

The Relationships among Giftedness, Androgyny, and Parental Gender Role Expectations in a
College Sample

An Honors Thesis (PSYSC 499)

By

Lauren Moss

Thesis Advisor

Dr. Thomas Holtgraves

Ball State University

Muncie, Indiana

April 2011

Expected Date of Graduation

May 2011

Abstract

The current study looked at the relationship between giftedness, androgyny, and the gender role expectations placed on participants by their parents. I am interested in the differences in masculinity and femininity between gifted and non-gifted students. Additionally, I looked at the differences in how parents teach their children about gender role expectations and gender identity among gifted and non-gifted students. Participants were 190 undergraduate students at Ball State University. Eighty-one participants were members of the Honors College and 109 participants were students enrolled in an introductory level psychology course. Participants completed two questionnaires: the Bem Sex Role Inventory to measure levels of masculinity and femininity and a measure created by the author to assess the role that parents play in the development of gender identity. Preliminary analyses revealed a significant association between gifted females and the masculinity sex role group and gifted males and the undifferentiated sex role group. Further analyses showed that males' parents had more traditional gender role beliefs than females' and that students in the Honors College were raised with less traditional beliefs about physical development than those in the psychology course. The study was limited by its low sample variability, but helped make connections as to the impact that parents have with regards to gender role development and academic achievement.

Keywords: giftedness, androgyny, parents, gender identity, gender role expectations

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my faculty advisor, Dr. Thomas Holtgraves, for his continued assistance and support throughout this project. His guidance and knowledge helped the project to go smoothly and he was always there to provide feedback and answer my (almost never-ending) questions.

I would also like to thank Dr. David Perkins and the rest of the Psychological Science Departmental Honors class for their help and feedback throughout the year. It was nice to be able to go through the process with fellow friends and students and to know I was not alone in the process.

Next, I would like to thank Dr. James Ruebel. He was there every step of the way to answer the many questions I had about the Honors College process in completing my thesis. If he did not have the answer, he would always find someone who did, and I am extremely grateful for all of his help.

Finally, I would like to thank the Ball State University Honors College for their financial assistance in funding the purchase of the Bem Sex Role Inventory, without which this project would not have been possible.

The Relationships among Giftedness, Androgyny, and Parental Gender Role Expectations in a College Sample

Many factors contribute to whether or not an individual is gifted and will succeed academically. Perhaps the most basic argument is the nature versus nurture controversy. Most people view giftedness from a nature perspective, believing that giftedness is something with which an individual is born. Others believe that giftedness is the result of extremely hard work and perseverance (Winner, 2000). Studies have shown that, rather than arguing about whether giftedness is the result of nature or nurture, it should be viewed as a product of both nature and nurture. Winner (2000) notes several studies that support the “nature and nurture” perspective. For example, Roe (1951, 1953, as cited in Winner, 2000) found that giftedness in science was the result of the individuals’ propensity for endurance, commitment, and concentration, rather than innate ability. All of the participants were gifted to begin with, though, so it is unreasonable to say that it was only their dedication that led to their success. Rather, it was a combination of their natural ability and their dedication to science. Another more well-known example is that of Sir Isaac Newton, who needed 20 years to think of the ideas presented in *Principia Mathematica*. In addition to being gifted, he put forth lots of effort before producing his masterpiece (Gruber, 1986, as cited in Winner, 2000).

Self-Efficacy and Giftedness

Other research indicates that a main contributing factor in academic success is self-efficacy, or one’s belief in their ability to successfully accomplish their goals. Bouffard-Bouchard (1990) and Cervone and Peake (1986) placed students of equal ability in high and low self-efficacy conditions. The students in the high self-efficacy condition received positive feedback regarding their performance and showed higher performance, set higher goals for

themselves, were more flexible with problem-solving, and more accurately evaluated their performance than those in the low self-efficacy condition. One possible explanation for these differences is that higher levels of self-efficacy result in calmer and more thoughtful approaches to problem-solving. The ability to make decisions in complex environments requires the ability to integrate lots of information, being able to interpret feedback, being able to test and revise knowledge, and being able to successfully implement the decisions one has made (Bandura & Jourden, 1991). In addition to being a product of high self-efficacy, all of these factors contribute to academic success because they lead to an individual being able to perform well in school. Furthermore, high self-efficacy leads to more effectively utilizing metacognitive strategies, including self-regulation and planning. These skills help improve time management skills, resource utilization, and one's ability to monitor and regulate his or her own effort, which leads to better ability to learn and master academic subjects (Zimmerman, 1995).

Personality Correlates of Giftedness

Another factor in academic success and giftedness is personality. Trapmann, Hell, Hirn, and Schuler (2007) looked at the five-factor model of personality, specifically, when analyzing the role that personality plays in academic success. The five-factor model views personality as being composed of five factors: openness to new experiences, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Each of these factors contributes to how a student approaches school and is a contributing factor in their success or failure. Neuroticism, a measure of emotional stability, is most apparent in the way that students handle stress and deadlines in their course work. Students who are more able to handle a rigorous work-load are probably more likely to pursue higher education because they believe that they can handle the workload in undergraduate and then graduate school. Extraversion helps determine two factors of academic

success: ambition and sociability. Students who are extraverted thrive from being around people, so they are more likely to interact with others and network as a means of making connections and doing well in school. These connections help fuel the extravert's ambition because they know who to talk to in order to accomplish their goals.

Openness to experience may be one of the biggest factors in undergraduate academic success. For most people, college opens their eyes to a whole world of which they weren't aware, and their ability to accept all the new ideas and points of view can determine how they view their college experience and how they choose to approach their college experience. Agreeableness goes hand in hand with openness to new experiences because if an individual is more agreeable, they will be more willing to learn from new experiences and see the positive, rather than the negative, in learning opportunities. Finally, conscientiousness contributes to academic success because students need to be willing to put in the required work to do well in classes. The ability to stay organized aids in one's ability to meet deadlines and increases time management skills, and self-discipline and competence contribute to feelings of self-efficacy (Trapmann, Hell, Hirn, & Schuler, 2007).

Family Contributions to Giftedness

Personality, self-efficacy, and the nature/nurture perspective all share a common link: parents. Children acquire genes from their parents that predispose them for giftedness, but without the proper environment, they may never develop the giftedness, sense of self-efficacy, or personality traits that are correlated with giftedness and academic success. Winner (2000) identifies two views of the role that parents play in the development of their gifted children. The first is that parents present their children with the opportunities needed to meet their children's need for artistic or intellectual stimulation. The second view is that parents push their gifted

children too far, leaving them bitter, depressed, and disengaged from the world around them. Most evidence supports the first view, with many gifted children reporting that their families played a positive role in their development.

Parents of gifted children share four main characteristics: they raise their children in a child-centered environment, they provide their children with high levels of stimulation, they set high expectations and model hard work and achievement, and they give their children more independence. It is impossible to know whether these characteristics are what create the gifted child, or if the gifted child causes their parents to respond in those manners. For example, spending more time with the child is probably not the source of his or her giftedness. Rather, the parents notice that the child has exceptional ability and responds by spending more time with the child. This does not mean that spending extra time with the child does not contribute to giftedness, however. If a parent ignores their child and his/her giftedness, the child may not develop the level of giftedness or achieve as much as they would have in a more supportive and nurturing environment (Winner, 2000).

Giftedness is not just a product of the amount of time that parents spend with their children; it is also a product *of the way* that parents spend their time with their children. One possible aspect of parenting that may influence academic performance is gender role expectations. Tenenbaum (2009) notes that parents often encourage their daughters to pursue English and foreign language courses, while they encourage their sons to pursue math and science courses. More than encouraging their children to pursue gender-typed courses, parents believe that their daughters perform better than their sons in English and foreign language courses, and vice versa for math and science courses, even if grades indicate otherwise. For example, even when girls had higher math grades than boys, mothers of girls indicated that their

daughters had to work harder for their grades than the mothers of boys. The perceptions of parents were transmitted to their children, with females underestimating their math abilities and males overestimating their math abilities. Unfortunately, little research has been done analyzing the way that parents of gifted children transmit gender roles to their children.

Self-Perceptions of Giftedness

There are differences in gender with regards to how males and females perceive their own giftedness. Perrone et al (2007) conducted a longitudinal study with adults who had been labeled “gifted” in high school to ascertain their ideas about giftedness. More women than men (21% vs. 8%) indicated that they did not believe they were gifted in high school or now, and no men believed that they were not gifted in high school, versus 23% of women. This is reflected in the finding that when males and females have equal SAT scores and GPAs, males are more likely to believe that they are gifted than females (Perrone et al, 2007). In a similar study, Arnold (1994) looked at a group of male and female valedictorians from the time they graduated high school, through adulthood. Initially, males and females rated their intelligence similarly, but as time went on, the men continued to believe that they were gifted and the women did not maintain this belief (Arnold, 1994).

A possible explanation for the results of both studies is something known as the imposter phenomenon. The imposter phenomenon occurs primarily among women who grow-up in a family with multiple gifted children or a family where they are recognized as being gifted and start to doubt this because some subjects are difficult for them. The women believe that when they do well, it is because of luck or because someone else made a mistake, in addition to believing that people will discover that they are an imposter who is unworthy of their success (Clance and Imes, as cited in Perrone et al, 2007). The reason that the imposter phenomenon is

uncommon with males is the idea that part of being male includes being intelligent and high-achieving (Kerr & Cohn, 2001), whereas this expectation does not exist for females.

Sex Role Group Orientation

When it comes to sex role group orientation, individuals with higher levels of masculinity or androgyny (high levels of masculinity and femininity) typically have higher levels of academic and general self-efficacy than those who are more feminine or undifferentiated (low levels of masculinity and femininity). Additionally, masculinity is more strongly associated with the formation of self-efficacy and self-esteem than femininity, meaning that varying levels of femininity do not affect one's self-esteem or belief that they can accomplish their goals. Rather, having lower levels of masculinity will more negatively affect self-esteem and self-efficacy than having high levels of masculinity (Choi, 2004).

Miller, Faulk, and Huang (2009) looked at overexcitability (OE) scores as a function of sex role group and physical sex. The different overexcitability subscales were: emotional, intellectual, imaginal, sensual, and psychomotor. High scores in any of the subscales indicated that the individual had increase frequency, intensity, or duration of response for that particular subscale (i.e., someone with emotional overexcitability will have complex emotions and will be able to identify with others' feelings). In the psychomotor OE subscale, those who were androgynous had higher scores than those who were masculine, feminine, or undifferentiated. There were no significant differences for the imaginal OE subscale. Androgynous and feminine individuals had higher sensual and emotional OE scores than those who were masculine and feminine, and those who were masculine and androgynous had higher intellectual OE scores than their feminine and undifferentiated counterparts. The findings regarding the sensual, emotional, and intellectual OE subscales are consistent with traditional

gender roles, and the idea that femininity includes being emotional and sensual, while masculinity is about being intellectual. Interestingly, those who were androgynous, and who incorporated masculine and feminine traits in their lives, demonstrated higher levels of OE in all subscales except for the imaginal subscale, which supports the idea that androgyny can help individuals to embrace and demonstrate different aspects of their personality. The implications of this study on gifted education suggests that in order to provide the best learning environment for students, teachers should provide an environment that is free from gender stereotypes and that shows men and women in a variety of roles in society (Miller, Faulk, & Huang, 2009).

Studies have looked at the differences between gifted and non-gifted students regarding sex role group orientation. Some studies on giftedness among males and females have found that gifted females are either androgynous or feminine, whereas gifted males are undifferentiated or masculine. Other studies have found that both gifted males and females tend to score higher on androgyny than their non-gifted counterparts (Miller, Faulk, & Huang, 2009).

Current Research

Different relationships have been found between giftedness and gender identity, parental expectations and gender identity, and giftedness and parental expectations. However, little has been done to link these three concepts. Understanding how the way that parents teach their children gender role expectations can affect giftedness and overall academic success. The current study focused on the differences in sex role group and the way that parents teach their children gender role expectations between Honors College and non-Honors College students. I hypothesized that female participants who are gifted would be more androgynous than female participants who were non-gifted, and that the non-gifted females would be more feminine. Also, gifted males would be more undifferentiated than non-gifted males, with the non-gifted males

being more masculine. Additionally, I hypothesized that those who were gifted would have parents who were less strict about traditional gender roles and expectations than those who were non-gifted. With regards to sex role group orientation, I expected to find that those who were androgynous or undifferentiated would indicate that their parents held less traditional beliefs about mental, physical, and emotional development than those who were masculine or feminine.

Method

Participants

Participants were 190 undergraduate students from Ball State University. The sample size was initially 198 participants. One participant was removed due to lack of demographic information. The remaining seven participants were removed because they did not take the time to adequately complete the survey and finished the survey in five minutes or less. Participants were recruited from the Honors College ($N = 81$) and an introductory psychology course ($N = 109$). Within the participant population, there were 12 Honors College males (6.3% of the total population), 69 Honors College females (36.3%), 48 psychology course males (25.3%), and 61 psychology course females (32.1%). Honors College students were entered into a drawing to receive a \$15 gift card as an incentive to participate and the psychology students received one half-hour of research participation credit for participating. A majority of the participants were Caucasian (90.4%), with the rest being Hispanic (4.3%), African-American (3.2%), Asian-American (0.5%), Other (1.1%) or Prefer not to answer (0.5%). Sixty-eight point four percent of the participants were female. Participants were primarily freshmen (43.7%) or sophomores (41.1%), with the remaining 15.3% being juniors or seniors.

Materials

In order to evaluate the research hypotheses, participants completed three questionnaires: the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), the Relationship with Parents questionnaire, and a demographic survey.

Bem sex role inventory. The BSRI contained 60 questions and was created by Sandra Bem (1974). Participants were asked to indicate how true of themselves each of the personality characteristics was on a scale of one (“Never or almost never true”) to seven (“always or almost always true”). The characteristics were masculine, feminine, or neutral. Sample characteristics were “Defend my own beliefs” (masculine), “Affectionate” (feminine), and “Conscientious” (neutral).

Relationship with parents questionnaire. This survey was created by the researcher and contained 37 questions with four subscales: perception of parents, emotional development, mental development, and physical development. The survey initially contained 100 questions and was created as part of a psychology course. The four subscales were created using past research regarding the different aspects of development and ideas about gender role expectations. The 100-item survey was completed by 33 students. I conducted an item analysis process to remove items that hindered the questionnaire’s reliability and validity. I looked at endorsement percentage, correlated each item with its own scale, correlated each item with the other scales, removed items to increase the Cronbach α of the scale, and conducted a differential reliability index analysis in order to create the more reliable and valid questionnaire that was used for this study. All alphas presented below are the alphas that were obtained in the current study.

The perception of parents scale measured participants’ beliefs about their parents’ gender role identities and had a Cronbach’s α of 0.73. The emotional development scale measured how parents taught the participants to express their emotions and had a Cronbach’s α of 0.76. The

mental development scale measured the academic beliefs and activities parents encourage their children to believe/pursue and had a Cronbach's α of 0.83. The physical development scale measured the activities and beliefs that parents taught or encouraged their child to believe/pursue and had a Cronbach's α of 0.87.

Participants indicated the extent to which their parents taught or encouraged certain thoughts and behaviors using a 5-point likert scale, where 1 = *Strongly Disagree* and 5 = *Strongly Agree*. Examples of statements in the perception of parents scale include: "My parent(s) believe(s) it is important to strictly follow gender roles" and "My parent(s) would be happier if I were more like him/her/them." Items in the emotional development scale included "It is okay to cry when I am upset" and "I should not let others know my feelings." Some items from the physical development scale include "Males and females should be allowed to play the same sports" and "It is okay to play with dolls." Examples of items in the mental development scale are: "Doing well in school is the key to doing well in life" and "I don't need to put emphasis on doing well in school in order to secure my future." Refer to Appendix 1 for the complete "Relationship with Parents" questionnaire.

Demographic survey. Participants were asked to respond to 18 demographic questions regarding gender, age, year in school, Honors College status, GPA, primary male and female parent figures, ethnicity, religious affiliation, parents' level of education, and SAT/ACT scores. Individuals who were in the Honors College were labeled "gifted," while those in the psychology course were labeled "non-gifted."

Procedure

Approval for the study was obtained by the Ball State University Institutional Review Board. Honors College students were recruited via email and given a link to participate in the

study if they wished to do so. The study was available to the first 100 psychology students who signed-up. All participants accessed the survey online using the InQsit testing system. They were required to log-in with their Ball State ID and password in order to receive research credit or be entered in the gift card drawing. Before proceeding to the survey, participants had to read an information sheet and acknowledge that they understood the sheet and agreed to participate in the study. After giving consent, they completed the BSRI, Relationship with Parents questionnaire, and demographic survey.

Results

Item Analysis

During the item analysis process, a total of ten questions were removed from the Relationship with Parents questionnaire. All items were removed in order to increase the Cronbach α of the scales. Some items that were removed included RWP01 (“My parent(s) want(s) me to be my own person”), RWP15 (“Crying is a sign of weakness”), and RWP18 (“My job should be one where I am in a position of power”). Refer to Table 1 for a complete list of items removed during the item analysis.

Substantive Analysis

Several significant differences were found when analyzing sex role group as a function of gender and gifted/non-gifted status; GPA as a function of sex role group, gender, and gifted/non-gifted status; and the different scales in the Relationship with Parents questionnaire as a function of sex role group, gender, and gifted/non-gifted status. To determine significant differences regarding sex role group, chi square analyses were used. When looking at GPA and the scales in the Relationship with Parents questionnaire, one-way analyses of variance were used.

Sex role group. Males in the psychology course ($N = 13$, 81.25%) were more likely to be masculine than Honors College males ($N = 3$, 18.75%), while Honors College females ($N = 23$, 65.71%) were more likely to be masculine than females in the psychology course ($N = 12$, 34.29%), $\chi^2(1, N = 51) = 9.69, p < .01$. Both male ($N = 15$, 88.24%) and female ($N = 21$, 56.76%) PSYSC students were more likely to be androgynous than male ($N = 2$, 11.76%) and female ($N = 16$, 43.24%) Honors College students, $\chi^2(1, N = 54) = 5.194, p < .05$ (see Table 2).

GPA. Females ($M = 3.39, SD = 0.47$) had significantly higher GPAs than males ($M = 3.06, SD = 0.55$), $F(1,186) = 3.84, p < .053$. Students in the Honors College ($M = 3.63, SD = 0.27$) had significantly higher GPAs than those in the psychology course ($M = 3.04, SD = 0.51$), $F(1,186) = 49.21, p < .01$. Those who were masculine ($M = 3.44$) had significantly higher GPAs than those who were feminine ($M = 3.21$) or androgynous ($M = 3.19$), $F(3,174) = 2.74, p < .05$. Androgynous females ($M = 3.27$) had significantly lower GPAs than masculine females ($M = 3.62$), $F(3, 126) = 4.06, p < .01$. There were no significant sex role group differences among males. Among PSYSC 100 students, those who were masculine ($M = 3.22$) had significantly higher GPAs than those who were feminine ($M = 2.79$), $F(3,105) = 3.67, p < .05$. There were no significant sex role group differences among Honors College students (see Table 3).

Relationship with parents subscales. Males ($M = 3.22, SD = 0.92$) were significantly more likely to indicate that their parents held traditional gender role beliefs than females ($M = 2.69, SD = 0.96$), $F(1,184) = 17.24, p < .01$. Within the Honors College, males ($M = 3.74$) indicated that their parents held more traditional gender role beliefs than females ($M = 2.49$), $F(1, 78) = 18.85, p < .01$. There were no significant gender differences among PSYSC 100 students. There were no significant differences in the mental development subscale with regards to gender or gifted/non-gifted status.

Students in PSYSC 100 ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.80$) were significantly more likely to indicate that their parents held traditional expectations about physical development than students in the Honors College ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 0.74$), $F(1,186) = 9.66$, $p < .01$. Females ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.76$) were significantly more likely to indicate that their parents encouraged them to express their emotions than males ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.75$), $F(1,186) = 10.02$, $p < .01$. When analyzing the perception of parents and emotional development subscales as a function of sex role group, no significant differences were found.

Those who were masculine ($M = 4.26$) and androgynous ($M = 4.39$) indicated that their parents had more traditional beliefs about mental development than those who were undifferentiated ($M = 4.00$), $F(3,186) = 5.63$, $p < .01$. Those who were masculine ($M = 3.70$) and androgynous ($M = 3.89$) reported that their parents had more traditional beliefs about physical development than those who were feminine ($M = 3.24$), $F(3, 186) = 6.20$, $p < .01$ (see Table 4).

Discussion

Implications

The hypothesis that gifted females would be more androgynous than non-gifted females was not supported. Given the relatively even distribution of gifted/non-gifted females, I do not think that the lack of significance is due to uneven sample sizes. Rather, the higher incidence of androgyny among the non-gifted females could be an indication that part of being gifted, for this population at least, is adhering to either masculine or feminine traits, but not both. This is supported in the finding that gifted females were more masculine than non-gifted females, which goes along with previous research that has found masculinity to be more related to academic self-efficacy (Choi, 2004). If part of being masculine is being intelligent and high-achieving

(Kerr & Cohn, 2001), then women who are more masculine should typically be more intelligent and high-achieving, as was supported by the finding that women in the Honors College were more masculine than women in the psychology course. Overall, that gifted females were more likely to be masculine, but not androgynous, than the non-gifted females, could be an indication that psychological androgyny in females is becoming less predictive of giftedness in females. If this is the case, there is no need for parents to encourage both masculine and feminine traits in their children as a means of helping them succeed academically. In the past, it was believed that being psychologically androgynous was the most advantageous in terms of maximizing one's overall potential, including academic abilities (Bem, 1974). Given the findings in this study and previous studies that indicate masculinity being more correlated with giftedness (Choi, 2004), it may be necessary to reevaluate the Bem Sex Role Inventory to see if the measure is still reliable and valid today.

While there were no significant differences with regards to undifferentiated males and Honors College/non-Honors College status, the second hypothesis was partially supported because males in the psychology course were more masculine than those in the Honors College. This is consistent with past research, and although it initially seems to contradict the idea that those who are masculine will be more intelligent, further examination reveals that when males subscribe to more traditional masculine gender roles (i.e., athleticism), they might not feel inclined to pursue more academic interests (Bem, 1981). It is difficult to generalize the results to a larger audience with and draw implications from these findings because of the low proportion of Honors College males who participated in the study. There are about twice as many females as males in the Ball State Honors College (J. Ruebel, personal communication, March 29, 2011),

but this was not reflected in the number of male Honors participants ($N = 12$) vs. the number of female Honors participants ($N = 69$).

Overall, there were few differences in how the parents of Honors College and non-Honors College students raised their children. The main difference was that psychology students reported that their parents held more traditional expectations about physical development than Honors College students, which is in line with the above findings and the idea that individuals who are encouraged to engage in more gender typical activities may not feel the need to explore areas outside of what is expected of them. Within the Honors College, the finding that males' parents held more traditional gender role beliefs than females' parents is an indication that males are more strongly encouraged to have traditional gender role beliefs. For example, it is much more socially acceptable for a female to take on masculine traits than it is for a male to take on feminine traits (Mahalik et al, 2003). While the results of this study are not conclusive, if there truly are few differences between how gifted and non-gifted children are raised, it means that an individual's genetic predisposition for academic success and giftedness may be more important than the environment in which they are raised.

The hypothesis that those who were androgynous or undifferentiated would indicate that their parents held less traditional beliefs about mental, physical, and emotional development than those who were masculine or feminine was minimally supported. Individuals who were undifferentiated did indicate that their parents held less traditional mental development beliefs than those who were masculine or androgynous, but there was no other support for this hypothesis. I think the reason for this is that overall, undifferentiated individuals do not have high levels of masculinity or femininity, so they will be less likely to have parents with traditional gender role beliefs.

Methodological Strengths and Weaknesses

The primary strengths of the study are the large sample size, relatively even distribution of honors and non-honors students, and use of a valid and reliable instrument (the BSRI) in the study. Weaknesses include a small population of gifted males, little ethnic variability, and a sample of primarily first and second-year college students. The small population of gifted males makes it hard to know if the results involving gifted males were reliable, and the other weaknesses decrease generalizability to outside populations. Additionally, the use of the Relationship with Parents questionnaire may have hindered the study because it is a new measure that does not have established reliability or validity. This makes it difficult to know if the findings in this study would be found again if the study were to be replicated and if the results are valid enough to be applied to other populations.

Future Research

Future research should utilize the Relationship with Parents questionnaire to help establish whether or not it is valid and reliable. Larger and more diverse samples should be utilized to assess more meaningful differences among honors and non-honors students, especially with regards to how their parents transmit gender role expectations to them. Another area of development would be to analyze the reasons behind why females have higher GPAs than males, and to further the knowledge of why different sex role group orientations have different effects on academic achievement. Finally, future research should focus on learning more about the role that parents play in all of the facets of their children's development.

The current study revealed a significant association between gifted females and the masculinity sex role group and gifted males and the undifferentiated sex role group. Further analyses showed that males' parents had more traditional gender role beliefs than females' and

that students in the Honors College were raised with less traditional beliefs about physical development than those in the psychology course. It was limited by its low sample variability, but helped make connections as to the impact that parents have with regards to gender role development and academic achievement.

References

- Arnold, K. D. (1994). Academically talented women in the 1980s: The Illinois valedictorian project. In K. D. Hulbert & D. T. Schuster (Eds.), *Women's lives through time: Educated women in the twentieth century*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bandura, A., & Jourden, F. J. (1991). Self-regulatory mechanisms governing the impact of social comparison on complex decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 941–951.
- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.
- Bem, S.L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354-364. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354.
- Bouffard-Bouchard, T. (1990). Influence of self-efficacy on performance in a cognitive task. *Journal of Social Psychology, 130*, 353–363.
- Cervone, D., & Peake, P. K. (1986). Anchoring, efficacy, and action: The influence of judgmental heuristics on self-efficacy judgments and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 492–501.
- Chemers, M. M., Hu, L., & Garcia, B.F. (2001). Academic self-efficacy and first year college student performance and adjustment. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*(1), 55-64. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.93.1.55.
- Choi, N. (2004). Sex role group differences in specific, academic, and general self-efficacy. *Journal of Psychology, 138*(2), 149-159.
- Kerr, B.A., & Cohn, S.J. (2001). *Smart Boys: Talent, manhood, and the search for meaning*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.

- Mahalik, J. R., Locke, B. D., Ludlow, L. H., Diemer, M. A., Scott, R. P. J., Gottfried, M., & Freitas, G. (2003). Development of the Conformity to Masculine Norms Inventory. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 4*, 3–25.
- Miller, N.B., Falk, R.F., & Huang, Y. (2009). Gender identity and the overexcitability profiles of gifted college students. *Roeper Review, 31*(3), 161-169.
- Perrone, K.M., Perrone, P.A., Ksiazak, T.M., Wright, S.L., & Jackson, Z.V. (2007). Self-perception of gifts and talents among adults in a longitudinal study of academically talented high-school graduates. *Roeper Review, 29*(4), 259-264.
- Tenenbaum, H.R. (2009). ‘You’d be good at that’: Gender patterns in parent-child talk about courses. *Social Development, 18*(2), 447-463. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00487.x.
- Trapmann, S., Hell, B., Hirn, J.W., & Schuler, H. (2007). Meta-analysis of the relationship between the Big Five and academic success at university. *Journal of Psychology, 215*(2), 132-151. doi: 10.1027/0044-3409.215.2.132.
- Winner, E. (2000). The origins and ends of giftedness. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 159-169. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.159.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1995). Self-efficacy and educational development. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-efficacy in changing societies* (pp. 202–231). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Table 1

Item Removal in the Relationship with Parents Measure

Item Removed	Item Subscale	Item Text
RWP01	Perception of Parents	My parent(s) want(s) me to be my own person.
RWP05	Physical Development	Males and females should be allowed to play the same sports.
RWP09	Physical Development	It is okay to play with dolls.
RWP14	Physical Development	It is not important to have a job where I am in charge.
RWP15	Emotional Development	Crying is a sign of weakness.
RWP16	Emotional Development	I should keep my thoughts and feelings to myself.
RWP17	Physical Development	Females should be nurses.
RWP18	Physical Development	My job should be one where I am in a position of power.
RWP20	Physical Development	It is acceptable for males to wear females' clothing.
RWP27	Physical Development	Play video games and/or RPGs (role-playing games).

Table 2

Sex Role Assignment as a Function of Gender and Gifted Status

Males	Masculine	Feminine	Androgynous	Undifferentiated
Honors College	18.75% (3)**	33.30% (4)	11.76% (2)*	20.00% (3)
Psychology	81.25% (13)**	66.70% (8)	88.24 (15)%*	80.00% (12)
Females				
Honors College	65.71% (23)**	59.40% (19)	43.24% (16)*	42.30% (11)
Psychology	34.29% (12)**	40.60% (13)	56.76% (21)*	57.70% (15)

Note. * $\chi^2(1, N = 54) = 5.194, p < .05$. ** $\chi^2(1, N = 51) = 9.69, p < .01$

Table 3

One-way ANOVA of GPA as a Function of Sex Role Assignment, Gender, and Giftedness

	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>
Sex Role Assignment	1.35	3,174	0.45	2.74*
SRA X Gender	1.40	3,126	0.47	4.06***
Gender	0.55	1,186	0.55	3.84**
Gender X Giftedness	0.60	1,186	0.60	0.37
Giftedness	9.14	1,186	9.14	49.21****
Giftedness X SRA	1.45	3,174	0.48	2.92**
Gender X Giftedness X SRA	0.47	3,190	0.16	0.94

Note. * $p < .053$. ** $p < .05$. *** $p < .01$. **** $p < .001$.

Table 4

One-way ANOVA of RWP Subscales as a Function of Sex Role Assignment, Gender, and Giftedness

	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>
Perception of Parents				
Giftedness	0.34	1,184	0.34	0.39
Gender	14.69	1,184	14.69	17.24**
Gender X Giftedness	8.62	1,178	8.62	18.85**
Sex Role Assignment	2.84	3,186	0.95	0.99
Physical Development				
Gender	0.12	1,186	0.12	0.20
Giftedness	5.85	1,186	5.85	9.66*
Giftedness X Gender	0.01	1,178	0.01	0.02
Sex Role Assignment	10.99	3,186	3.66	6.20**
Emotional Development				
Gender	5.74	1,186	5.74	10.02*
Giftedness	1.09	1,186	1.09	1.90
Gender X Giftedness	0.56	1,178	0.56	0.98
Sex Role Assignment	3.84	1,186	1.28	2.19
Mental Development				
Gender	0.10	1,186	0.10	0.46
Giftedness	0.56	1,186	0.56	2.50
Gender X Giftedness	0.16	1,178	0.16	0.72
Sex Role Assignment	3.57	3,186	1.19	5.63*

Note. * $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.