3.0.   INTRODUCTION

I have employed several theories and concepts to present a systematic understanding of the concepts related to the present study. Thus, this chapter explains the theories and concepts that I have employed to analyze the ways which helps to construct the gender based identities in society. This is followed by reflections on the relevance of these theories for my study and also explanation of limitations of these concepts that I found while applying them in this study. Before going through any genders related theories or conceptualizing those theories in this research, it's very important to clear the distinction between gender and sex.

Sex: Sex is a term that is used to biological distinction between females and males. The characteristics it include chromosomes, anatomy, hormones, and other physical traits

Gender: Gender is a term that has social and psychological characteristics associated with being male or female

Gender Identity: Gender Identity is a perception of self as a woman or man, masculine or feminine

3.1.   THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK TO CONCEPTUALIZE IDENTITY

3.1.1.   SIT: AN OVERVIEW

Social Identity Theory was first developed by Heneri Tajfel and Turner in the year 1979. The theory was basically developed to understand the psychological roots of intergroup discrimination. Tajfel et al (1971) attempted to detect the minimal conditions which leads the members of one group to discriminate in the favour of the another group (which group they belongs to)and against other groups.

This theory focuses on the relationship between self-image and group behavior (Hogg & Terry, 2001). Not only this, it also explains that "the identity factor" that motivates behaviour is determined by the specific circumstances the person faces (PSU World Campus, 2012). Personal identity consists of ethical sensibility and morality with a desire for success, mastery, and competency (Mayor et al, 2009). This theory has been

described as a theory which forecasts about intergroup behaviors by studying the individuals' perceived position in an intergroup atmosphere" (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Tajfel identified three factors of social identity: a) self-conceptualization b) group pride, and c) obligation to the group, when these factors join together they led a person to feel associated themselves to their in-group. Consequencely, all other groups become out-groups. Which are considered mostly as rivals for status and resources and become source for comparison. It further leads to discrimination in favor of the in-group and stereotyping and prejudice against other groups especially at the time when a perceived threat arises (Redmond, 2009).

Posten says that if we apply this theory to sports fans we can explain their behaviors in a better way. He added that sports can be reason to increase self-esteem. The kind of connection sports fans feel towards their teams is termed as Ingroup Favoritism. which is nothing but a belief that, the group they belongs to is superior to others. For instance, let's take a closer look at the Indian man's cricket fans. When the Indian cricket team wins a match, the fan feel full of with pride and seems extremely happy, as if they had played themselves. It also reveals that when the team loses we will found that they take defeat positively which can help them to save self-esteem. (Posten, 1998). A true fan try to look for other reason due to which their team lost, without pointing the finger on it. So that they do not hurt their own self-esteem.

3.2.   SDO THEORY: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social Dominance Theory was designed in an effort to unite the more classical theories of social behaviour like Marxism and more contemporary theories like Social Identity Theory into a cohesive behavioral model to describe the biasness in group behavior (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) it is based on the idea that in almost all societies, hierarchies (group-based) are formed in which dominant and subordinate both groups co-exist. As the case itself indicates, the dominant group have positive social value in the group structure such as has access to rights and privileges which are denied to subordinate group due to their (negative) social value or ability (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). This theory has significant practical, yet profound implications on behavior across all approaches of group-based social identities.

This theory was developed to examine the way of oragnising human societies. It helps us to understand how the groups are formed and how the members of different groups behave to maintain them. This theory also helpful to describe how groups are form into hierarchies. How prejudice stereotypes and discrimination are created and maintained. Actually Social practices are responsible for dispensing social value in our social systems.

A significant thing of this theory is, it has been found a predictor of discrimination. Sibley & Duckitt's meta-analysis found Social Dominance Orientation as a strong interpreter of discrimination in general. One more strong point of this theory is, it is one amoung those few which take into account several variables that are usually ignored. Thus it is a comprehensive theory (Redmond, 2010).

3.2.1. Positive Social Value

Positive social value (PSV) is all about the beliefs which motivates high status group members to preserve the hierarchy (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999). The Members of the high prestige group maintain the hierarchy by keeping ingroup favoritism and derogation practices for out-group. This helps them to keep their group's status, its power, and resources. So that they alone can continue to benefit. On the other hand Subordinate group members also help to keep the status quo in hopes of sooner or later joining the dominant group and enjoying to the positive social value (Pratto et al, 2006; Sidanius and Pratto, 1999).

3.2.2. Negative Social Value

Negative social value is one that motivates members of low-status group to join high-status group (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999).and when they try to join membership of high-status group, group conflict starts between the group with high-status and the group with the negative social value. (Pratto et al., 2006).

The difference between dominant groups and subordinate groups motivations has been characterized as behavioral asymmetry (Pratto et al., 2006; Sidanius and Pratto, 1999).

Why do people from one social group oppress and discriminate against people from other groups? Why is this oppression so difficult to eliminate?

The Social Dominance Theory explains that many subordinate groups also work to keep up the social hierarchy even though they are at disadvantage, and the reason is that the existence of the subordinate group provides a chance to join a high status group. This is labelled as legitimizing myths (Sidanius and Pratto, 1999).

3.3. Social Dominance Theory Components

There is a principle distinction between Social Dominance Theory and other similar group-based social theories like Social Identity Theory. And the distinction is to explaining that members of a group are not only motivated to protect their group to preserve their social status, but they feel compelled to defend their group behavior (dominant or subordinate) through a hierarchical system. Which are represented through the following components: a)Legitimizing Myths b)Trimorphic Structure d) Social Dominance Orientation (Redmond, 2009).

3.3.1. Social Dominance Orientation (SDO)

Sidanius and Pratto defined SDO as the degree to which individuals hope and support group-based hierarchy or the extent they accept the domination of 'subordinate' groups by 'superior' groups" (Sidanius and Pratto 1999, p. 48). You will find an individual having high SDO will behave in such a way that support group-based hierarchy and discriminates against subordinate groups. For instance, a person of high SDO will most likely select a job candidate from a high-status group, despite another candidate from a lower-status group being more qualified for the same. Even if the individual with high SDO himself belongs to a low-status group, they more likely to favour someone from a 'superior' group. This tendency is not in adults but in children too. How it is practised is explaining by Clark & Clark in a fantastic way by using The Doll Technique. they Interview children (3 to 7 year old) using two white and two black dolls.they ask them to choose the doll that they want to play with or that is a nice one in look as well as in colour.

3.3.2. Legitimizing Myths

It is found that Individuals legitimizing myths in order to justify and support why their group is superior to another. This In-group favoritism is more likely for members of high-

status groups (Umphress, et al, 2008).Social systems engaged in certain types of social practice. These practices are responsible for dispensing social value in social systems. In other words legitimizing myths help to make up the attitude and values that fuel moral and cognitive explanation for the social practices. Therefore, legitimizing myths are a way in which (group based) social hierarchies are produced and maintained (Sidanius and Pratto 1999).

Pratto et al catagorised Legitimizing myths into two distinct groups: known as Hierarchy-enhancing legitimizing myths (HELM) and Hierarchy-attenuating legitimizing myths (HALM). HELM is not only organize the behavior of individual, group, and institutional in such a way that sustain dominance. And they often lead subordinates to co-operate with dominants to the maintain the oppression (Pratto et all 2006).

3.3.3. Trimorphic Structure of Group-Based Hierarchies

Sidanius and Prato argued that Social Dominance Theory assumes a trimorphic structure of social hierarchy based on group system. Where members are stratified into different social groups based on following characteristics .

- **Age System** - The age system describe one in which adults have more power over children. The older individuals have a high social value and are motivated to maintain their social stature.

- **Gender System** – It refers men have more power over women in various areas. How it is reinforced in society is clearly shown through a study by Aulette, Judy Root et. all titled as ''gendered world (2009)'' in which they revealed that men have a higher SDO score than women . This high SDO score is a feature of those with a strong disposition towards the gender system status quo.

- **Arbitrary Set system** – a system in which groups are formed on ''arbitrary'' bases. Arbitrary-set groups may be defined by social distinctions implicitly related to power. Or we can say it is made up of multiple ordered factors of human belief categories such as religion, organizational beliefs, and statutory authority.

  These unique categories influence status and value within groups.

3.4. CONSTRUCTING A GENDER IDENTITY

Gender identity construction process starts right from birth. Parents are the first noteworthy individuals in our lives who start introducing us to gender and gender socialization. Some explanations of gender include just our sex (male or female). But Gender is actually a perspective and behaviour that expected of us because we are either a male or female in society. In the process of learning the gender map (popularly called gender socialization), we are pushed into different lanes in life – into different attitudes and behaviors (Henslin, 2012, p. 73). There are established set attitudes and behaviors that explain our role in life as we were born as a male or a female. As babies are born, they are wrapped in either a pink cloth signalling a baby girl, or a blue one signaling a baby boy. You can see it in the hospital wards also. If the baby boy is born it is shifted to blue color decorated ward and if a baby girl is born it is shifted to pink color decorated ward. Thus one of the first distinctions of a male and female starts from here.

As the **Cognitive Development Theory** describes that a child develops the concept of being male or female first and then gender behaviors are learnt. They observed that sex identity is facilitated by people around child but it is not imitation. This model believes that a child develops permanent cognitive category for him/herself as being male or female at the age of 4 to 6 years. After that sex-roles are adopted. This theory is criticized because it ignores cultural aspects. As little kids starts learning we introduced them to different words, toys, relations, food etc. for example if we take case of introducing toys boys are more likely to get guns action figure toys that destroy enemies. While girls attracted towards dolls and jewellery. Right from the time we born or we learn to speak and understand the different trends in society, we are made to internalizing social norms as expected about how to feel, how to think, how to behave in the social roles we inhabited as parents and children, husband and wives, employers and employee etc.

Gender Schema theory (Bem 1981) in addition to socialization focuses on the role of cognitive organization. The Gender schema theory proposes that children learn from the culture in which they live a concept of what it means to be male and female and then internalize set behaviour associated with respective sex. language, dress, toys, and songs etc social learning shapes gender schemas. Children then compare themselves with their

concept of gender as being a male one should masculine, strong, aggressive. Being a female one should feminine, sweet, and helpful and adjust their behavior accordingly

Eagly's social role theory proposed that the sex based division of labor and societal expectations constructed on stereotypes produce gender roles. Eagly (1987) differentiates between the communal and agentic dimensions of gender-stereotype features. The communal role is categorized by the attributes, such as nurturing emotional expressiveness which are commonly linked with domestic activities, and thus, with females. The agentic role is considered by attributes such as aggression and independence which commonly linked with the public activities, and thus, with male. Behaviour is strongly prejudiced toward gender by gender roles when cultures validate gender stereotypes and form firm beliefs based on those stereotypes (Eagly 1987).

The aforesaid argument is also supported by Social Learning Theory. This theory stresses that person's gender development is a process of observational learning. Social prejudice, cultural rules or norms and the agents of socialization (parents, peers, teacher) plays a vital role in expansion of gender identity. But this approach overlooks the individual's importance of cognitive abilities, inheritance and the developmental stages and treat individual a passive entity to respond for environment. Gender development can be explained through this theory which suggests that gender development is shaped like other behaviours through reinforcement and punishment. Reinforcement is the main idea to operant conditioning, there are two reinforces: positive reinforcement and negative reinforcement.

Positive reinforcement is when something desired is given in response to a particular behaviour, for example in relation to gender development, a boy plays really well in a football a game is then rewarded with a new football. Whereas in a girl's case she helps clean the kitchen so is rewarded with additional pocket money. Negative reinforcement is when something undesired is taken away in response to a behaviour for example if a girl wears the "pretty" dress her grandma got her, she doesn't have to do the washing up. These reinforcements reinforce gender-stereotyped behaviour, so that girls will grow up in an

environment where they are rewarded for doing "lady-like" roles and boys rewarded for being active and into sports.

In addition to this there is another element to operant conditioning and that is punishment. Punishment discourages a behaviour by doing something unpleasant to stop the behaviour, for example in relation to gender development, a girl may be punished for play-fighting as this is seen as rough and boyish behaviour, she may be punished by being grounded for a week. Relating to punishment with boys, a boy may play with a doll and is punished by not being allowed to have the doll as it is seen as a girl's toy. The idea of punishment is to stop behaviour, so that the behaviour is not repeated.[1]

3.4.1. Gender Identity and Parental Influence

3.4.1.1. Gender relations within the Family Structure

In early gender socialization, "children have start facing the norms that outline "masculine" and "feminine" identity from an early age. Boys are said not to cry, not to get panic, not to be merciful and instead to be aggressive and strong. On the other hand girls are asked not to be very demanding, to be merciful, and dress up "ladylike". These type of early childhood behaviours grab us through our teenage. And when we start to enter the workforce girls are told to be more sensitive and helpful while boys are supposed to be more violent and independent.

"Goldberg and Lewis say that in many families mothers had subconsciously pleased their daughters for being submissive and reliant on their father or brother, and their sons for being active and independent" (Henslin, 2012, p. 73). It is assumed that in a situation when a girls want to get something ,her cultural and social nourishment enforced her not to do anything and to just sit there and cry for their moms. After doing this, their mom will come to them and gave attention and give them what they want. On the other hand, boys' behaviors toward the same situations is different. They are trying to get something that they

---

[1]   http://caggie-harvey.over-blog.com/article-how-learning-theories-can-be-used-to-explain-gender-development-76703400.html

want is to physically or mentally try to get that item or flight over that barrier. Boys will figure things out on their own to get what they want while girls will just to sit there and wait for that chance come to them. These type of attitudes that we are possessing toward gender from our early times. We are socialized by the people whom we love and trust the most from birth. We are exposed to a "robust set of rules, characters, and assumptions that cannot help but shape our sense of ourselves".

3.4.1.2. Gender relations within the Profession

In the workforce, females are usually occupying professions like nurses and medical assistants, teachers, psychological counsellors because it involves caring for other. Males usually occupy professions like doctors, lawyers, police officers, army man and engineers because they are difficult fields and male are more likely to work with their hands and build what their mind thinks of. Personally, I also related to gender socialization. Right from when I was a baby, acting, thinking, dressing, and eating, I am definitely acting out the behaviors and attitudes of a girl. When I have been entering in the male dominating field as an central armed personal it is not welcomed by the society and even by my family itself. It is not the "norm" for a female to entering such a male dominated field.

The gap expectations between male and female have decreased as the change from a boy to a man and a girl to a woman emerges. I feel several restrictions on me because I don't want to disappoint my parents. I made learn from childhood to right now to have decent manners. To dress up ladylike and have a strong and graceful personality, who always try to be friendly to others. I was always forcefully pushed towards the etiquettes and behaviors of a lady. However, in my teenage when I was already familiarised to the manner I should act and think than my parents let me off the hook. They did not tell me what to do, what to wear, how to have table manners etc. From our infant years to till now we are built into gender socialization. At last, it is in our own hands, what we decide to do and how we decide.[2]

---

[2] www.Sociology2spring2013.blogspot.in/2013/05/gender-socialization.html

3.5. RESEARCH MODEL ON GENDER IDENTITY AND STRATIFICATION OF ASSIGNED GENDER ROLES