ORIGINAL ARTICLE

GRT

The Sociology of Femininity

Dr. Ashok Yakkaldevi

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Sociology,
A.R. Burla Mahila Varishtha Mahavidyalaya, Solapur

ABSTRACT:

The human science of womanliness' contemporary landscape is established in the eighteenth-century works of the radical scholar, Mary Wollstonecraft (1792). Her Vindication of the Rights of Woman reprimanded the penance of ladies' capability to "libertine thoughts of excellence," the procurement of force through appeal and shortcoming, and ceaseless reliance in marriage. Two hundred years after the fact, things were much the same when Simone de Beauvoir (1953) distributed The Second Sex again attracting consideration regarding harsh ladylike excellence guidelines that were a fundamental part of the subordination of ladies. In 1963, Betty Friedan tended to comparable troubling topics in The Feminine Mystique, an examination of an "issue with no name," or the desire that ladies "could want no more noteworthy fate than to magnificence in their own womanliness" and that bliss accompanied committing oneself to finding a spouse and having youngsters (Friedan [1963] 2001:15). A couple of years after the fact, Jessie Bernard, a humanist and the principal lady educator at Princeton University, would take a more dynamic perspective of womanliness as an arrangement of characteristics that cover with manliness and that differ in time and place (Bernard 1971). In the most recent three decades, gentility has turned into a generally investigated theme of sociological request that draws fundamentally on Jessie Bernard's initial bits of knowledge into the adaptable and changing nature of womanliness additionally weaves in contemporary issues of sexual orientation, race, and class.

KEYWORDS: Sociology of Femininity, nature of womanliness, fundamental part of the subordination of ladies

I. Introduction

The meaning of gentility is a slippery one. Dorothy Smith (1988) puts it well: "the idea itself is ensnared in the social development of the wonders it seems to depict" (p. 37). She recommends that gentility is best characterized as an arrangement of socially sorted out connections in the middle of ladies and in the middle of ladies and men that are interceded by writings. We grasp that meaning of gentility in this examination paper.

Womanliness is firmly identified with conceptualizations of sexual orientation relations and sex parts. Grant on sex relations generally looks at the unequal force relations in the middle of ladies and men (and also among various gatherings of ladies and men taking into account different tomahawks of disparity, for example, race, class, sexuality, nationality), at the macrolevel of social establishments, and in addition on the miniaturized scale level of social collaboration. Sexual orientation researchers characterize sex parts more barely than general sex relations. Sexual orientation parts are the gendered practices and activities that are anticipated from ladies and men; for instance, one "acts female" playing the "part" of lady in the United States. Womanliness is implanted in sex relations; it is socially built, imitated, and arranged inside of the more extensive setting of sexual orientation relations and sex parts.

Sociologists look at the development of womanliness as a procedure of sex part socialization and the ways gentility illuminates and is educated by social establishments, for example, the media, sports, solution, marriage, family, the military, the economy, and the welfare state. Sociologists assess the degree to which societal foundations characterize principles of gentility to which ladies are relied upon to acclimate, and the different routes in which people and gatherings of ladies (and men) oppose, challenge, duplicate, and strengthen those guidelines. Underlining the socially built nature of womanliness, sociologists proceed with the line of feeling that started in the 1970s in

belligerence that gentility is not a static trademark but rather a dynamic procedure. Consideration is attracted to the significance of perceiving that an individual's area in time and place, and in addition one's race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality, cross in the creation of different femininities (Collins 2004).

To cover the expansiveness of the grant on womanliness, we have sorted out this examination paper into eight segments. We start with a discourse of the flexibility of stereotyped gentility in the public arena. Dialect and talk are then exhibited as urgent destinations of the generation, arrangement, and imperviousness to womanliness standards. We then inspect gentility and the life course, with an accentuation on sex socialization in youth, pre-adulthood, adulthood, and among more seasoned ladies. The relationship in the middle of womanliness and the body is talked about next, with an attention on excellence guidelines, medicalization and generation, and real imperviousness to gentility. Next, we examine gentility in the working environment and intersectional and diverse femininities. We end with a discourse of the interdisciplinary way of the ebb and flow work in womanliness and the bearings for productive future exploration.

II. The Resilience of Stereotyped Femininity

Some exploration has observed that dispositions about gentility and sexual orientation parts have changed in the course of recent years in the U.S. society and are moving far from conventional generalizations (Mason, Czajka, and Arber 1976; Mason and Lu 1988; Holt and Ellis 1998). For instance, there has been extensive change in ladies' sex part states of mind somewhere around 1964 and 1974, with a decrease in customary sex part stereotyping and an expansion in profeminist sees among both ladies and men (Mason et al. 1976:593). The term sexual orientation part is utilized as a part of a large portion of the examination paper; be that as it may, the term sex part is utilized here on the grounds that the term was utilized as a part of the articles being refered to. The term sex part has to a great extent been supplanted by sex part to attract thoughtfulness regarding the way that these parts are socially built. Most sociological examination shows that sex part states of mind and sexual orientation generalizations taking into account customary standards of gentility and manliness have remained moderately stable in the course of recent years. Numerous studies find that conventional thoughts of gentility are impervious to change as well as pervasive in contemporary society (Werner and LaRussa 1985; Bergen and Williams 1991; Street, Kimmel, and Kromrey 1995; Lueptow, Garovich-Szabo, and Lueptow 2001). For instance, utilizing arrangements of qualities that speak to characteristics held fast to by contemporary ladies, (for example, loving, resigned, passionate, thoughtful, and delicate) and men, (for example, focused, forceful, overwhelming, autonomous, and driven), a late study that looked at individuals' womanliness and manliness evaluations of themselves as well as other people inferred that no adjustment in sex part appraisals had happened from 1974 to 1997 (Lueptow et al. 2001:23). Another study concentrating on college understudies' sexual orientation part recognitions found that both men ladies still depend on sex-wrote discernments in light of societal standards of womanliness and manliness. While apparently outlandish in light of the social changes that have occurred subsequent to the 1970s, these discoveries demonstrate the noteworthy strength of customary ideas of gentility and manliness.

III. Language and Discourse

Dialect assumes a basic part in the development of womanliness, the flexibility of female generalizations, and the potential for change. We get to be gendered through our dialect and our discussion with others. In the enclosure of phonetic conduct, womanliness is built through the disguise of sexist dialect, the standardizing regulation of discourse, (for example, the reception of a unique genteel dialect in girlhood, not swearing and utilizing label questions (e.g., I am a decent young lady, aren't I? The answer is genuine, right?), figuring out how to be responsive and strong in cross-sex discussions, and "in matters that truly tally (learning) to remain moderately tranquil" (Schur 1984:58–59).

Dialect is additionally critical in testing and arranging customary representations of womanliness. Dialect can be seen as a gathering of talks, and diverse talks permit access to various femininities (some standard and some radical), with the significance of womanliness relying upon the sort of talk that draws in the word (Coates 1998:301, 318–319). In belligerence that "our work starts and closures with dialect," Dorothy Smith (1993) considers ladies dynamic members during the time spent making gentility through "literarily intervened talk" (p. 91). As a social association of connections intervened by printed and visual writings, gentility is a desultory wonder that includes the discussion ladies do in connection to messages and the work they do to understand the literary pictures, for example, the sending of abilities required for shopping, picking garments, and settling on choices about styles and cosmetics (p. 163).

IV. Femininity and the Life Course

The bunch ways that gentility is built, showed, and adjusted for the duration of the life course has been the center of much sociological exploration. Sociologists have been especially intrigued by the development of womanliness in girlhood and youthfulness. With an emphasis on sex socialization, this region of study analyzes how female personalities are delivered and imitated in the family, school, and associate gathering. Folks, kin, and close family and companions take an interest in a continuous procedure of mingling youngsters into the family amid which the parts and desires connected with gentility are found out and sex turns out to be a piece of one's self-character (Stockard 1999:215). The generation of gentility has additionally been analyzed in school settings and associate gatherings. Guidelines of manliness and gentility grow ahead of schedule in adolescence peer bunches (Kessler et al. 1985), and research has demonstrated that young ladies accomplish ubiquity in view of their physical appearance, social abilities, and scholarly achievement (Adler, Kless, and Adler 1992). That exploration likewise exhibited that the esteemed characteristics of gentility are not ahistorical but instead reflect changes in the public eye on the loose.

Not all the examination on sex socialization in girlhood and pre-adulthood concentrate on the unproblematic securing of socially satisfactory gentility. Some sociological grant looks at imperviousness to customary principles of gentility, concentrating on how organization is included during the time spent learning sexual orientation (Acker 1992; Lorber 1994; Connell 1995; West and Fenstermaker 1995). For instance, a few ladies report that as youngsters they had a sharp familiarity with the disservices of gentility and the benefits of manliness that urged them to self-distinguish as "boyish girls" (Carr 1998:548). In reality, an expansive number of U.S. ladies (perhaps even a slight larger part) was spitfires as kids (Rekers 1992).

The media assumes a basic part in the sex socialization of ladies for the duration of the life course. The part of media is critical in the life course point of view. In this way, much sociological examination has concentrated on the compelling part of media pictures of gentility passed on to young ladies through the electronic and print media, especially TV and magazines. Researchers have amassed an extensive collection of writing archiving the substance of the messages about womanliness that are passed on by the media (e.g., Ferguson 1983; Roman and Christian-Smith 1988; Ballaster et al. 1991; Douglas 1994; Peril 2002). Others have contemplated the media purchaser's understanding of the messages and have found that media messages have various implications for the crowd, and elucidations reflect standardizing desires for womanliness and manliness. Viewers of music TV, for instance, translate gendered messages construct not just in light of associations they make between the content and their own encounters additionally on the ideological significance of womanliness, sexuality, and force (Kalof 1993:647). Young ladies' elucidations of magazine ads are likewise particular, with implications arranged and contrasted with lived encounters (Currie 1997:465). Be that as it may, the prevailing thoughts regarding sexual orientation parts educates a significant part of the understandings that youngsters have of pop culture pictures of womanliness, for example, seeing delightful and attractive ladies as in control of men and connections (Kalof 1993) and making cruel negative judgments of ladies who don't comply with standard standards of gentility (Currie 1997). Muriel Cantor, a spearheading humanist of pop culture, presumed that all classes depict ladies as basically conventional in their longing for sentiment and marriage and that bliss relies on upon having a hetero relationship (1987:210).

Subsequent to most ladies get to be included in long haul associations with men and regularly wed in their twenties and thirties, grant on gentility and grown-up ladies has frequently centered around womanliness in the connection of marriage, for example, the division of family unit work (e.g., Brines 1994), the relationship in the middle of gentility and male spousal hostility (e.g., Boye-Beaman, Leonard, and Senchak 1993), and the relationship in the middle of gentility and choice making in conjugal connections (e.g., Komter 1989). Standards of gentility and manliness assume a significant part in the transaction of family unit work. For instance, young men learn right off the bat in their sexual orientation personality improvement that the essential meaning of manliness is what is not ladylike or included with ladies, and this has critical results for later division of family unit work (Brines 1994: 683). While breadwinning ladies have less "compensatory" work to do to keep up their gentility, subordinate spouses must endeavor to keep up their manliness, clarifying why, regardless of the expanding quantities of ladies in the workforce, the division of family unit work still inclines toward more work for ladies (Brines 1994).

Sociologists have additionally analyzed the part of womanliness in intervening male spousal animosity. In considering the relationship between sex character and animosity in conjugal connections, Boye-Beaman et al. (1993) measured gentility levels (principally expressiveness and sympathy toward interpersonal connections) of both spouses and wives. They found that larger amounts of womanliness among white spouses tempered spouses' hostility. Be that as it may, for dark couples, more elevated amounts of gentility and/or manliness among wives

tempered spouses' animosity (Boye-Beaman et al. 1993:312). Other family part intricacies in the space of gentility and manliness have been contemplated by sociologists. For instance, Komter (1989) found that while in many couples both accomplices asserted that choices were made mutually, populist relations were truth be told extremely uncommon, and cliché female and manly parts played out by spouses and wives sustained gendered imbalance in conjugal choice making forms.

Womanliness in later life has likewise been of some enthusiasm to researchers, with the vast majority of the examination concentrated on self-perception among more seasoned ladies. More established ladies have been found to disguise ageist excellence standards (Hurd 2000). Besides, some exploration reports a twofold standard of maturing in which ladies view maturing contrarily as far as its effect on appearance, while men are either nonpartisan or positive about the effect of maturing on appearance (Halliwell and Dittmar 2003). In one of only a handful couple of ethnographic investigations of gentility in more established ladies, Frida Furman (1997) considered magnificence shop society. She found that more established ladies were focused on customary gentility and excellence measures and looked for appealing appearances to accomplish economic wellbeing and agreeableness. Be that as it may, more seasoned ladies' encounters in excellence shops were likewise set apart by imperviousness to sexist and ageist standards, giving a spot to reaffirmation and social backing in the battle against the bigger society's depreciation of maturing ladies' bodies.

VI. Femininity in the Workplace

Notwithstanding the grant on the development of the female body, sociologists have additionally analyzed the part of womanliness in an expansive scope of social establishments, for example, training (e.g., Adler et al. 1992), the military (e.g., Cock 1994), the welfare state (e.g., Orloff 1996), family and marriage (e.g., Boye-Beaman et al. 1993), and the media (e.g., Hollows 2000). Since a lot of our exchange up to this point has been locked in with the development of gentility in the media, the family and in instruction, we will center here on womanliness standards in connection to the military and the welfare state.

The military and the welfare state are comparable in their joining and multiplication of social standards of gentility through the procedures of avoidance, privilege, and disgrace. Militarization in a general public is gendered in a way that reflects more extensive societal standards of womanliness and manliness. During the time spent activating assets for war, a refinement between the guarded and the shields shapes both militarism and sexism, with ladies to a great extent prohibited from the part of defender and dependably cast in the part of the ensured (Cock 1994:152). Militarization and war are organized courses in which men reaffirm their manly part as defender and guard, and the rejection of ladies from battle is completely important to keep up the "ideological structure of patriarchy" taking into account dichotomous thoughts of womanliness and manliness (p. 168). Much like the military, the welfare state is likewise an establishment that is educated by and thus illuminates standards of gentility (and manliness), typifying conventional sexual orientation philosophies and making gendered citizenship (Gordon and Fraser 1994; Knijn 1994; Orloff 1996). The welfare framework not just treats men and ladies in an unexpected way, rendering men autonomous as compensation workers and ladies reliant as relatives that need bolster, the projects focused to ladies tend to convey more negative social marks of disgrace than those focused to men (Orloff 1996).

VII. Intersectional and Cross-Cultural Femininities

Concentrating on the ways that gentility converges with race, class, and sex has been especially imperative sociological work (Collins 2004; Lovejoy 2001; Pyle 1996; Thompson and Keith 2001). Researchers have accentuated race as an essential arranging rule that connects with different imbalances in the forming of gendered people (Baca Zinn and Thornton Dill 1996). For instance, in her intersectional examination of common laborers and white collar class thoughts of womanliness for dark ladies, Patricia Hill Collins (2004) contends that the prevailing media pictures portray dark gentility contrarily, speaking to average workers African American ladies as "bitches" and "circling pictures of dark ladies' wantonness" (p. 137). For white collar class dark ladies, the media passes on messages about their potential for not getting to be regular workers, and the message of womanliness for working class African American ladies is that "they should by one means or another make sense of an approach to wind up Black "women" by keeping away from these common laborers traps. . . . Doing as such means arranging the muddled legislative issues that go with this triad of touchiness, indiscrimination, and fruitfulness" (p. 139).

Another critical improvement in the human science of womanliness is the culturally diverse grant that analyzes gentility in an extensive variety of worldwide connections, for example, Indonesia (Sears 1996), Puerto

Rico (Crespo 1991), Southern India (Niranjana 2001), and South Africa (Mindry 1999). Researchers have additionally centered around the development of womanliness in multiethnic connections, for example, Chinese schoolgirls in Great Britain (Archer and Francis 2005) and Asian ladies in America (Creef 2004). Crosscultural grant accentuates the thought of femininities that not just relies on upon sex, race, class, and sexuality contrasts but on the other hand are geologically, spatially, and socially particular. Researchers have analyzed the development of femininities in a worldwide connection as impressions of neighborhood sexual orientation imbalances (Laurie et al. 1999), as far as the mental measurements of multifaceted femininities (Hofstede et al. 1998), and regarding the socially and geologically particular developments of womanliness in space and on the body (Niranjana 2001). A lot of this grant concentrates on how gentility has been built in settings of expansionism, government, and globalization. For instance, Sears (1996) talks about the part of expansionism and colonialism in the generation of Indonesian femininities. In a postcolonial, postmodern world, Westerners regularly see Indonesian ladies as colorfully ladylike, especially in representations of prominent visitor spots, for example, Bali (p. 3). The admired Western sentimental generalization of ladies from colorful grounds has been connected to imperialism by researchers from an extensive variety of controls, including execution studies and human studies (e.g., Lutz and Collins 1993; Desmond 1999).

VIII. Interdisciplinary Scholarship on Femininity

As noted above, womanliness has been concentrated on in an extensive variety of interdisciplinary stadiums. Workmanship history specialists have inspected how visual pictures portray ladies watching themselves being taken a gander at by men (Berger 1972), and English researchers have concentrated on the externalization of ladies in representations of the wonderful female body (Bronfen 1992). Thinkers have composed on the part of gentility in style and mold and the ways that sex, race, and sexual introduction educate the idea of magnificence (Brand 2000). Ethnographers of girlhood instructive procedures have inspected the impact of associate gathering fortification of womanliness in an anthropological system (Holland and Eisenhart 1990) and the talks that characterize female sexuality and exemplification from the perspective of correspondences and ladies' studies (Gonick 2003). Therapists have dealt with the estimation of womanliness, manliness, and bisexuality (Bem 1974) and the distinguishing proof of ladies' typical pictures of gentility and sex (Ussher 1997). Social antiquarians have concentrated on numerous parts of the changing developments of gentility after some time, for example, the picture of the lovely lady more than 200 years in America (Banner 1983).

IX. Future Directions for Scholarship on Femininity

There is awesome potential for the future bearings of grant on gentility both inside of the order of human science and through interdisciplinary grant. There is a requirement for more research on femininities diversely. Issues of the body and wellbeing, especially ailments that influence ladies' conceptive wellbeing, for example, bosom, cervical, and ovarian diseases, are regions that need more examination regarding their connection to standards of womanliness. For instance, the well known media talk about bosom growth spins around gentility and principles of magnificence, sexuality, and parenthood. The expanding standardization of restorative surgery in numerous Western nations is additionally a territory that requires more grant as to its part in opening up ladylike excellence guidelines among ladies of all ages.

Regarding imperviousness to and renegotiation of the sociocultural standards of gentility, grant on men performing womanliness and ladies performing womanliness in nontraditional ways is likewise pivotal. Rupp and Taylor's (2003) late production, Drag Queens at the 801 Cabaret, is an illustration of the kind of work that grows our comprehension of womanliness and manliness as social exhibitions and uncouples the execution of gentility with ladies and of manliness with men.

Developments of womanliness keep on evolving. Donna Haraway (1989) has composed that pictures of lady and the female body as connected to propagation, parenthood, and family life are in decrease in "about each desultory stadium, from pop culture to lawful regulation" (p. 352). She contends that there is nothing about being female that is valid for all ladies and that the rambling way of womanness and gentility prompts the acknowledgment of the significance of making coalitions among ladies who are not anxious of "fractional characters and conflicting outlooks" (Haraway 1991:154–155). Not amazed that the idea of lady gets to be slippery pretty much as the systems between individuals on the planet have turned into various and complex, Haraway imagines a cyborg shape that changes gentility and ladies' encounters, an "animal in a postgender world" (pp. 149, 150, 160). For

instance, ladies of shading have a cyborg personality, a subjectivity developed from the merger of different "pariah characters" (p. 174). Audre Lorde (1984), an early champion of producing a group of contrasts, composed that survival relies on upon making associations with others recognized as outside and distinctive to refashion "a world in which we can all twist . . . figuring out how to take our disparities and make them qualities" (p. 112). Sex, womanliness and manliness are at the focal point of arrangements of contrast, however what is required is a hypothesis of distinction that is not twofold since usthem talks legitimize persecution and mastery (Haraway 1991).

Bibliography:

1. Acker, Joan. 1992. "From Sex Roles to Gendered Institutions." Contemporary Sociology 21:565–69.
2. Adler, Patricia A., Steven J. Kless, and Peter Adler. 1992. "Socialization to Gender Roles: Popularity among Elementary School Boys and Girls." Sociology of Education 65:169–87.
3. Altabe, Madeline. 1996. "Ethnicity and Body Image: Quantitative and Qualitative Analysis." International Journal of Eating Disorders 23:153–59.
4. Archer, Louise and Becky Francis. 2005. "They Never Go Off the Rails Like Other Ethnic Groups: Teachers' Constructions of British Chinese Pupils' Gender Identities and Approaches to Learning." British Journal of Sociology of Education 26:165–82.
5. Atkinson, Michael. 2002. "Pretty in Ink: Conformity, Resistance, and Negotiation in Women's Tattooing." Sex Roles 47:219–35.
6. Baca Zinn, Maxine and Bonnie Thornton Dill. 1996. "Theorizing Difference from Multiracial Feminism." Feminist Studies 22:321–31.
7. Baker, Nancy C. 1984. The Beauty Trap. London, England: Piatkus.
8. Ballaster, Ros, Margaret Beetham, Elizabeth Frazer, and Sandra Hebron. 1991. Women's Worlds: Ideology, Femininity and the Women's Magazine. London, England: Macmillan.
9. Banner, Lois W. 1983. American Beauty. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
10. Barrett, Rusty. 1999. "Indexing Polyphonous Identity in the Speech of African American Drag Queens." Pp. 313–31 in Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse, edited by M. Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, and L. A. Sutton. New York: Oxford University Press.
11. Bay-Cheng, Laina Y., Alyssa N. Zucker, Abigail J. Stewart, and Cynthia S. Pomerleau. 2002. "Linking Femininity, Weight Concern, and Mental Health among Latina, Black, and White Women." Psychology of Women Quarterly 26:36–45.
12. Bem, Sandra. 1974. "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 42:155–62.
13. Bergen, David J. and John E. Williams. 1991. "Sex Stereotypes in the United States Revisited: 1972–1988." Sex Roles 24:413–23.
14. Berger, John. 1972. Ways of Seeing. London, England: Penguin.
15. Bernard, Jessie. 1971. Women and the Public Interest. New York: Aldine.
16. Bond, S. and T. F. Cash. 1992. "Black Beauty: Skin Color and Body Images among African-American College Women." Journal of Applied Social Psychology 22(11):874–88.
17. Bordo, Susan. 1993. Unbearable Weight: Feminism, Western Culture, and the Body. Berkeley: University of California Press.
18. Boye-Beaman, Joni, Kenneth E. Leonard, and Marilyn Senchak. 1993. "Male Premarital Aggression and Gender Identity among Black and White Newlywed Couples." Journal of Marriage and the Family 55:303–13.
19. Brand, Peg Zeglin. 2000. Beauty Matters. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
20. Brines, Julie. 1994. "Economic Dependency, Gender, and the Division of Labor at Home." American Journal of Sociology 100:652–88.
21. Bronfen, Elisabeth. 1992. Over Her Dead Body: Death, Femininity and the Aesthetic. New York: Routledge.
22. Brownmiller, Susan. 1984. Femininity. New York: Linden Press.
23. Butler, Judith. 1990. Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity. London: Routledge.
24. Butler, Judith. 1993. Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex." New York: Routledge.
25. Cantor, Muriel G. 1987. "Popular Culture and the Portrayal of Women: Content and Control." Pp. 190–214 in Analyzing Gender: A Handbook of Social Science Research, edited by B. B. Hess and M. M. Ferree. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
26. Carr, C. Lynn. 1998. "Tomboy Resistance and Conformity: Agency in Social Psychological Gender Theory." Gender & Society 12:528–53.

27. Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. The Reproduction of Mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.
28. Coates, Jennifer. 1998. "Thank God I'm a Woman: The Construction of Differing Femininities." Pp. 295–320 in The Feminist Critique of Language: A Reader, edited by D. Cameron. New York: Routledge.
29. Cock, Jacklyn. 1994. "Women and the Military: Implications for Demilitarization in the 1990s in South Africa." Gender & Society 8:152–69.
30. Cole, C. 1993. "Resisting the Canon: Feminist Cultural Studies, Sport and Technologies of the Body." Journal of Sport and Social Issues 17:77–97.
31. Collins, Patricia Hill. 2004. Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism. New York: Routledge.
32. Connell, R.W. 1995. Masculinities. Berkeley: University of California Press.
33. Creef, Elena Tajima. 2004. Imaging Japanese America: The Visual Construction of Citizenship, Nation, and the Body. New York: New York University Press.
34. Crespo, Elizabeth. 1991. Changing Conceptions of Femininity among Puerto Rican Women. New York: State University of New York.
35. Currie, Dawn H. 1997. "Decoding Femininity: Advertisements and Their Teenage Readers." Gender & Society 11:453–77.
36. de Beauvoir, Simone. 1953. The Second Sex. New York: Knopf.
37. Demarest, Jack and Rita Allen. 2000. "Body Image: Gender, Ethic, and Age Differences." Journal of Social Psychology 140(4):465–72.
38. DeMello, M. 2000. Bodies of Inscription: A Cultural History of the Modern Tattoo Community. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
39. Desmond, Jane C. 1999. Staging Tourism: Bodies on Display from Waikiki to Sea World. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
40. Douglas, Susan J. 1994. Where the Girls Are: Growing Up Female with the Mass Media. New York: Random House.
41. Featherstone, M. 2000. Body Modification. London, England: Sage.
42. Ferguson, Marjorie. 1983. Forever Feminine: Women's Magazines and the Cult of Femininity. London, England: Heinemann.
43. Foucault, Michel. 1977. Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. Translated by A. Sheridan. New York: Vintage.
44. Friedan, Betty. [1963] 2001. The Feminine Mystique. New York: W. W. Norton.
45. Furman, Frida Kerner. 1997. Facing the Mirror: Older Women and Beauty Shop Culture. New York: Routledge.
46. Gilligan, Carol. 1982. In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
47. Gonick, Marnina. 2003. Between Femininities: Ambivalence, Identity, and the Education of Girls. New York: State University of New York Press.
48. Gordon, Linda and Nancy Fraser. 1994. "Dependency Demystified: Inscriptions of Power in a Keyword of the Welfare State." Social Politics 1:14–31.
49. Greer, Germaine. 1971. The Female Eunuch. London, England: Paladin Press.
50. Hall, M. 1993. "Feminism, Theory, and the Body: A Response to Cole." Journal of Sport and Social Issues 17:98–105.
51. Halliwell, E. and H. Dittmar. 2003. "A Qualitative Investigation of Women's and Men's Body Image Concerns and Their Attitudes toward Aging." Sex Roles 49:675–84.
52. Haraway, Donna. 1989. Primate Visions: Gender, Race, and Nature in the World of Modern Science. New York: Routledge.
53. Haraway, Donna. 1991. Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature. New York: Routledge.
54. Hargreaves, J. 1994. Sporting Females: Critical Issues in the History and Sociology of Women's Sports. London, England: Routledge.
55. Hofstede, Geert, Willem A. Arrindell, Deborah L. Best, Marieke De Mooij, Michael H. Hoppe, Evert Van de Vliert, et al. 1998. Masculinity and Femininity: The Taboo Dimensions of National Cultures. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
56. Holland, Dorothy C. and Margaret A. Eisenhart. 1990. Educated in Romance: Women, Achievement, and College Culture. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
57. Hollows, Joanne. 2000. Feminism, Femininity, and Popular Culture. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

58. Holt, Cheryl L. and Jon B. Ellis. 1998. "Assessing the Current Validity of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory." Sex Roles 39:929–41.
59. hooks, bell. 1992. Black Looks: Race and Representation. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
60. Hurd, L. C. 2000. "Older Women's Body Image and Embodied Experience: An Exploration." Journal of Women & Aging 12:77–97.
61. Johns, D. 1996. "Fasting and Feasting: Paradoxes of the Sport Ethic." Sociology of Sport Journal 15:41–63.
62. Kalof, Linda. 1993. "Dilemmas of Femininity: Gender and the Social Construction of Sexual Imagery." Sociological Quarterly 34:639–51.
63. Kapsalis, Terri. 1997. Public Privates: Performing Gynecology at Both Ends of the Speculum. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
64. Kessler, S., D. J. Ashenden, R. W. Connell, and G. W. Dowsett. 1985. "Gender Relations in Secondary Schooling." Sociology of Education 58:34–48.
65. Knijn, T. 1994. "Fish without Bikes: Revision of the Dutch Welfare State and Its Consequences for the (In)dependence of Single Mothers." Social Politics 1:83–105.
66. Komter, Aafke. 1989. "Hidden Power in Marriage." Gender & Society 3:187–216.
67. Krane, V. 1997. "Homonegativism Experienced by Lesbian College Athletes." Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal 6:141–63.
68. Krane, V., Precilla Y. L. Choi, Shannon M. Baird, Christine M. Aimar, and Kerrie J. Kauer. 2004. "Living the Paradox: Female Athletes Negotiate Femininity and Masculinity." Sex Roles: A Journal of Research 50:315–29.
69. Lakoff, Robin and Raquel L. Scherr. 1984. Face Value: The Politics of Beauty. London, England: Routledge.
70. Laurie, Nina, Claire Dwyer, Sarah L. Holloway, and Fiona M. Smithe. 1999. Geographies of New Femininities. New York: Prentice Hall.
71. Lorber, Judith. 1994. Paradoxes of Gender. New Haven, CT:Yale University Press.
72. Lorber, Judith and Lisa Jean Moore. 2002. Gender and the Social Construction of Illness. New York: AltaMira Press.
73. Lorde, Audre. 1984. Sister Outsider: Essays & Speeches by Audre Lorde. New York: Crossing Press.
74. Lovejoy, Meg. 2001. "Disturbances in the Social Body: Differences in Body Image and Eating Disorders among African American and White Women." Gender & Society 15:239–61.
75. Loy, J. W., D. L. Andrews, and R. E. Rinehart. 1993. "The Body in Culture and Sport." Sport Science Review 2:69–91.
76. Lueptow, Lloyd B., Lori Garovich-Szabo, and Margaret B. Lueptow. 2001. "Social Change and the Persistence of Sex Typing: 1974–1997." Social Forces 80:1–36.
77. Lutz, Catherine A. and Jane L. Collins. 1993. Reading National Geographic. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
78. Martin, Emily. 1992. The Woman in the Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
79. Mason, Karen O., John L. Czajka, and Sara Arber. 1976. "Change in U.S. Women's Sex-Role Attitudes, 1964–1974." American Sociological Review 41:573–96.
80. Mason, Karen O. and Yu-Hsia Lu. 1988. "Attitudes toward Women's Familial Roles: Changes in the United States, 1977–1985." Gender and Society 2:39–57.
81. Mifflin, M. 1997. Bodies of Subversion: A Secret History of Women and Tattoo. New York: Juno Books.
82. Mikosza, J. M. and M. G. Phillips. 1999. "Gender, Sport and the Body Politic: Framing Femininity in the Golden Girls of Sport Calendar and the Atlanta Dream." International Review for the Sociology of Sport 34:5–16.
83. Miller, K. E., D. F. Sabo, M. P. Farrell, G. M. Barnes, and M. J. Melnick. 1999. "Sports, Sexual Behavior, Contraceptive Use, and Pregnancy among Female and Male High School Students: Testing Cultural Resource Theory." Sociology of Sport Journal 16:366–87.
84. Mindry, Deborah. 1999. "Good Women": Philanthropy, Power, and the Politics of Femininity in Contemporary South Africa. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Dissertation Services.
85. Niranjana, Seemanthini. 2001. Gender and Space: Femininity, Sexualization and the Female Body. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
86. Orloff, Ann. 1996. "Gender in the Welfare State." Annual Review of Sociology 22:51–78.
87. Peril, Lynn. 2002. Pink Think: Becoming a Woman in Many Uneasy Lessons. New York: W. W. Norton.

88. Pyle, Karen D. 1996. "Class-Based Masculinities: The Interdependence of Gender, Class, and Interpersonal Power." Gender & Society 10:527–49.
89. Rekers, G. A. 1992. "Development of Problems of Puberty and Sex Roles in Adolescence." Pp. 606–22 in Handbook of Clinical Child Psychology, edited by C. W. Walker and M. C. Roberts. New York: John Wiley.
90. Roman, Leslie G. and Linda K. Christian-Smith. 1988. "Introduction." Pp. 1–34 in Becoming Feminine: The Politics of Popular Culture. London, England: Falmer Press.
91. Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. 2003. Drag Queens at the 801 Cabaret. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
92. Schur, Edwin. 1984. Labeling Women Deviant: Gender, Stigma, and Social Control. New York: Random House.
93. Sears, Laurie J. 1996. "Fragile Identities: Deconstructing Women and Indonesia." Pp. 1–46 in Fantasizing the Feminine in Indonesia, edited by L. J. Sears. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
94. Shilling, C. 1993. The Body and Social Theory. London, England: Sage.
95. Smith, Dorothy E. 1988. "Femininity as Discourse." Pp. 37–59 in Becoming Feminine: The Politics of Pop Culture, edited by L. G. Roman, L. K. Christian-Smith, and E. Ellsworth. London, England: Falmer Press.
96. Smith, Dorothy E. 1993. Texts, Facts, and Femininity: Exploring the Relations of Ruling. London, England: Routledge.
97. Stockard, Jean. 1999. "Gender Socialization." Pp. 215–27 in Handbook of the Sociology of Gender, edited by J. S. Chafetz. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Press.
98. Street, Sue, Ellen B. Kimmel, and Jeffery D. Kromrey. 1995. "Revisiting University Student Gender Role Perceptions." Sex Roles 33:183–201.
99. Thompson, Maxine S. and Verna M. Keith. 2001. "The Blacker the Berry: Gender, Skin Tone, Self-Esteem, and Self- Efficacy." Gender & Society 15:336–57.
100. Tyler, Carole-Anne. 2003. Female Impersonation. New York: Routledge.
101. Ussher, Jane M. 1997. Fantasies of Femininity: Reframing the Boundaries of Sex. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
102. Van Den Wijngaard, Marianne. 1997. Reinventing the Sexes: The Biomedical Construction of Femininity and Masculinity. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
103. Weitz, Rose, ed. 1998. The Politics of Women's Bodies: Sexuality, Appearance, and Behavior. New York: Oxford University Press.
104. Werner, Paul D. and Georgina Williams LaRussa. 1985. "Persistence and Change in Sex Role Stereotypes." Sex Roles 12:1089–1100.
105. West, C. and S. Fenstermaker. 1995. "Doing Difference." Gender & Society 9:8–37.
106. Williams, S. and G. Bendelow. 1998. The Lived Body: Sociological Themes, Embodied Issues. London, England: Routledge.
107. Wolf, Naomi. [1991] 2002. The Beauty Myth: How Images of Beauty Are Used against Women. New York: HarperCollins.
108. Wollstonecraft, Mary. 1792. A Vindication of the Rights of Women. Boston, MA: Peter Eades. Retrieved August 23, 2014 (http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl302/texts/wollstonecraft/woman-contents.html).
109. Woodward, K. 1997. Identity and Difference. London, England: Sage.