_____

THE SOCIOLOGY OF FEMININITY

Ashok Shivaji Yakkaldevi

Assistant Professor A.R. Burla Vartishta Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Solapur.

Abstract:

The social science of womanliness' contemporary territory is established in the eighteenth-century compositions of the radical mastermind, Mary Wollstonecraft (1792). Her Vindication of the Rights of Woman reprimanded the offering of ladies' capability to "libertine ideas of excellence," the securing of force through appeal and shortcoming, and never-ending reliance in marriage. Two after hundred years, things were much the same when Simone de Beauvoir (1953) distributed The Second Sex again attracting consideration regarding harsh ladylike magnificence models that were a vital piece of the subordination of ladies. In 1963, Betty Friedan tended to comparative troubling subjects in The Feminine Mystique, an examination of an "issue with no name," or the desire that ladies "could seek no more prominent predetermination than to radiance in their own gentility" and that satisfaction accompanied committing oneself to discovering a spouse and having youngsters (Friedan [1963] 2001:15). A couple of years after the fact, Jessie Bernard, a humanist and the first lady educator at Princeton University, would take a more dynamic perspective of gentility as a set of attributes that cover with manliness and that shift in time and spot (Bernard 1971). In the most recent three decades, womanliness has turned into a broadly explored subject ofsociological request that draws fundamentally on Jessie Bernard's initial experiences into the adaptable and changing nature of gentility additionally weaves in contemporary issues of sexual orientation, race, and class.

Key words: social science , Rights of Woman , Sociology of Femininity.

INTRODUCTION

The meaning of gentility is a subtle one. Dorothy Smith (1988) puts it well: "the idea itself is involved in the social development of the phenomena it seems to portray" (p. 37). She suggests that gentility is best characterized as a set of socially composed connections in the middle of ladies and in the middle of ladies and men that are intervened by writings. We grasp that meaning of gentility in this examination paper.

Womanliness is nearly identified with conceptualizations of sex relations and sexual orientation parts. Grant on sexual orientation relations normally looks at the unequal force relations in the middle of ladies and men (and in addition among distinctive gatherings of ladies and men focused around different tomahawks of imbalance, for example, race, class, sexuality, nationality), at the macrolevel of social establishments, and also on the micro-level of social communication. Sex researchers characterize sex parts more barely than general sexual orientation relations. Sex parts are the gendered practices and activities that are anticipated from ladies and men; for instance, one "demonstrations ladylike" assuming the "part" of lady in the United States. Womanliness is implanted in sexual orientation relations; it is socially developed, replicated, and arranged inside the more extensive connection of sex relations and sex parts.

Sociologists analyze the development of gentility as a methodology of sexual orientation part socialization and the ways womanliness advises and is educated by social organizations, for example, the media, games, drug, marriage, family, the military, the economy, and the welfare state. Sociologists assess the degree to which societal

_____

_____

organizations characterize norms of gentility to which ladies are required to adjust, and the different courses in which people and gatherings of ladies (and men) oppose, test, duplicate, and fortify those principles. Accentuating the socially developed nature of womanliness, sociologists proceed with the line of believing that started in the 1970s in belligerence that gentility is not a static trademark however an element process. Consideration is attracted to the imperativeness of perceiving that a singular's area in time and spot, and additionally one's race, ethnicity, class, and sexuality, cross in the generation of various femininities (Collins 2004).

To cover the broadness of the grant on womanliness, we have composed this exploration paper into eight areas. We start with an exchange of the strength of stereotyped gentility in the public eye. Dialect and talk are then introduced as critical destinations of the creation, arrangement, and imperviousness to womanliness standards. We then look at womanliness and the life course, with an attention on sexual orientation socialization in adolescence, puberty, adulthood, and among more seasoned ladies. The relationship in the middle of gentility and the body is examined next, with a concentrate on magnificence gauges, medicalization and multiplication, and substantial imperviousness to womanliness. Next, we talk about gentility in the working environment and intersectional and diverse femininities. We end with an exchange of the interdisciplinary nature of the flow work in gentility and the bearings for productive future exploration.

II. The Resilience of Stereotyped Femininity

Some exploration has observed that demeanor 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). Case in point, there has been extensive change in ladies' sex part demeanor somewhere around 1964 and 1974, with a decrease in conventional sex part stereotyping and an increment 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 exploration paper; be that as it may, the term sex part is utilized here in light of the fact that it is the term that was utilized as a part of the articles being refered to. The term sex part has generally been supplanted by sexual orientation part to attract regard for the way that these parts are socially developed. Most sociological exploration demonstrates that sex part demeanor and sexual orientation generalizations focused around customary standards of womanliness and manliness have remained generally steady in the course of recent years. Numerous studies find that conventional thoughts of womanliness 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). Case in point, utilizing arrangements of qualities that speak to characteristics stuck to by contemporary ladies, (for example, loving, resigned, passionate, thoughtful, and delicate) and men, (for example, aggressive, forceful, overwhelming, free, and aspiring), a late study that thought about individuals' womanliness and manliness appraisals of themselves as well as other people reasoned that no change in sex part evaluations had happened from 1974 to 1997 (Lueptow et al. 2001:23). An alternate study concentrating on college understudies' sex part observations found that both men ladies still depend on sex-wrote recognitions focused around societal standards of womanliness and manliness. While apparently strange in light of the social changes that have occurred since the 1970s, these discoveries show the striking flexibility of conventional thoughts of womanliness and manliness.

III. Dialect and Discourse

Dialect assumes a basic part in the development of womanliness, the strength of ladylike generalizations, and the potential for change. We get to be gendered through our dialect and our discussion with others. In the coliseum of semantic conduct, gentility is built through the disguise of sexist dialect, the regularizing regulation of discourse, (for example, the reception of an extraordinary refined 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 generally peaceful" (Schur 1984:58–59).

_____

_____

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

IV. Gentility and the Life Course

The horde ways that womanliness is built, showed, and changed for the duration of the life course has been the center of much sociological exploration. Sociologists have been especially intrigued by the development of gentility in girlhood and immaturity. With a concentrate on sex socialization, this range of study inspects how ladylike personalities are created and repeated in the family, school, and associate gathering. Folks, kin, and close family and companions take an interest in a progressing methodology of standardizing youngsters into the family amid which the parts and desires connected with gentility are educated and sex gets to be a piece of one's character toward oneself (Stockard 1999:215). The creation of womanliness has additionally been inspected in school settings and associate gatherings. Principles of manliness and womanliness create ahead of schedule in youth companion bunches (Kessler et al. 1985), and research has demonstrated that young ladies attain prevalence focused around their physical appearance, social aptitudes, and scholarly achievement (Adler, Kless, and Adler 1992). That exploration additionally exhibited that the esteemed characteristics of gentility are not ahistorical but instead reflect changes in the public arena on the loose.

Not all the examination on sexual orientation socialization in girlhood and youthfulness concentrate on the unproblematic securing of socially worthy gentility. Some sociological grant analyzes imperviousness to conventional guidelines of womanliness, concentrating on how organization is included at present learning sex (Acker 1992; Lorber 1994; Connell 1995; West and Fenstermaker 1995). Case in point, some ladies report that as youngsters they had a sharp attention to the disservices of gentility and the benefits of manliness that urged them to self-recognize as "spitfires" (Carr 1998:548). To be sure, an expansive number of U.s. ladies (potentially even a slight larger part) review being boyish girls as kids (Rekers 1992).

The media assumes a discriminating part in the sex socialization of ladies for the duration of the life course. The part of media is noteworthy in the life course viewpoint. Along these lines, much sociological exploration has concentrated on the persuasive part of media pictures of gentility passed on to youngsters through the electronic and print media, especially TV and magazines. Researchers have amassed an expansive group of writing reporting 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 concentrated on the media purchaser's understanding of the messages and have discovered that media messages have numerous implications for the gathering of people, and translations reflect regulating desires for womanliness and manliness. Viewers of music TV, for instance, decipher gendered messages built not just with respect to associations they make between the content and their individual encounters additionally on the ideological importance of womanliness, sexuality, and force (Kalof 1993:647). Young people's elucidations of magazine commercials are additionally particular, with implications arranged and contrasted with existed encounters (Currie 1997:465). However the prevailing thoughts regarding sexual orientation parts educates a great part of the understandings that youngsters have of mainstream culture pictures of gentility, for example, seeing excellent 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 womanliness (Currie 1997). Muriel Cantor, a spearheading social scientist of pop culture, presumed that all classifications depict ladies as basically conventional in their craving for sentiment and marriage and that bliss relies on upon having a hetero relationship (1987:210).

_____

_____

Since most ladies get to be included in long haul associations with men and commonly wed in their twenties and thirties, grant on gentility and grown-up ladies has regularly centered around womanliness in the setting of marriage, for example, the division of family unit work (e.g., Brines 1994), the relationship in the middle of womanliness 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 vital part in the arrangement of family work. Case in point, young people learn right on time in their sexual orientation personality improvement that the essential meaning of manliness is that which is not ladylike or included with ladies, and this has vital outcomes for later division of family unit work (Brines 1994: 683). While breadwinning ladies have less "compensatory" work to do to keep up their gentility, ward spouses must endeavor to keep up their manliness, clarifying why, notwithstanding the expanding quantities of ladies in the workforce, the division of family work still inclines to more work for ladies (Brines 1994).

Sociologists have additionally analyzed the part of womanliness in interceding male spousal hostility. In contemplating the relationship between sexual orientation character and animosity in conjugal connections, Boye-Beaman et al. (1993) measured gentility levels (basically expressiveness and sympathy toward interpersonal connections) of both spouses and wives. They found that more elevated amounts of womanliness among white spouses tempered spouses' hostility. However 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 womanliness and manliness have been concentrated on by sociologists. Case in point, Komter (1989) found that while in many couples both accomplices asserted that choices were made mutually, libertarian relations were indeed exceptionally uncommon, and cliché female and manly parts played out by spouses and wives propagated gendered imbalance in conjugal choice making methodologies.

Gentility in later life has likewise been of some enthusiasm to researchers, with a large portion of the examination concentrated on self-perception among more seasoned ladies. More seasoned ladies have been found to disguise ageist excellence standards (Hurd 2000). Moreover, some exploration reports a twofold standard of maturing in which ladies perspective maturing adversely 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 the few ethnographic investigations of gentility in more established ladies, Frida Furman (1997) mulled over magnificence shop society. She found that more seasoned ladies were focused on customary gentility and magnificence measures and looked for alluring appearances to attain societal position and worthiness. In any case, more seasoned ladies' encounters in excellence shops were additionally checked by imperviousness to sexist and ageist standards, giving a spot to reaffirmation and social backing in the battle against the bigger society's downgrading of maturing ladies' bodies .

VI. Gentility in the Workplace

Notwithstanding the grant on the development of the female body, sociologists have additionally inspected the part of womanliness in an expansive scope of social establishments, for example, instruction (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 much of our talk so far has been locked in with the development of gentility in the media, the family and in instruction, we will concentrate here on womanliness standards in connection to the military and the welfare state.

The military and the welfare state are comparable in their fuse and generation of social standards of gentility through the procedures of avoidance, privilege, and shame. Militarization in a general public is gendered in a manner that reflects more extensive societal standards of gentility and manliness. Currently activating assets for war, a qualification between the protected and the safeguards shapes both militarism and sexism, with ladies generally prohibited from the part of defender and dependably cast in the part of the ensured (Cock 1994:152). Militarization and war are regulated courses in which men reaffirm their manly part as defender and protector, and the rejection of ladies from battle is completely important to keep up the "ideological structure of patriarchy" focused around dichotomous thoughts of gentility and manliness (p. 168). Much like the military, the welfare state is

_____

likewise an organization that is educated by and thusly educates standards of gentility (and manliness), encapsulating conventional sex 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 free as compensation earners and ladies reliant as relatives that need help, the projects focused to ladies have a tendency to convey more negative social marks of shame than those focused to men (Orloff 1996).

VII. Intersectional and Cross-Cultural Femininities

Considering the ways that gentility meets with race, class, and sex has been especially paramount sociological work (Collins 2004; Lovejoy 2001; Pyle 1996; Thompson and Keith 2001). Researchers have underscored race as a key sorting out standard that interfaces with different imbalances in the forming of gendered people (Baca Zinn and Thornton Dill 1996). For instance, in her intersectional examination of working people and white collar class ideas of womanliness for dark ladies, Patricia Hill Collins (2004) contends that the overwhelming media pictures portray dark gentility contrarily, speaking to common laborers African American ladies as "bitches" and "coursing 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 common laborers, and the message of womanliness for working class African American ladies is that "they should some way or another make sense of an approach to wind up Black "women" by evading these regular workers traps. . . . Doing so means arranging the entangled legislative issues that go hand in hand with this triad of touchiness, wantonness, and ripeness" (p. 139).

An alternate essential advancement in the social science of womanliness is the 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 gentility in multiethnic connections, for example, Chinese schoolgirls in Great Britain (Archer and Francis 2005) and Asian ladies in America (Creef 2004). Crosscultural grant underlines the idea of femininities that not just relies on upon sex, race, class, and sexuality contrasts but at the same time are topographically, spatially, and socially particular. Researchers have analyzed the development of femininities in a worldwide setting as impressions of neighborhood sexual orientation imbalances (Laurie et al. 1999), as far as the mental measurements of diverse femininities (Hofstede et al. 1998), and regarding the socially and topographically particular developments of gentility in space and on the body (Niranjana 2001). Much of this grant concentrates on how womanliness has been developed in connections of expansionism, dominion, and globalization. For instance, Sears (1996) examines the part of provinciality and dominion in the generation of Indonesian femininities. In a postcolonial, postmodern world, Westerners frequently see Indonesian ladies as intriguingly female, especially in representations of prominent traveler spots, for example, Bali (p. 3). The glorified Western sentimental generalization of ladies from fascinating terrains has been connected to expansionism by researchers from an extensive variety of controls, including execution studies and human sciences (e.g., Lutz and Collins 1993; Desmond 1999).

VIII. Interdisciplinary Scholarship on Femininity

As noted above, gentility has been mulled over in an extensive variety of interdisciplinary stadiums. Craftsmanship antiquarians have analyzed how visual pictures portray ladies viewing themselves being taken a gander at by men (Berger 1972), and English researchers have mulled over the generalization of ladies in representations of the lovely ladylike cadaver (Bronfen 1992). Rationalists have composed on the part of gentility in feel and style and the ways that sex, race, and sexual introduction advise the idea of magnificence (Brand 2000). Ethnographers of girlhood instructive methods have inspected the impact of companion gathering fortification of womanliness in an anthropological skeleton (Holland and Eisenhart 1990) and the talks that characterize female sexuality and encapsulation from the perspective of interchanges and ladies' studies (Gonick 2003). Therapists have taken a shot at the estimation of gentility, manliness, and hermaphrodism (Bem 1974) and the distinguishing proof of ladies' typical pictures of womanliness and sex (Ussher 1997). Social history specialists have examined numerous

_____

parts of the changing developments of womanliness over the long run, for example, the picture of the wonderful lady in excess of 200 years in America (Banner 1983).

IX. Future Directions for Scholarship on Femininity

There is extraordinary potential for the future bearings of grant on gentility both inside the order of social science and through interdisciplinary grant. There is a requirement for more research on femininities diversely. Issues of the body and wellbeing, especially maladies that influence ladies' regenerative wellbeing, for example, bosom, cervical, and ovarian diseases, are territories that need more examination as far as their connection to standards of womanliness. For instance, the well known media talk about bosom disease spins around gentility and principles of magnificence, sexuality, and parenthood. The expanding standardization of nonessential surgery in numerous Western nations is additionally a region that requires more grant concerning its part in enhancing female magnificence guidelines among ladies of all ages.

As far as imperviousness to and renegotiation of the sociocultural standards of gentility, grant on men performing womanliness and ladies performing womanliness in nontraditional ways is likewise significant. Rupp and Taylor's (2003) late production, Drag Queens at the 801 Cabaret, is a sample of the kind of work that stretches our understanding of gentility and manliness as social exhibitions and uncouples the execution of womanliness with ladies and of manliness with men.

Developments of womanliness keep on chaning. Donna Haraway (1989) has composed that pictures of lady and the ladylike body as connected to proliferation, parenthood, and family life are in decrease in "about every verbose stadium, from pop culture to legitimate principle" (p. 352). She contends that there is nothing about being female that is valid for all ladies and that the verbose nature of womanness and gentility prompts the distinguishment of the vitality of making coalitions among ladies who are not perplexed about "fractional characters and opposing points of view" (Haraway 1991:154–155). Not shocked that the idea of lady gets to be tricky pretty much as the systems between individuals on the planet have ended up various and complex, Haraway imagines a cyborg structure that changes womanliness and ladies' encounters, an "animal in a postgender world" (pp. 149, 150, 160). Case in point, ladies of color have a cyborg character, a subjectivity built from the merger of numerous "outcast characters" (p. 174). Audre Lorde (1984), an early champion of fashioning a group of contrasts, composed that survival relies on upon making associations with others distinguished 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). Sexual orientation, womanliness and manliness are at the core of characterizations of contrast, however what is required is a hypothesis of distinction that is not parallel since usthem talks legitimize abuse and mastery (Haraway 1991).

REFERENCES:

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.

Ashok Shivaji Yakkaldevi
Assistant Professor A.R. Burla Vartishta Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Solapur.