, a stereotypically feminine toy, or no toy. Children were asked to rate their preference for playing with the peer using a smiley face scale ('I strongly want to play' to , 'I strongly do not want to play' ranked from 1 to 6) (see appendix F).

2.2.7 Toy Preference

This scale was used to measure influence of gender stereotypes on children's preferences for toys. Children were shown 12 pictures of toys (four stereotypically masculine, four stereotypically feminine and four neutral toys) and were asked how much they would like to play with them. Children's responses were rated by a smiley face scale ranging from 1 ('I strongly do not want to play') to 6 ('I strongly want to play'). The masculine toys showed a high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha=

.93) as did the feminine toys ($\alpha = .86$) and therefore a composite score of ‘masculine toy preference’ and ‘feminine toy preference’ was created and entered into the analysis. The neutral toy preference was not included in any further analysis (see appendix G).

2.2.8 Gender Flexibility in Occupational Perceptions

The same scale given to parents was given to the children in order to see how flexible they perceived occupations to be. The scoring was the same as above (see appendix H)

2.3 Procedure

Before starting the research, ethical approval was obtained from the Research and Ethics Committee of Eastern Mediterranean University. Participants were selected by using a convenience sampling recruitment strategy. Three private educational institutes in Famagusta were approached and written permission was gathered from institutes before data collection. The head teacher of the institute was given an informed consent form in which they were asked if they wanted to join the study along with a brief explanation about the study and confidentiality. After the head teacher consented, the questionnaire was given to the parents who were asked to complete the questionnaire in their homes and bring back to private educational institutes the following day. From children, the data was collected in the private educational institute in an empty classroom. The researcher gave brief information about the study verbally to the children reminding them that they could drop out the study at any time. After verbal confirmation, if the child accepted, he or she participated the study. Researcher read all the information and questions on the scales to the children. The data collection session lasted around 25 minutes with each child. A total of 23 children were collected from Famagusta, North Cyprus. The same procedure was repeated for children and

families in Turkey, however data was collected in homes as well as a college in Iğdır (N= 49). The response rate from families was not as high for their children in total out of the 72 children whose parents were approached, 61 mothers (11 missing) and 42 fathers (30 missing) responded. All participants were thanked and debriefed at the end of the study.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

3.1 Descriptive Statistics

3.1.1 Gender Differences between Parents' Hostile-Benevolent Sexism, Gender Flexibility in Occupation.

In order to see differences in parents' scores, an independent samples t-test was conducted. Gender analysis was done separately for each variable. As can be seen in Table 1, the only significant difference between parents was on hostile sexism, whereby fathers scored higher than mothers, $t(100)= 3.61, p<.001$.

Table 1. Independent samples t-test for mother vs. father scores on ambivalent sexism and gender flexibility in occupation

	Father M (<i>SD</i>)	Mother M (<i>SD</i>)	t-value
Benevolent sexism	3.00 (.69)	2.54 (.61)	.067
Hostile sexism	3.27 (.81)	3.26 (.70)	3.61**
Flexibility in Occupation	20.55 (4.57)	21.59 (4.06)	1.02

Note: ** $p<.001$

3.1.2 Gender Differences on all study variables

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare gender differences on children's gender stereotyping, gender flexibility, peer preferences and toy preferences.

There was no significant gender difference on gender stereotyping between boys and girls, $t(70)=0.35, p=.11$. Also, there was no significant gender difference for children's gender flexibility between boys and girls, $t(70)=-.97, p=.98$. However, there was a significant gender difference for peer preferences. Girls reported higher preference to playing with feminine girl peer, than boys, $t(70)=-8.55, p<.001$. Also, girls reported higher preference to play with feminine boy peer than did boys, $t(70)=69.82, p=.005$.

Additionally, boys reported higher preference for playing with masculine boy peers than girls, $t(70)=65.91, p<.001$. There were no significant gender differences on children's feminine and masculine toy preferences (see Table 2).

Table 2. Gender differences between study variables for children

Variables	M (SD) Boys	M(SD) Girls	t-value
Gender flexibility	15.25 (6.15)	16.70 (6.29)	-.97
Gender stereotyping	16.09 (6.12)	16.04 (5.44)	.035
Peer Preference-Masculine girl	3.38 (1.30)	3.60 (1.30)	-.71
Peer Preference-Feminine girl	1.90 (1.10)	4.12 (1.07)	-8.55**
Peer Preference-Masculine boy	4.16 (1.26)	2.21 (1.31)	6.30**
Peer Preference-Feminine boy	1.90 (1.27)	2.75 (1.60)	-2.43*
Masculine toy preference	3.09 (1.37)	3.01 (1.58)	.221
Feminine toy preference	3.33 (1.51)	3.28 (1.31)	.132

Note: * $p<.05$, ** $p<.001$

3.1.3 Correlation Analysis

To test the hypothesis that those parents who exhibit high levels of ambivalent sexism and more traditional gender ideology will have children who report more traditional gender stereotyped attitudes, will be less flexible in their occupation, report more gender-typed job aspirations and be less likely to want to play with a gender non-conforming peer, a correlation analysis was conducted. The results reveal a number of significant correlations between parental attitudes and children's measures, these can be seen in Table 3. There is significant correlation between parental hostile sexism and maternal hostile sexism in boys group. There is significant correlations between paternal flexibility and feminine toy preferences in boys as well. Also, there is significant correlation between paternal benevolent sexism and paternal hostile sexism in girls group. Also, there is significant correlations paternal hostile sexism and feminine toy preferences in girls group. And there is significant correlation between maternal benevolent sexism and maternal hostile sexism.

Table 3. Correlation analysis between parental attitudes and children measures

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Maternal BS	___	.35*	.30	.27	-.03	-.12	-.12	-.01	-.07	.36*	-.02	-.10	.39*	-.08	.23	-.02
2. Maternal HS	.17	___	.01	.30	.03	.25	.04	.04	.04	.34*	-.07	.07	.23	-.12	.03	.08
3. Paternal BS	-.16	.43	___	.60**	.30	.29	-.19	-.08	-.14	.36	-.44*	.04	-.09	.23	.02	-.06
4. Paternal HS	.32	.66*	.00	___	.33	.13	-.32	-.31	-.34	.53**	-.56**	.16	.00	.17	.12	-.00
5. Maternal Flexibility	-.40*	-.02	-.09	-.86**	___	.62**	.05	-.08	-.01	.15	-.005	-.15	-.17	-.08	.18	.16
6. Paternal Flexibility	.15	.30	.21	.19	-.08	___	-.18	-.03	-.10	-.08	.06	-.04	.13	.29	.12	.03
7. GASC_masculine	.05	-.19	-.19	-.21	.00	-.09	___	.78**	.94**	.06	-.07	-.58**	-.44**	-.03	-.34*	.14
8. GASC_feminine	.00	-.18	-.11	-.16	-.01	.11	.76**	___	.94**	-.04	.04	-.62**	-.28	.04	-.20	.02
9. Gender stereotyping	.02	-.19	-.16	-.20	-.006	.02	.92**	.94**	___	.01	-.01	-.64**	-.38*	.007	-.28	.09
10. Feminine toy preference	.25	.29	.34	-.04	.07	.71**	-.04	-.16	-.11	___	-.77**	.09	.04	-.05	.03	.01
11. Masculine toy preference	.03	.10	-.06	.39	-.22	-.13	.00	.12	.06	-.59**	___	-.18	.09	.006	.06	.10
12. Child flexibility occupation	-.03	.21	-.13	.14	-.07	.24	-.61**	-.53**	-.60**	-.024	.00	___	.20	-.04	-.11	.01
13. Masculine girl peer	-.20	-.15	-.09	-.41	-.11	-.28	.04	.00	.02	-.34	.02	.13	___	-.07	.40**	-.26
14. Feminine girl peer	-.16	-.14	-.11	-.22	.13	-.61**	-.23	-.22	-.24	-.30	-.02	-.08	.18	___	.03	.16
15. Masculine boy peer	.11	.09	-.33	-.27	-.28	-.09	-.10	.03	-.02	-.02	.01	.17	.06	-.17	___	.08
16. Feminine boy peer	-.33	-.27	-.27	-.36	.47*	-.52*	.01	-.01	.00	-.22	.09	-.35	-.13	.49**	-.28	___

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .000$; above the diagonal are the values for boys and below the diagonal for girls.

3.2 Hierarchical Regression Analysis

A three step multiple hierarchical regression was conducted to assess the influence of each predictor variable (maternal hostile and benevolent sexism, paternal hostile and benevolent sexism and maternal/paternal gender flexibility in occupation perception) on each dependent measure. In order to see the influence on gender, the analyses were conducted separately for girls and boys. Preliminary analyses were conducted to ensure no violations of the assumptions of normality, linearity, multicollinearity and homoscedasticity. Examination of the data revealed no significant multicollinearity among variables as no values approached or exceeded the limits in any of the regression models (highest VIF= 4.53; lowest Tolerance levels=.220)

In the first step age was entered, followed by maternal variables and lastly paternal variables.

3.2.1 Gender Stereotyping

3.2.1.1 Gender Stereotyping in Boys

We tested the hierarchical regression analysis for predictors of children's gender stereotyping, Age was entered in Step 1, explaining 5%, $F(1,11)=.62$, $p>.05$ of the variance in gender stereotyped. After entry of mother's flexibility, mother's hostile sexism and mother's benevolent sexism at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 8%, $F(4,8)= .19$, $p>.05$. The three measures explained an additional 10% of the variance in gender stereotyping, in step 3, adding father's flexibility, father's hostile sexism and father's benevolent sexism, R square change =.019, F change (7,5) = .08, $p>.05$. In the final model, there was no significant predictors of gender stereotyping in boys.

3.2.1.2 Gender Stereotyping in Girls

Age was entered in Step 1, explaining 1%, $F(1,16)=.18, p>.05$ of the variance in gender stereotyped. After entry of mother's flexibility, mother's hostile sexism and mother's benevolent sexism at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 2%, $F(4,13)=.09, p>.05$. The three measures explained an additional 35% of the variance in gender stereotyping, in step 3, adding father's flexibility, father's hostile sexism and father's benevolent sexism, R square change =.35, F change (7,10) = .88, $p>.05$. In the final model, after entering step 3, one variable marginally predicted gender stereotyping in girls which was father hostile sexism ($\beta=-.79, p=.06$), (see Table 4).

Table 4. Hierarchical regression model of study predictors for gender stereotyping in girls

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SEb</i>	β
Step 1			
Age	-.36	.84	-.10
R ² =.01			
Step 2			
Age	-.44	1.29	-.22
Mother H. Sexism	.97	2.44	-.12
Mother B. sexism	-.72	2.15	-.09
Mother Flexibility	-.05	.39	-.04
R ² =.02			
Step 3			
Age	-1.41	1.06	-.41
Mother H. Sexism	5.55	3.07	.68
Mother B. sexism	-2.05	2.28	-.27
Mother Flexibility	.76	.52	.54
Father H. Sexism	-5.4	2.59	-.79*
Father B. Sexism	3.15	2.48	.48
Father Flexibility	-.97	.54	-.83
R ² =.38			

Note: * p =.06

3.2.2 Feminine Toy Preference

3.2.2.1 Feminine Toy Preference in Boys

Age was entered in Step 1, explaining 2%, $F(1,11)=.22$, $p>.05$ of the variance in feminine toy preference. After entry of mother's flexibility, mother's hostile sexism and mother's benevolent sexism at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 17%, $F(4,8)=.40$, $p>.05$. The three measures explained an additional 51% of the variance in feminine toy preference, in step 3, adding father's flexibility, father's hostile sexism and father's benevolent sexism, R square change $=.51$, F change $(7,5) = 2.78$, $p<.05$. In the final model, after entering step 3, one variable was statistically significant with feminine toy preference in boys which was father flexibility ($\beta=.61$, $p<.05$), (see Table 5).

Table 5. Hierarchical regression model of study predictors for feminine toy preference in boys

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SEb</i>	β
Step 1			
Age	.12	.27	.14
R ² = .06			
Step 2			
Age	.08	.30	.09
Mother H. Sexism	.66	.92	.23
Mother B. sexism	.65	.81	.28
Mother Flexibility	.06	.12	.17
R ² =.17			
Step 3			
Age	.35	.26	.38
Mother H. Sexism	5.55	3.07	.68
Mother B. sexism	1.38	1.13	.49
Mother Flexibility	.01	.09	.04
Father H. Sexism	-2.27	1.25	-.78
Father B. Sexism	.10	.59	.05
Father Flexibility	.21	.07	.61*
R ² =.79			

Note: * $p < .05$

3.2.2.2 Feminine Toy Preference in Girls

We tested the hierarchical regression analysis for predictors of feminine toy preference in girls however, none of the variables entered into hierarchical regression yielded a significant result in feminine toy preference in girls (R square change =.30, F change (3,10) =2.06, $p > .05$).

3.2.3 Masculine Toy Preferences

None of the variables entered into hierarchical regression yielded a significant result in boys on masculine toy preference (R square change =.31, F change (7,5) =.33, $p>.05$) and girls on masculine toy preference (R square change =.44, F change (7,10) = 1.16, $p>.05$).

3.2.4 Children Flexibility on Occupation

None of the variables entered into hierarchical regression yielded a significant result in boys flexibility on occupation (R square change =.24, F change (7,5) =.23, $p>.05$) and girls flexibility on occupation (R square change =.19, F change (7,10) = .35, $p>.05$).

3.2.5 Counterstereotypical Peer Preferences

3.2.5.1 Masculine Girl Peer Preference in Boys

Age was entered in Step 1, explaining 0%, F (1,11)=.07, $p>.05$ of the variance in masculine girl peer preference. After entry of mother's flexibility, mother's hostile sexism and mother's benevolent sexism at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 11%, F (4,8)= .26, $p>.05$. The three measures explained an additional 84% of the variance in masculine girl peer preference, in step 3, adding father's flexibility, father's hostile sexism and father's benevolent sexism, R square change =.84, F change (7,5) = 16.8, $p<.05$. In the final model, after entering step 3, the variables that predicted children's masculine girl peer preference were age ($\beta=1.00$, $p=.001$), mother hostile sexism ($\beta=1.41$, $p=.001$), mother flexibility ($\beta=-.89$, $p=.001$), father hostile sexism ($\beta=-1.86$, $p=.000$), father benevolent sexism ($\beta=-.79$, $p=.002$) and father flexibility ($\beta=-.30$, $p=.02$) and one variable that showed a trend in predicting masculine girl peer was mother's benevolent sexism ($\beta=-.22$, $p=.09$) in boys (see Table 6).

Table 6. Hierarchical regression model of study predictors for masculine girl peer preference in boys

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SEb</i>	<i>B</i>
Step 1			
Age	.06	.23	.08
R ² = .007			
Step 2			
Age	.11	.27	.14
Mother H. Sexism	-.30	.82	-.12
Mother B. sexism	-.55	.73	-.27
Mother Flexibility	-.08	.11	-.26
R ² =.11			
Step 3			
Age	.79	.10	1.00**
Mother H. Sexism	3.42	.43	1.41**
Mother B. sexism	-.44	.21	-.22*
Mother Flexibility	-.27	.03	-.89**
Father H. Sexism	-4.69	.48	-1.86**
Father B. Sexism	-1.41	.22	-.79 **
Father Flexibility	-.09	.02	-.30*
R ² =.95			

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

3.2.5.2 Masculine Girl Peer Preference in Girls

Age was entered in Step 1, explaining 0%, $F(1,16)=.00$, $p>.05$ of the variance in masculine girl peer preference. After entry of mother's flexibility, mother's hostile sexism and mother's benevolent sexism at step 2, the total variance explained by the model as a whole was 20%, $F(4,13)=.84$, $p>.05$. The three measures explained an additional 25% of the variance in masculine girl peer preference, in step 3, adding father's flexibility, father's hostile sexism and father's benevolent sexism, R square change =.25, F change (7,10) =1.20, $p>.05$. In the final model, mother's benevolent sexism ($\beta=.66$, $p=.04$) predicted the dependent measure and father's flexibility ($\beta=.87$, $p=.07$) marginally predicted the masculine girl peer preference in girls (see Table 7).

Table 7. Hierarchical regression model of study predictors for masculine girl peer preference in girls

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SEb</i>	β
Step 1			
Age	-.003	.20	-.004
R ² = .000			
Step 2			
Age	-.09	.21	-.11
Mother H. Sexism	.28	.52	.14
Mother B. sexism	.62	.46	.35
Mother Flexibility	-.06	.08	-.18
R ² =.20			
Step 3			
Age	.16	.23	.20
Mother H. Sexism	-.68	.68	-.35
Mother B. sexism	1.16	.51	.66*
Mother Flexibility	-.20	.11	-.60
Father H. Sexism	.56	.58	.34
Father B. Sexism	-.88	.55	-.57
Father Flexibility	.24	.12	.87**
R ² =.45			

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p = .07$

3.2.6 Feminine Boy Peer Preference

None of the variables entered into hierarchical regression yielded a significant result in boys feminine boy peer preference (R square change =.16, F change (7,5) =1.10, $p > .05$) and girls feminine boy peer preference (R square change =.07, F change (7,10) = .20, $p > .05$).

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

In the current study, the influence of parental ambivalent sexism on their children's gender roles and future job aspirations was examined. It was expected that, those parents who exhibit high levels of ambivalent sexism and more traditional gender ideology will have children who report more traditional gender stereotyped attitudes, report more gender-typed job aspirations and be less likely to want to play with a gender non-conforming peer. The results partially supported the hypotheses. To summarize the findings it was found that, fathers and mothers had the same amount of scores on benevolent sexism. This finding is parallel with studies on benevolent sexism as it is suggesting that women usually score equally or more than men on benevolent sexism (Ayan, 2014; Chen, Fiske & Lee, 2009; Glick et al., 2004). Additionally, it was found that fathers had higher hostile sexism scores than mothers. This once again has been found in a number of studies conducted in Western cultures such as the USA (Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2002; Glick et al., 2000) as well as those studies conducted in Turkish speaking cultures (Glick et al., 2002; Husnu & Mertan, 2017). A significant outcome that fit one of the hypotheses was that those fathers who had higher hostile sexist beliefs, had daughters who showed more gender stereotyped beliefs. These findings have some overlaps with past findings such as that by Garaigordobil and Aliri (2012) who found higher scores on fathers than mother on both components of ambivalent sexism also. The authors did not specifically look at the influence of ambivalent sexism on children but they looked at the role of socialization or parenting

styles of parents and their adolescent children's sexism levels. Differently to the current study, the parents' socialization style had little influence on their children's sexism, although it had a higher impact on the sons' sexism and father's had less influence than mother's on their sons' sexism, and had no influence on their daughters' sexism. The current study however found that fathers played a significant role on their daughter's gender stereotyping, not the mothers.

Similarly, Tennenbaum and Leaper (2002), found that fathers have more stress than mothers with regards to their children's gender stereotyping and it has also been found that girls are influenced more than boys. Similarly, it has been found that fathers dominate their daughters in order to effect their behaviors in line with their own expectations and based on their child's sex (Gaunt, 2013; Glick, Diebold & Bailey-Werner, 1997). These past findings help to explain why daughters but not sons gender stereotyping were influenced and why the father played more of a significant role compared to the mothers. These findings are also meaningful when one turns to the cultural context of the study. Turkish speaking populations have been shown to have high levels of sexism and male power (Kağıtçıbaşı, 1982). Men are often considered to be the head of the family and are expected to carry out the role of child rearing in a conservative and traditional fashion (Bolak-Boratav, Okman-Fişek, & Eslen-Ziya, 2017; Yalcin & Tanriverdi, 2018). Therefore, it might not be surprising that men play a more prominent role in the rearing of their daughters, in line with such traditional gender roles, which is then practiced by the daughters.

Peer influence have greater importance on children's gender stereotypical beliefs and preferences as much as parents. Namely, outcome of studies in North America show that children who exhibit cross-sex behaviors, receive negative responses from their

peers (Lee & Troop-Gordon, 2010). In the current research it was predicted that children will be less likely to play with non-conforming peers based on high parental ambivalent sexism. Results showed that, there was a significant finding for counterstereotypical peer preference, whereby masculine girl peer preference in boys were related to lower parental ambivalent sexism scores. In line with this finding, Rose and Rudolph (2006) indicated that, children's relationships with peers would be influenced by their parents' socialization processes and gender roles. According to Glick and Fiske (2001) paternal and maternal roles have an impact on children's preferences and gender roles. In the hostile view of paternalism, men have a tendency to punish and reject non-traditionality and have a tendency to punish their children when they play with cross-gender peers, toys, etc. However, flexible fathers and mothers more likely to accepted cross-gendered attitudes and behaviors, therefore allowing their children the freedom to play with counterstereotypical peers. Parental flexibility however had the opposite effect to what was predicted such that high flexibility led to lower counterstereotypical peer preference in boys. For girls however, fathers' flexibility marginally predicted their daughters counterstereotypical peer preference. Maternal benevolent sexism scores also predicted this relationship. Since the flexibility variable played different roles for girls vs. boys the reliability of the measure must be questionable and future studies should ensure a more solid scale to measure parental flexibility in perceptions of occupations. There was a non-significant finding for feminine boy peer preference in both boys and girls, such that none of the variables predicted counterstereotypical peer preference of a feminine boy. McCreary (1994) suggests that peers have a greater impact on children's gendered attitudes and preferences than parents and underlined that girls who are tomboys or act like boys are less likely to be rejected than boys who act like girls. Also, tomboy girls are more

likely to be accepted or unexpectedly rewarded by others whereas, boys who act girly are more likely to be rejected from their same-sex boys group. Hence the masculinity of girls is not evaluated as harshly as the femininity of boys (Katz & Ksanskak, 1994). According to Leszczynski and Strough (2008), in boy peer groups those who share cross-sex behaviors are more likely to be rejected from their group yet it is more likely to be acceptable in girls' peer groups. Further, girls receive less pressure by their peers to prefer gender conforming peers than boys (Lee & Troop-Gordon, 2010). All these findings help to explain why children and parents alike are less accepting of a counterstereotypical peer in the form of a feminine boy.

Another factor that predicted masculine girl peer preference in boys was age, such that as age increased preference for non-traditional peer increased. This finding can be explained when we look at young children's tendency to play with their own gender when they are young however, this gender segregation reduces by early adolescence and at the end of this process, children tend to interact with cross-gender children more frequently (Lemus, Moya & Glick, 2010). Similarly, Leszczynski (2008) suggested that children have awareness about gender differences regarding maleness and femaleness and children become more flexible after transition from elementary school to high school. Additionally, having more information about cross-gender and similarities between peers' regardless of gender as age grows might allow boys to prefer to play with masculine girl peer (Martin et al., 2011).

In the current study, with regards to toy preferences which was divided into feminine toy preference and masculine toy preference it was seen that, boys who were more likely to prefer to play with feminine toys had fathers with a higher flexibility in perceptions of occupations. Kollmayer, Schultes, Schober, Hodosi and Spiel (2018),

found that parents preferred their children to play with same-sex toys and neutral than cross-sex typed toys. In the difference of fathers and mothers, fathers have more traditional gender roles than mothers. This might be a possible explanation for fathers' gender stereotyping influence on boys' gender roles and toy preference in this study, fathers have stronger stereotypes and influence their children's gender roles based on their sex more so than mothers.

Lastly, there was no significant link found between parental ambivalent sexism and children's flexibility on occupations as well as counterstereotypical boy peer. Keener, Mehta and Strough (2013), suggest that children do not believe one's gender might be influential in their decisions of future job aspirations which might explain the null result. Similarly, in the study by Fulcher (2011), there was non-significant effect of mother's behaviors on their children's occupational aspirations however, mother's traditional or non-traditional attitudes matched with children's occupational preferences. Also, Barak, Feldmen and Noy (1991) found a low relationship between fathers and mothers gender stereotypical beliefs and their children's stereotypical beliefs on occupational choices. The researchers explained this outcome by possibility of presence of other variables such peers, teachers etc. Importantly, in Turkey vocational guidance starts at the end of secondary school, children therefore have more awareness about vocational aspirations later than the age of the children sampled in the current study. Researchers in Turkey compared six, seven and eight grade students career development scores based on gender and they found that children in the eighth grade have more awareness about vocational aspirations with no gender difference (Can & Taylı, 2014). This might be a possible explanation for the non-significant finding on child flexibility in occupation as well.

4.1 Limitations and Future Research

Cultural differences were the main limitations of the research. As in the literature, degree of male dominance have greater impact on men and women's sexist attitudes and flexibilities and more male power and dominance linked with hostility while benevolence underlined men dependence on women for being reproductive and fulfill their roles (Glick et al., 2000).

Additionally, the small sample size limited the findings and more data would have helped to obtain significant results. Our data was also collected from two different places Northern Cyprus and Iğdır, because of the low response rate of questionnaires gathered from Northern Cyprus. Despite the similarity in terms of language and ethnicity of parents' future studies should be collected from the same place to reduce potential confounds of culture and SES. Further, data was collected from children of the ages of 6-11 years. In future research, adolescents might be participating to occupational aspirations. In early adolescence, children have less gender segregation and tend to interact with cross-sex peers, this might give clear cues about sexist attitudes and occupational choices (Glick et al, 2000). Because, children tend to prefer be with same-sex peers and show more traditional gender roles in childhood and Glick and Fiske (2001), suggest that young children around 3 years old, boys tend to act dominant way such as tries to get what he wants such as objects while interacting with cross-gender. At the other hand, girls share hostile cues and anger during interaction. Early adolescence period might explain more sexist attitudes between both sexes and occupational aspirations.

One other significant limitation was that an unequal number of mothers and fathers did attend the study. Many children participated with either of their parents, which did not allow for a measure of both parental influences on the children's gender roles and future job aspirations. It therefore led to an imbalance of parental influences which limited the findings. Also, in future research, parents' education level and parents' current job might be linked with children's occupational choices and therefore these should be factored in when conducting future studies on the topic. Prior studies have emphasized the importance of parental (particularly maternal) education in children's sexist attitudes (Garaigordobil & Aliri, 2012). In addition, another important factor is peer influence on children's gender roles. It is suggested that, peers' have a greater impact on children's gender roles development (Lee & Troop-Gordon, 2011), hence should also be incorporated in future research.

In terms of the application of this research, it is believed that the findings can be used to educate and train parents on topics of sexism and gender segregation in order to allow for more flexible gender stereotypes and upbringing of their offspring. For instance, the Association for Struggle against Violence created a project named 'What's up What's Not!?' which aims to encourage youth in Turkey to have an increased awareness on sexism, dating violence, bullying and cyber violence. Counselors and school teachers created workshops and handbooks for youth awareness. A similar program could be created for children aged between 6-11 years which is extended pre-school to elementary school and the target group of the current study. As it is known children have an awareness of gender roles around 5 years old and gender roles are shaped in terms of gender-appropriate behaviors, first at the home then by peers, the school and also from the media (Witt, 1997; Martin & Ruble, 2004).

This project could be adopted by counseling services in preschools and elementary schools to give similar function to children and parents. Counselors and teachers would increase awareness of gender roles, its limitations, and attempt to decrease conflicts between peers on gender- themed activities and inform parents about sexism and what role they have in influencing their children's perception of gender via their socialization process.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. A., Kless, S. J., & Adler, P. (1992). Socialization to gender roles: popularity among elementary school boys and girls. *Sociology of education*.
- Ashby, M. S., & Wittmaier, B. C. (1978). Attitude changes in children after exposure to stories about women in traditional or nontraditional occupations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(6), 945.
- Ayan, S. (2014). Cinsiyetçilik: Çelişik duygulu cinsiyetçilik. *Cumhuriyet Medical Journal*, 36(2), 147-156.
- Ayan, S. Y., & Gökkaya, V. B. (2016). The testing of ambivalent sexism theory. *Cumhuriyet Medical Journal*, 88-97.
- Barak, A., Feldman, S., & Noy, A. (1991). Traditionality of children's interest as related to their parents' gender stereotypes and traditionality of occupations. *Sex Roles*, 24(7-8), 511-524.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing source. *Psychological Review*, 88, 354.
- Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. *Signs: Journal of women in culture and society*, 8(4), 598-616.

Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender: Transforming the debate on sexual inequality*.
Yale University Press.

Boe, J. L., & Woods, R. J. (2018). Parents' influence on infants' gender-typed toy preferences. *Sex Roles, 79*(5-6), 358-373.

Boratav, H. B., Fişek, G. O., & Eslen-Ziya, H. (2017). *Erkekliğin Türkiye halleri*.
İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental psychology, 22*(6), 723.

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1999). Social cognitive theory of gender development and differentiation. *Psychological review, 106*(4), 676.

Can, A. ve Taylı, A. (2014). Ortaokul öğrencilerinin kariyer gelişimlerinin incelenmesi. *Abant İzzetBaysal Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 14*(2), 321-346.

Caldera, Y. M., Huston, A. C., & O'Brien, M. (1989). Social interactions and play patterns of parents and toddlers with feminine, masculine, and neutral toys. *Child development, 70*-76.

- Cook, E. P., Heppner, M. J., & O'Brien, K. M. (2005). Multicultural and gender influences in women's career development: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 33*(3), 165-179.
- Chen, Z., Fiske, S. T., & Lee, T. L. (2009). Ambivalent sexism and power-related gender-role ideology in marriage. *Sex roles, 60*(11-12), 765-778.
- Dawson, A., Pike, A., & Bird, L. (2016). Associations between parental gendered attitudes and behaviours and children's gender development across middle childhood. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 13*(4), 452-471.
- Dinella, L. M., Weisgram, E. S., & Fulcher, M. (2017). Children's gender-typed toy interests: Does propulsion matter?. *Archives of sexual behavior, 46*(5), 1295-1305.
- Dökmen, Z. Y. (2009). Toplumsal cinsiyet sosyal psikolojik açıklamalar. (4. basım) İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Eccles, J. S., Jacobs, J. E., & Harold, R. D. (1990). Gender role stereotypes, expectancy effects, and parents' socialization of gender differences. *Journal of social issues, 46*(2), 183-201.

- Endendijk, J. J., Groeneveld, M. G., & Mesman, J. (2018). The gendered family process model: An integrative framework of gender in the family. *Archives of sexual behavior, 47*(4), 877-904.
- Fagot, B. I. (1978). The influence of sex of child on parental reactions to toddler children. *Child development, 49*, 459-465.
- Fagot, B. I., & Leinbach, M. D. (1993). Gender-role development in young children: From discrimination to labeling. *Developmental Review, 13*(2), 205-224.
- Fisher-Thompson, D. (1993). Adult toy purchases for children: Factors affecting sex typed toy selection. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 14*(3), 385-406.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2018). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition (2002). In *Social cognition* (pp. 171-222). Routledge.
- Fulcher, M. (2011). Individual differences in children's occupational aspirations as a function of parental traditionality. *Sex Roles, 64*(1-2), 117-131.

- Fulcher, M., Sutfin, E. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2008). Individual differences in gender development: Associations with parental sexual orientation, attitudes, and division of labor. *Sex Roles, 58*(5-6), 330-341.
- Freeman, N. K. (2007). Preschoolers' perceptions of gender appropriate toys and their parents' beliefs about genderized behaviors: Miscommunication, mixed messages, or hidden truths? *Early childhood education journal, 34*(5), 357-366.
- Frey, K. S., & Ruble, D. N. (1992). Gender constancy and the "cost" of sex-typed behavior: A test of the conflict hypothesis. *Developmental Psychology, 28*(4), 714.
- Garaigordobil, M., & Aliri, J. (2013). Ambivalent sexism inventory: standardization and normative data in a sample of the Basque country. *Psicología Conductual, 21*(1), 173.
- Garrett, C. S., Ein, P. L., & Tremaine, L. (1977). The development of gender stereotyping of adult occupations in elementary school children. *Child Development, 50*, 507-512.
- Gaunt, R. (2013). Ambivalent sexism and perceptions of men and women who violate gendered family roles. *Community, Work & Family, 16*(4), 401-416.

- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2001). Ambivalent sexism. In *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 33, 115-188. Academic Press.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Ambivalent sexism revisited. *Psychology of women quarterly*, 35(3), 530-535.
- Glick, P., Diebold, J., Bailey-Werner, B., & Zhu, L. (1997). The two faces of Adam: Ambivalent sexism and polarized attitudes toward women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(12), 1323-1334.
- Glick, P., Lameiras, M., Fiske, S. T., Eckes, T., Masser, B., Volpato, C. & Castro, Y. R. (2004). Bad but bold: Ambivalent attitudes toward men predict gender inequality in 16 nations. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 86(5), 713.
- Glick, P., Fiske, S. T., Mladinic, A., Saiz, J. L., Abrams, D., Masser, B. & Annetje, B. (2000). Beyond prejudice as simple antipathy: hostile and benevolent sexism across cultures. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 79(5), 763.

- Gottfredson, L. (1981). Circumscription and compromise: A developmental theory of occupational aspirations. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 545–580.
- Halim, M. L., Ruble, D., Tamis-LeMonda, C., & Shrout, P. E. (2013). Rigidity in gender-typed behaviors in early childhood: A longitudinal study of ethnic minority children. *Child development*, 84(4), 1269-1284.
- Halpern, H. P., & Perry-Jenkins, M. (2016). Parents' gender ideology and gendered behavior as predictors of children's gender-role attitudes: A longitudinal exploration. *Sex roles*, 74(11-12), 527-542.
- Hoffmann, M. L., & Powlishta, K. K. (2001). Gender segregation in childhood: A test of the interaction style theory. *The Journal of genetic psychology*, 162(3), 298-313.
- Husnu, S., & Mertan, B. E. (2017). The roles of traditional gender myths and beliefs about beating on self-reported partner violence. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 32(24), 3735-3752.
- Jacklin, C. N., & Maccoby, E. E. (1978). Social behavior at 33 months in same-sex and mixed-sex dyads. *Child development*, 49, 557.
- Jacobs, J. E., Chhin, C. S., & Bleeker, M. M. (2006). Enduring links: Parents' expectations and their young adult children's gender-typed occupational choices. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 12(4), 395-407.

- Lee, E. A. E., & Troop-Gordon, W. (2011). Peer processes and gender role development: Changes in gender atypicality related to negative peer treatment and children's friendships. *Sex Roles, 64*(1-2), 90-102.
- Liben, L. S., Bigler, R. S., & Krogh, H.R. (2002). Language at work: Children's gendered interpretations of occupational titles. *Child development, 73*, 810–828.
- de Lemus, S., Moya, M., & Glick, P. (2010). When contact correlates with prejudice: Adolescents' romantic relationship experience predicts greater benevolent sexism in boys and hostile sexism in girls. *Sex Roles, 63*(3-4), 214-225.
- Lipowska, M., Lipowski, M., & Pawlicka, P. (2016). “Daughter and son: a completely different story”? Gender as a moderator of the relationship between sexism and parental attitudes. *Health Psychology Report, 4*(3).
- Leszczynski, J. P., & Strough, J. (2008). The contextual specificity of masculinity and femininity in early adolescence. *Social Development, 17*(3), 719-736.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1982). Sex roles, value of children and fertility. *Sex roles, family, and community in Turkey*, 151-180.
- Kağıtcıbaşı & D. Sunar, *Sex roles, value of children and fertility* (pp. 151-180).
Bloomington: Turkish Studies, Indiana University.

- Kağıtcıbaşı, C., & Ataca, B. (2005). Value of children and family change: A three decade portrait from Turkey. *Applied Psychology, 54*, 317-337. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.2005.00213.x.
- Katz, P. A., & Ksiansnak, K. R. (1994). Developmental aspects of gender role flexibility and traditionality in middle childhood and adolescence. *Developmental psychology, 30*(2), 272.
- Keener, E., Mehta, C., & Strough, J. (2013). Should educators and parents encourage other-gender interactions? Gender segregation and sexism. *Gender and Education, 25*(7), 818-833.
- Kollmayer, M., Schultes, M. T., Schober, B., Hodosi, T., & Spiel, C. (2018). Parents' judgments about the desirability of toys for their children: Associations with gender role attitudes, gender-typing of toys, and demographics. *Sex roles, 79*(5-6), 329-341.
- Kohlberg, L. (1966). A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974) *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

- Martin, C. L., & Fabes, R. A. (2001). The stability and consequences of young children's same-sex peer interactions. *Developmental Psychology*, *37*, 431–446. doi:10.1037//0012-1649.37.3.431.
- Martin, C. L., Fabes, R. A., Hanish, L., Leonard, S., & Dinella, L. M. (2011). Experienced and expected similarity to same-gender peers: Moving toward a comprehensive model of gender segregation. *Sex Roles*, *65*(5-6), 421-434.
- Martin, C. L., & Halverson Jr, C. F. (1981). A schematic processing model of sex typing and stereotyping in children. *Child development*, 1119-1134.
- Martin, C. L., & Little, J. K. (1990). The relation of gender understanding to children's sex-typed preferences and gender stereotypes. *Child Development*, *61*(5), 1427-1439.
- Martin, C. L., Wood, C. H., & Little, J. K. (1990). The development of gender stereotype components. *Child development*, *61*(6), 1891-1904.
- Martin, C. L., & Ruble, D. (2004). Children's search for gender cues: Cognitive perspectives on gender development. *Current directions in psychological science*, *13*(2), 67-70.

- McCreary, D. R. (1994). The male role and avoiding femininity. *Sex Roles*, 31(9-10), 517-531.
- McHale, S. M., Crouter, A. C., & Whiteman, S. D. (2003). The family contexts of gender development in childhood and adolescence. *Social development*, 12(1), 125-148.
- Milkie, M. A., Bianchi, S. M., Mattingly, M. J., & Robinson, J. P. (2002). Gendered division of childrearing: Ideals, realities, and the relationship to parental well-being. *Sex roles*, 47(1-2), 21-38.
- Moller, L. C., & Serbin, L. A. (1996). Antecedents of toddler gender segregation: Cognitive consonance, gender-typed toy preferences and behavioral compatibility. *Sex roles*, 35(7-8), 445-460.
- Perry, D. G., & Bussey, K. (1979). The social learning theory of sex differences: Imitation is alive and well. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 37(10), 1699.
- Raag, T., & Rackliff, C. L. (1998). Preschoolers' awareness of social expectations of gender: Relationships to toy choices. *Sex Roles*, 38, 685-700.
- Reich, S. M., Black, R. W., & Foliaki, T. (2018). Constructing difference: LEGO® set narratives promote stereotypic gender roles and play. *Sex Roles*, 79(5-6), 285-298.

- Rose, A. J., & Rudolph, K. D. (2006). A review of sex differences in peer relationship processes: potential trade-offs for the emotional and behavioral development of girls and boys. *Psychological bulletin*, *132*(1), 98.
- Ross, D. M., & Ross, S. A. (1972). Resistance by preschool boys to sex-inappropriate behavior. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *63*, 342–346.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: The effects of patriarchy, sexism and sex differences. *Sex Roles*, *44*, 599-610. doi:10.1023/A:1012295109711.
- Sakallı-Uğurlu, N. (2008). Erkeklerle İlişkin Çelişik Duygular Ölçeği'nin Türkçe'ye Uyarlanması. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *11*(21), 1-11.
- Selkow, P. (1984). Effects of maternal employment on kindergarten and first-grade children's vocational aspirations. *Sex Roles*, *11*(7-8), 677-690.
- Serbin, L. A., Connor, J. M., Burchardt, C. J., & Citron, C. C. (1979). Effects of peer presence on sex-typing of children's play behavior. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *27*(2), 303-309.
- Signorella, M. L., & Liben, L. S. (1985). *Assessing children's gender-stereotyped attitudes*. American Psycholog. Ass., Journal Suppl. Abstract Service.

Shields, S. A., & Shields, S. A. (2002). *Speaking from the heart: Gender and the social meaning of emotion*. Cambridge University Press

Spinner, L., Cameron, L., & Calogero, R. (2018). Peer toy play as a gateway to children's gender flexibility: The effect of (counter) stereotypic portrayals of peers in children's magazines. *Sex Roles*, 1-15.

Tenenbaum, H. R., & Leaper, C. (2002). Are parents' gender schemas related to their children's gender-related cognitions? A meta-analysis. *Developmental psychology*, 38(4), 615.

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: Girls and boys in school*. Rutgers University Press.

Turner, P. J., & Gervai, J. (1995). A multidimensional study of gender typing in preschool children and their parents: Personality, attitudes, preferences, behavior, and cultural differences. *Developmental Psychology*, 31, 759–772.

Van Rooij, F. B., Van Balen, F., & Hermans, J. M. A. (2006). Migrants and the meaning of parenthood: Involuntary childless Turkish migrants in the Netherlands. *Human Reproduction*, 21, 1832-1838.

Yalçın, M. G., & Tanrıverdi, V. (2018). “Kavanozu Açan” Erkeklerle “Kafasını Kullanabilen” Kadınlar: Erkek Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Erkeklik Müzakereleri. *Erkeklikler: Kimlik ve Kültür Dergisi*, (9-10), 129-167.

Güder, S., & Yıldız, T. (2016). Okul öncesi dönemdeki çocukların toplumsal cinsiyet algılarında ailenin rolü. (H. U. Journal of Education) 31(2): 424-446.

Witt, S. D. (1997). Parental influence on children's socialization to gender roles. *Adolescence*, 32(126), 253-260.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Demographic Questions

Şimdi ise size çocuklarınızla ilgili sorular sorulacak.

1. Kaç çocuğunuz var?

2. Yaş(lar)ı kaç?

3. Çocuklarımızın ileride hangi mesleği seçecekleriyle ilgili müdahale etmemiz çok doğru olmaz fakat çocuğunuzun ileriki mesleğini seçme şansınız olsa hangi mesleği seçerdiniz?

Son olarak, sizinle ilgili birkaç sorumuz daha olacak

1. Yaşınız: ____

2. Cinsiyet: Kadın____ Erkek____

3. Uyruk: KKTC____ TC____ Diğer____

4. İlişki Durumu: Evli____ Boşanmış____

5. Eğitim Durumunuz:

Lise____ Önlisans____ Lisans____ Yüksek Lisans/ Üzeri____

6. Meslek sahibi misiniz? Hayır____ Evet____

Evet ise mesleğiniz: _____

Appendix B: Ambivalent Sexism Scale

Aşağıda erkek, kadın ve onların günümüz toplumundaki ilişkileri hakkında bir dizi ifade bulunmaktadır. Lütfen, aşağıdaki ölçeği kullanarak bu ifadelere ne derece katıldığınızı belirtiniz.

	kesi nlik le katıl mıy oru m	katı lmı yor um	ne katılı yoru m ne katıl mıyo rum	katı lıy oru m	kesi nlik le katı lıyo rum
1. Adaletli bir yarışmada kadınlar erkekler karşı kaybettikleri zaman tipik olarak kendilerinin ayrımcılığa maruz kaldıklarından yakınır.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Kadınlar işyerlerindeki problemleri abartmaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Kadınlar erkekler üzerinde kontrolü sağlayarak güç kazanmak hevesindedir.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Bir kadın bir erkeğin bağlılığını kazandıktan sonra genellikle o erkeğe sıkı bir yular takmaya çalışır.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Gerçekte birçok kadın "eşitlik" arıyoruz maskesi altında işe alınmalarda kendilerinin kayırılması gibi özel muamele alıyorlar.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Kadınlar çok çabuk alınır.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Birçok kadın erkeklerin kendileri için yaptıklarına tamamen minnettar olmamaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Feministler erkekler makul olmayan istekler sunmaktadırlar.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Feministler gerçekte kadınların erkeklerden daha fazla güce sahip olmalarını istemektedirler.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Erkekler cinsel yönden yaklaşılabılır olduklarını gösterircesine şakalar yapıp daha sonra erkeklerin tekliflerini reddetmekten zevk alan birçok kadın vardır.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Birçok kadın masum söz veya davranışları cinsel ayrımcılık olarak yorumlamaktadır.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Erkekler kadınsız eksiktirler.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Ne kadar başarılı olursa olsun bir kadının sevgisine sahip olmadıkça bir erkek gerçek anlamda bütün bir insan olamaz.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Karşı cinsten biri ile romantik ilişki olmaksızın insanlar hayatta gerçekten mutlu olamazlar.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Her erkeğin hayatında hayran olduğu bir kadın olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Kadınlar erkekler tarafından el üstünde tutulmalı ve korunmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Erkekler hayatlarındaki kadın için mali yardım sağlamak için kendi rahatlarını gönüllü olarak feda etmelidirler.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Bir felaket durumunda kadınlar erkeklerden önce kurtarılmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5
19. İyi bir kadın erkeği tarafından yüceltilmelidir.	1	2	3	4	5
20. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha yüksek ahlaki duyarlılığa sahip olma eğilimindedirler.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Birçok kadın çok az erkekte olan bir saflığa sahiptir.	1	2	3	4	5
22. Kadınlar erkeklerden daha ince bir kültür anlayışına ve zevkin e sahiptirler.	1	2	3	4	5

Appendix C: Gender Flexibility in Occupational Perceptions

Asağıdaki meslekler sizce kadınlar, erkekler yada iki cinsiyet tarafından yapılabilir?
Uygun olanlara işaret koymanız yeterli olacaktır.

	Erkekler	Kadınlar	Her ikisi
Asker			
Sanatçı			
Atlet			
Marangoz			
Üniversite öğretmeni			
Dansçı			
Dişçi			
Doktor			
Fabrika İşçisi			
İtfaiyeci			
Petrol İstasyonunu Çalışanı			
Ev Hanımı			
Hakim			
Avukat			
Kütüphaneci			
Postacı			
Tamirci			
Bakan			
Film Yıldızı			
Müzişyen			
Gazeteci			
Hemşire			
Ebeveyn			
Pilot			
Tesisatçı			
Polis Memuru			
Okul Müdürü			
Restoran Çalışanı			

Satış Elemanı			
Bilim İnsanı			
Sekreter			
Senatör			
Öğretmen			
Telefon Operatörü			
Film Yönetmeni			
Veteriner hekim			
Yazar			

Appendix D: Demographic Questions

SORU KAĞIDI

AÇIKLAMA

Aşağıda çocukların kavram gelişimleriyle ilgili bazı sorular verilmiştir. Herbir bölümdeki sorular çocuklara Gelişim Psikolojisi Master Programı öğrencisi Özüm Kübra Yıldız tarafından okunacaktır. Bu sorulara, çocukların içlerinden geldiği gibi yanıt vermeleri beklenmektedir. Bu araştırmada toplanacak veriler bir bütün olarak değerlendirileceği için çocukların kimlikleriyle ilgili bilgi verilmesi gerekmemektedir.

Bu bir test veya sınav değildir.

Katkılarınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

Doç. Dr. Şenel Hüsni Raman

Kişisel Bilgiler

Yaş: [_____]

number [_____]

Doğum tarihi: / /

Cinsiyet: erkek [1] kız [2]

Yaş Grubu [1= 7y] [2=9y] [3=11y] [4=13y]

Anket tarihi: / /

Appendix E: Gender Stereotyped Attitude Scale for Children (GASC)

Attitude Scale for Children (GASC) (Signorella & Liben, 1985)

'Burada bir faaliyet listesi var ve bana bunların erkek, kadın veya hem erkek hem de kadınlar tarafından yapılabileceğini söylemeni istiyorum. Birkaç tane alıştırmaya yapalım. Bana hangisinin baba ya da anne olabileceğini gösterebilir misin?'

Cevap vermeleri için, çocuklara bir karton üzerine yerleştirilmiş figürlerin üç çizgi çiziminden birine işaret etmeleri söylenir: iki erkek, iki kadın, bir erkek ve bir kadın. Üç grup olacak olan figürlerin pozisyonları her çocuk için farklı olacaktır. Çocuklara 34 maddeden her birine "Bana kimin olabileceğini gösterebilir misin?" sorusu sorulmuş olacaktır. Her öğenin sırası her çocuk için rastgele seçilecektir.

	E	K	E&K
Plaja gitmeyi sevmek	E	K	E&K
İnsanlara çok sarılmak	E	K	E&K
Uçağı uçurmak	E	K	E&K
Bale dansı yapmak	E	K	E&K
Kağıt oynamak	E	K	E&K
Kamyon sürmek	E	K	E&K
Kek yapmak	E	K	E&K
Öğretmen olmak	E	K	E&K
Çöpleri toplamak	E	K	E&K
Mutfakta yemek yapmak	E	K	E&K
Futbol oynamak	E	K	E&K
Dışarıda bir şeyler yapmayı sevmek	E	K	E&K
Dikiş makinası kullanmak	E	K	E&K
Bir restoranda yemek yapmak	E	K	E&K
Çimleri biçmek	E	K	E&K
Masayı kurmak	E	K	E&K
Şapka yapmak	E	K	E&K
Hakem olmak	E	K	E&K
Evi temizlemek	E	K	E&K
Balık tutmak	E	K	E&K
Hemşire olmak	E	K	E&K

Bisiklete binmek	E	K	E&K
Lavaboyu tamik etmek	E	K	E&K
Doktor olmak	E	K	E&K
Çocuklara bakmak	E	K	E&K
Araba yarıştırmak	E	K	E&K
Tiyatro yapmak	E	K	E&K
Kendi bavullarını taşımak	E	K	E&K
Zor bir bulmaca çözmek	E	K	E&K
Bulaşık yıkamak	E	K	E&K
Kar küreklemek	E	K	E&K
Sekreter olmak	E	K	E&K
Sinemaya gitmeyi sevmek	E	K	E&K
Arabayı tamir etmek	E	K	E&K

Appendix F: Openness to playing with a non-conforming peer

III- BÖLÜM Uygun olmayan akranlara açıklık (Martin & Little, 1990)

Akran tercihi. - Çocuklara tek tek, üç erkek çocuk fotoğrafı (biri erkeksi bir oyuncakla, bir kadınsı oyuncakla ve bir oyuncakı olmayan) ve üç kız fotoğrafı (biri erkeksi bir oyuncakla, bir kadınsı bir oyuncakla ve oyuncaksız biriyle) gösterilecektir. Her çocuğa, her erkek veya kız ile ne kadar oynamak istedikleri sorulup, gülen yüzler ölçeğinden göstermeleri istenecektir. Her çocuk için resimlerin sırası rasgele seçilecektir

	1	2	3	4	5
Erkeksi kız					
Kadınsı kız					
Nötr kız					
Erkeksi erkek					
Kadınsı erkek					
Nötr erkek					

Onunla birlikte oynamak ister miydin?

çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim [5]
bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Appendix G: Toy Preference

III- BÖLÜM Toy Preference

Oyuncak tercihi. Her çocuğa, her erkek veya kız ile ne kadar oynamak istedikleri sorulup, gülen yüzler ölçeğinden göstermeleri istenecektir. Her çocuk için resimlerin sırası rasgele seçilecektir

	1	2	3	4	5
Sihirli Değnek					
Çay seti					
Pony					
Bebek					
Araba					
Kamyon					
Tamir Aletleri Seti					
Jet					
Lego					
Playdoe					
Scooter					
Telescope					

Oyuncakla birlikte oynamak ister miydin?

çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim [5]
bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Appendix H: Gender Flexibility in Occupational Perceptions

IV- BÖLÜM Meslek Seçimi (Ashby & Wittmaier, 1978)

Çocuklara 'Aşağıdaki hangi meslekler kadınlar, erkekler yada iki cinsiyet tarafından yapılabilir?' şeklinde sorulacaktır.

	E	K	E&K
Ordu Subayı	E	K	E&K
Sanatçı	E	K	E&K
Atlet	E	K	E&K
Marangoz	E	K	E&K
Kolej Profesör	E	K	E&K
Dansçı	E	K	E&K
Dişçi	E	K	E&K
Fabrika İşçisi	E	K	E&K
İtfaiyeci	E	K	E&K
Petrol İstasyonunu Çalışanı	E	K	E&K
Ev Hanımı	E	K	E&K
Hakim	E	K	E&K
Avukat	E	K	E&K
Kütüphaneci	E	K	E&K
Postacı	E	K	E&K
Tamirci	E	K	E&K
Film Yıldızı	E	K	E&K
Müzisyen	E	K	E&K
Gazeteci	E	K	E&K
Ebeveyn	E	K	E&K
Pilot	E	K	E&K
Tesisatçı	E	K	E&K
Polis Memuru	E	K	E&K
Okul Müdürü	E	K	E&K
Restoran Çalışanı	E	K	E&K
Satış Elemanı	E	K	E&K

Bilim İnsanı	E	K	E&K
Film Yönetmeni	E	K	E&K
Veteriner hekim	E	K	E&K
Yazar	E	K	E&K

Peki bu mesleklerden hangisini ileride yapmak istiyorsun? Bu listede olmayan meslekleri de seçebilirsin!

Appendix I: Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology Department's Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter



**Eastern
Mediterranean
University**
"Virtue, Knowledge, Advancement"

99628, Gazimagusa, KUZEY KIBRIS /
Famagusta, North Cyprus,
via Mersin-10 TURKEY
Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995
Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919
E-mail: bayek@emu.edu.tr

Etik Kurulu / Ethics Committee

Reference No: ETK00-2019-0174

22. 07.2019

Subject: Application for Ethics.

RE: Özüm Kübra Yıldız

Department of Psychology

To Whom It May Concern:

On the date of **22.07.2019**, (Meeting number **2019/18-01**), EMU's Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee (BAYEK) has granted, Özüm Kübra Yıldız from the Department of Psychology to pursue with her MA thesis work "**Parental influence on gender roles and children's future job aspirations in Turkish speaking children.**" under the supervision of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Shenel Husnu Raman. This decision has been taken by the majority of votes.

Regards,

Prof. Dr. Fatma Güven Lisaniler

Director of Ethics Committee

FGL/ns.

www.emu.edu.tr