

ADVANCES IN LIFE COURSE RESEARCH VOLUME 7

NEW FRONTIERS IN SOCIALIZATION

EDITED BY

RICHARD A. SETTERSTEN, JR.

Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, USA

TIMOTHY J. OWENS

Purdue University, Indianapolis, USA

2002



JAI

An Imprint of Elsevier Science

Amsterdam – Boston – London – New York – Oxford – Paris
San Diego – San Francisco – Singapore – Sydney – Tokyo

ELSEVIER SCIENCE Ltd
The Boulevard, Langford Lane
Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, UK

© 2002 Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved.

This work is protected under copyright by Elsevier Science, and the following terms and conditions apply to its use:

Photocopying

Single photocopies of single chapters may be made for personal use as allowed by national copyright laws. Permission of the Publisher and payment of a fee is required for all other photocopying, including multiple or systematic copying, copying for advertising or promotional purposes, resale, and all forms of document delivery. Special rates are available for educational institutions that wish to make photocopies for non-profit educational classroom use.

Permissions may be sought directly from Elsevier Science Global Rights Department, PO Box 800, Oxford OX5 1DX, UK; phone: (+44) 1865 843830, fax: (+44) 1865 853333, e-mail: permissions@elsevier.co.uk. You may also contact Global Rights directly through Elsevier's home page (<http://www.elsevier.com>), by selecting 'Obtaining Permissions'.

In the USA, users may clear permissions and make payments through the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc., 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, USA; phone: (+1) (978) 7508400, fax: (+1) (978) 7504744, and in the UK through the Copyright Licensing Agency Rapid Clearance Service (CLARCS), 90 Tottenham Court Road, London W1P 0LP, UK; phone: (+44) 207 631 5555; fax: (+44) 207 631 5500. Other countries may have a local reprographic rights agency for payments.

Derivative Works

Tables of contents may be reproduced for internal circulation, but permission of Elsevier Science is required for external resale or distribution of such material.

Permission of the Publisher is required for all other derivative works, including compilations and translations.

Electronic Storage or Usage

Permission of the Publisher is required to store or use electronically any material contained in this work, including any chapter or part of a chapter.

Except as outlined above, no part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Publisher.

Address permissions requests to: Elsevier Science Global Rights Department, at the mail, fax and e-mail addresses noted above.

Notice

No responsibility is assumed by the Publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein. Because of rapid advances in the medical sciences, in particular, independent verification of diagnoses and drug dosages should be made.

First edition 2002

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
A catalog record from the Library of Congress has been applied for.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record from the British Library has been applied for.

ISBN: 0-7623-0863-X
ISSN: 1040-2608 (Series)

♾️ The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

Printed in The Netherlands.

CONTENTS

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

PREFACE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

PART 1: THE FIELD

NEW FRONTIERS IN SCIENCE

Timothy J. Owens and

1. SOCIALIZATION AND

NEW FRONTIERS IN

Richard A. Settersten

2. SELF-SOCIALIZATION

SOCIETY

Walter R. Heinz

3. LIFE CAREERS AND

Janet Zollinger Giele

PART 2: SOCIALIZATION

4. UNDERSTANDING ADULTHOOD: A CONCEPTUAL

APPROACH

Daniel M. Hyson

9. CAREERS AND LIVES: SOCIALIZATION, STRUCTURAL LAG, AND GENDERED AMBIVALENCE

Phyllis Moen and Robert M. Orrange

The Unevenness of Social Change

In times of rapid change in roles and relationships, old norms and templates are no longer relevant, but new ones have yet to emerge. This is particularly striking in the case of the gendered life course (Linton, 1942; Moen, 1992, 2001). For example, many women have been socialized to believe: (1) they can (and should) pursue and move up career ladders, and (2) they can (and should) simultaneously have a successful marriage and family life. Similarly, many "new age" men have come to believe: (1) they can (and should) continue to be the family breadwinners, following the traditional linear, male career path, and (2) they can (and should) actively participate in the carework of child rearing and domesticity on the home front. Yet jobs remain structured around the male breadwinner template of at least full-time (but typically more) continuous employment, wage scales have failed to keep pace with the costs of living, and women as well as men are in the workforce, increasingly, without any backups for carework.

Simultaneously, this traditional lock-step career path, characteristic of so many middle-class men in the middle of the 20th century, is becoming a shaky

proposition, even for white, educated, male professionals, as the (often implicit) social contract between employer and employee is being rewritten. Workers of all ages and stages find themselves vulnerable to restructuring and downsizing, with seniority no longer necessarily meaning security. Young, new entrants to the workforce can no longer plan to stay in the same job or with the same company for very many years.

In this "half-changed world" (see Orenstein, 2000; Moen, 1992, 2001), traditional agents of socialization do not provide guideposts but, rather, socialize young people to a sense of ambiguity and uncertainty regarding their own life biographies. Not only do the media, parents, and teachers offer mixed messages, but the structure of contemporary institutions (work, family, gender, retirement, and the life course) lag behind societal and personal expectations related to them. Individuals, therefore, must actively engage in the construction of their own life course in a world characterized by structural lag and conflicting signals. The resulting double binds produce a sense of ambivalence among many women and men regarding their own occupational and family career paths. Thus, not only young adults, but individuals of all ages, are scrutinizing formerly taken-for-granted schemes that guide behavior (for instance, about gender and age) and assessing their relevance and "fit" with emerging realities. The life course focus on human agency – that is, goal-oriented behavior aimed at strategies of adaptation to new situations (e.g. Clausen, 1986; Elder, 1998; Giele & Elder, 1998; Moen & Wethington, 1992; Settersten, 1999) – becomes especially salient in times of social change.

Socialization and Behavior

"Path dependence" is a term characterizing continuity in behavior, with actors tending to behave in the present and future much the same way as they have in the past. Socializing new generations to follow prescribed and predictable trajectories helps to ensure continuity in lives, organizations, and communities. But such blueprints become obsolete in the throws of a transition-in-progress, enabling (or requiring) individuals to forge their own trails, create their own scripts. In these circumstances, it is men's and women's *actual* experiences, not simply past socialization processes, that become forces of self-discovery and self-construction. A case in point is the baby boom generation of women born in the 1950s. What they learned at their mothers' knees – at least in white middle-class homes – were the traditional gendered roles of nurturer, caregiver, homemaker. But they grew up with the women's movement and the shift to a service economy, both of which opened educational and occupational doors closed to women of earlier generations. In the "Women's Roles and Well Being

ne (often implicit)
itten. Workers of
; and downsizing,
t, new entrants to
or with the same

992, 2001), tradi-
rather, socialize
ng their own life
mixed messages,
ender, retirement,
tations related to
struction of their
onflicting signals.
ong many women
paths. Thus, not
g formerly taken-
gender and age)
. The life course
d at strategies of
; Giele & Elder,
especially salient

avior, with actors
ay as they have
and predictable
nd communities.
tion-in-progress,
create their own
ual experiences,
of self-discovery
tation of women
at least in white
rturer, caregiver,
nd the shift to a
upational doors
and Well Being

Study," Dempster-McClain, Moen and Williams followed women first interviewed in upstate New York in the mid-1950s, reinterviewing them and their adult daughters thirty years later (Dempster-McClain & Moen, 1998; Moen, Dempster-McClain & Williams, 1989, 1992). They found that the daughters' own experiences as students, workers, wives, and mothers became the powerful socializing force in their lives, frequently contradicting lessons from childhood and creating new patterns and possibilities. At the same time, the mothers of the adult daughters in the study also benefited from the changing opportunity structure, many choosing to return to school, pursue paid or unpaid careers, and/or divorce (Bradburn, Moen & Dempster-McClain, 1995; Esterberg, Moen & Dempster-McClain, 1994; Moen & Erickson, 1995; Moen, Erickson & Dempster-McClain, 1997; Moen & Forest, 1990).

Structuration

"Structuration" refers to the ways institutionalized rules and routines: (1) shape (structure) behavior and social relations, and (2) allocate (structure) resources and rewards (Sewell, 1992; Settersten & Mayer, 1997; Riley, Kahn & Foner, 1994). But institutions also instill beliefs and expectations, socializing individuals as to the culture as well as structure of both occupational and family careers along with, more generally, life course paths and possibilities. The economy is the principal structuring and socializing institution in today's global culture. What is learned at home, in the classroom, and through the media – in childhood and adulthood – typically relates directly or indirectly to either labor force participation and/or consumerism (Schor, 1991, 1998). Occupation operates like a master role – providing identity and status as well as income, and locating individuals and their families in the larger social structure of rewards and resources. While individuals and groups may turn to their communities and social networks for a sense of belonging and security, these forms of support still have implications for their relationship to the larger economic system of opportunities and rewards.

But the contemporary economy is itself a transition-in-progress, transforming occupational career paths and producing structural uncertainties for today's workers. Since waves of downsizing and restructuring began affecting the middle class during the 1980s, managers and professionals, as well as production and service workers, have been encouraged to follow a new set of career rules. Those rules relate to remaining open to changing employment situations and new opportunities, and to letting go of expectations for long-term employment security (Handy, 1990; Kanter, 1995; Kotter, 1995). The competitive economic environment is such that many firms (and not simply manufacturers)

now follow lean production models (Harrison, 1994), as the markets in which many operate are increasingly global in scope, and such expanded competition often fosters winner-take-all outcomes (Frank & Cook, 1995). Given the new economic environment, firms are more likely to retain small cores of valued employees over the long-term, while striving to maintain more flexible arrangements with others, either by hiring temporary contract employees or by sub-contracting portions of their operations with smaller firms. There is also a powerful ideological component to new employment relationships between workers and employers: Perhaps to a greater extent than in the past, business culture has an especially prominent position in American society, with business elites achieving celebrity status in the mass media. As a result, more recent generations of young adults are being socialized via the mass media to the excitement, glamour, and uncompromising needs of business (Frank, 1997).

In this new business environment, workers are encouraged to take responsibility for and to manage their own careers. Those in professional and managerial positions commonly feel they must constantly seek out new work experiences that will help them stretch and grow, thus enhancing their capability to find the next job or project, which may or may not be with the same employer. This new employment model is at odds with, yet operates in uneasy proximity to, the traditional lock-step path, as companies strive to retain groups of skilled workers. Moreover, the lock-step male breadwinner template continues to shape both the structure of work and the culture of career development, providing conflicting messages to those wanting to achieve occupational success. This is a striking example of structural lag (Moen, 1994, 2001; Riley et al., 1994; Riley & Riley, 1994), predicated on the largely obsolete "organization man" model (White, 1970) of moving up an organizational and/or seniority ladder.¹ Current employees and young adults anticipating their occupational futures cannot assume that they will be given opportunities (should they desire them) to forge long-term relationships with single firms. At the same time, the male breadwinner template characterizes societal as well as employer expectations regarding work hours, work effort, and work continuity. And workers themselves, men and women, often strive to fit this male breadwinner blueprint in order to move up occupational ladders. Not only is the continuous "organization man" stereotype obsolete in today's economic environment, it also assumes someone else, a wife, is around to take care of family responsibilities. Thus, the broad changes in the economy and in the nature of career possibilities, along with the rise in women's workforce participation and the corresponding decline in full-time homemakers, mean that even those who have been socialized to the old lock-step breadwinner career model are likely to end up reassessing it at some point in their life course.

Such reassessments often are a consequence of biographical experiences (which are also gendered) – such as mergers and downsizing, job loss, shifts in occupational status, geographical mobility associated with one's own or one's spouses' job relocation, and/or scaling back on work responsibilities or aspirations in the context of family obligations.

GENDER AS SOCIALIZATION AND STRUCTURATION

Reconstructing Gender

While individuals are obviously socialized into particular gender role identities (in households, schools, and the workplace as well as through the media (see Bem, 1998, 1999), prevailing institutional structures serve to create and perpetuate gendered life courses. Gender as a social category – and a hierarchical one at that – is therefore constructed and reconstructed by ongoing rules and relations, even apart from socialization processes (Homans, 1958; Emerson, 1976; Linton, 1942; Moen, 2000, 2001). These rules and relations, moreover, lay the groundwork for and establish the normative templates that agents of socialization intentionally and unintentionally reproduce.

The fact is that variants of traditional gender roles continue to be constructed and reconstructed (Bem, 1998; Moen & Yu, 2000; Risman, 1998; Williams, 2000), despite the fact that ever fewer numbers of households can afford or even want the traditional male breadwinner/female homemaker lifestyle. Dual-earner households now outnumber traditional ones by roughly three to one (Clarkberg & Moen, 2001). What has changed is women's paid work role, not their carework role. And men are still expected, and expect themselves, to be full-time breadwinners. Thus, the lock-step career template persists in the organization of work and the structure of occupational careers, despite the reality of a changing workforce and changing economy. This structural lag is an impediment to the work/life effectiveness of all contemporary workers, male and female, as well as to their spouses and families (Moen, 2001; Riley & Riley, 1994). For example, this blueprint makes the prospect of reduced-hour work, even on a temporary basis in order to handle early childrearing responsibilities, highly problematic – in terms of benefits, advancement, and long-term job security (Hochschild, 1997; Moen, 2001; Epstein, 1999). Workplace and career security and success remain predicated upon a highly competitive model in which workers are expected to exhibit single-minded devotion to organizational goals. As a result, at least one adult in contemporary households tends to put in the long hours that “good” jobs in white-collar and blue-collar occupations require (Clarkberg & Moen, 2001; Moen & Yu, 2000).

Gendered assumptions and expectations are more than just ideas that individuals are socialized to embrace, they are embedded in the functioning of institutions, framing the parameters for social interaction. Nowhere is this more apparent in the opportunity structures of contemporary careers. As Williams (2000) and Moen (2001) argue, basic assumptions about ideal male workers having no caretaking responsibilities have defined the ways in which careers/work get defined both legally and in practice. Gender assumptions therefore shape and bend the passageways through which individuals must pass in order to be successful in their careers. Similarly, Risman (1998) argues that we must conceptualize gender as social structure, along the lines of West and Zimmerman's (1987) "doing gender" approach. She points out the way gender-based assumptions shape institutional, interactional, and individual domains of life. These assumptions, in tandem with a half-changed world, make negotiating work and family dimensions of life increasingly problematic.

The push toward the reconstruction of gendered roles and relationships has two important exceptions. First, employment is now required of poor women if they are to receive government support; and even middle-class women are seldom out of the labor force for long periods of time. This means that women's typical life course now involves the integration of paid work and carework, but within an occupational structure that presumes workers are without family responsibilities. Women typically confront these double obligations without the support of kin, neighbors, and friends, the network of careworkers that historically facilitated the paid work of poor women. Today the members of such networks are themselves either in the workforce or geographically dispersed. Moreover, growing numbers of men lack the support of a homemaker, an ingredient that was a crucial (though unacknowledged) component of the lock-step career blueprint.

Second, loyalty, hard work, and commitment no longer provide a formula for employment security in today's economy, for men or for women. Instead, career experts herald the idea of *employability* – not employment – security. Many employees signal their commitment to and investment in their jobs by working long hours. Thus, the life paths of both men and women are increasingly problematic.

Dual-earner couples and single parents seek to forge at best creative and at worst livable adaptations to a career template that is at odds with their family goals and responsibilities. The dilemmas of single parents – fulfilling two roles simultaneously – means for many the absence of secure, stable career paths. Many couples adopt strategies in response to the structural reality of the breadwinner career template and, in effect but not necessarily in intent, reproduce a variant of the traditional gendered division of labor. This typically involves *neotraditional* arrangements in which husbands pursue careers largely

in the manner of good providers, with their wives arranging their own employment around their husbands' careers (Moen, 2001; Moen & Yu, 2000; Quick & Moen, 2002; Schwartz, 1994). This strategy, in turn, reproduces gendered roles and relationships, with women expected, and often expecting, to manage paid work and carework while men are expected, and typically expect, to concentrate principally on paid work.

The More Things Change . . .

There remains deep ambivalence about **child rearing, especially given the difficulties of negotiating both full-time work and full-time parenting.** Moreover, individuals and couples negotiating contemporary occupational and family career paths are doing so in the face of outmoded institutional arrangements. Most resistant to change is the structure and **culture of work and of career paths.** Employers typically gauge the performance, commitment, and productivity of their employees based on **input (hours worked) rather than output (the end result of their labors).** Government wage and hour laws are geared to "at least" full-time employment.

The perpetuation of gendered work and family responsibilities may therefore reflect early socialization in the form of mixed messages at home, in the media, and in school. Yet equally important is ongoing *adult* socialization in workplace and household climates of cultural contradictions and structural lag laden with gendered prescriptions, options, and constraints. Individuals shape and reshape their goals and expectations through observation and experience, on the job and in the family throughout adulthood, accompanied by self-socialization in the form of adaptive strategies to a world of work grounded in the traditional lock-step model of careers.

SOCIALIZATION AS A LIFE COURSE PROCESS

Cohort Replacement and Adult Socialization

Socially defined life course and career patterns provide continuity in roles, relationships, and institutions across cohorts and over time. Processes of socialization (by example, exhortation, experience) and various agents of socialization (parents, spouses, schools, media, bosses, coworkers) serve to prepare each generation for the rules, roles, and relationships of adulthood. Socialization explanations are central to theories of social stability; what is more problematic is the role of socialization in times of fundamental transformations in the nature of the life course.

"Cohort replacement" is a key explanation of social change – as young cohorts of individuals, socialized to new ways of thinking, gradually replace older cohorts. From this vantagepoint, younger adults should expect to pursue more egalitarian occupation and family career paths than was true of the generations before them. And it is certainly the case that younger cohorts hold more egalitarian gender beliefs than do older cohorts. But the outdated breadwinner/homemaker template still structuring occupational careers and the privatization of carework (to families and women) means that young people continue to confront hard choices (e.g. Gerson, 1985; Orenstein, 2000) in constructing their life course, hard choices that also contribute to their ongoing adult socialization. As Gerson (1985) found, adolescent plans and expectations tend to get overwhelmed by the structural realities that individuals (and couples) confront.

A second explanation of social change assumes a "period" rather than "cohort" effect. Thus, a major shift in attitudes or behavior at a particular point in history is a result of a single event or a series of events that created discrepancies in expectations and values. The women's movement, in tandem with the growth of a service economy and social policies aimed at erasing gendered discrimination in the workplace, transformed the ways men and women think about gender and equality at work and in society at large (Epstein, 1988; Rosen, 2000). But even in these times of unprecedented social change in beliefs about gender and in the broadening of women's opportunity structure, contemporary norms, policies, and practices related to work and family careers continue to offer mixed messages and contradictory expectations, along with Hobson's choices in opportunities.

Both cohort replacement and period effects in the form of attitude changes through discrepant messages and experiences (in the broader culture and in personal biographies) operate to shape beliefs about work, family, and gender. But neither explanation can provide full understanding of the uneven processes of socialization, structuration, and social choice shaping work/life career paths over the life course.

Life Course Themes

The life course focus on the agentic self (e.g. Elder, 1998; Marshall, 2000) conforms with both traditional career development literature and the rational choice theory of decision-making (e.g. Becker, 1981). Individuals are assumed to make optimal choices in the context of constraints, once we make allowances for the fact that gender shapes those options and constraints. Men and women therefore choose career paths that best match their goals and values in light of

— as young cohorts
ultimately replace older
cohort to pursue more
of the generations
cohorts hold more
the outdated bread-
careers and the
that young people
renstein, 2000) in
te to their ongoing
s and expectations
duals (and couples)

period” rather than
at a particular point
that created discrep-
n tandem with the
erasing gendered
and women think
stein, 1988; Rosen,
ge in beliefs about
ure, contemporary
careers continue to
g with Hobson’s

f attitude changes
er culture and in
mily, and gender.
uneven processes
k/life career paths

Marshall, 2000)
and the rational
duals are assumed
make allowances
Men and women
values in light of

the gendered realities of the world in which they live. What the life course approach emphasizes, however, are four key propositions related to the choice process. First is the issue of *timing*. When individuals move in or out of school or the workforce, in or out of family roles, can have tremendous implications for their life chances and life quality, with early choices shaping the biographical pacing of lives (see Bradburn, Moen & Dempster-McClain, 1995; Han & Moen, 1999a, b; Moen & Han, 2001; Hogan, 1981). Thus, women and men who enter, exit, or reenter educational or career paths at various life stages, as well as those who precipitate or postpone marriage or parenthood (or forgo one or the other altogether), experience the opening up of some options and the closing of others.

Second, socialization, structuration, and choice are all *relational* processes, products of on-going interactions with parents, peers, spouses, employers, supervisors, coworkers, friends, neighbors. Because women are socialized to consider others’ needs and desires in shaping their own lives, their choices tend to be more constrained than those of men. A case example of this is the fact that women are more apt than are men to relocate, or to expect to do so, in favor of their spouses’ career advancement, not their own (Bielby & Bielby, 1992; Quick & Moen, 2001).

Third, socialization, allocation, structuration, and choice are all ongoing, dynamic processes, occurring throughout adulthood (see George, 1993; Jacobs, 1989; O’Rand, 1995, 1996a, b; Pavalko, 1997). The biographical pacing of work and family career trajectories and transitions reflect not only one or two choice points, but a series of adaptive strategies over the life course. Adult socialization on the job and in the home are often neglected by investigators who focus exclusively on socialization as fundamental only to the transition into adulthood (but see Kohn & Schooler, 1983; Mortimer & Simmons, 1978; Mortimer, Finch, & Kumka, 1982; Mortimer, Lorence & Kumka, 1986; Mortimer, 1996).

The fourth and final proposition of life course analysis is its emphasis on role contexts (see Elder, 1998; Moen, Dempster-McClain & Williams, 1989; Moen, 2000; Musick, Herzog & House, 1999). Gender, as we have discussed, is a key contextual consideration shaping life choices and chances, as are race and ethnicity, age, social class, occupation, education. These serve as markers of location in the larger social structure that allocates roles and resources across individuals.

Important as well is historical context, especially the changing economy and the changing workforce (see Moen, 2001; Newman, 1993), as well as both stable and changing social policies (see Mayer & Schoepflin, 1989). At the dawn of the 21st century, men and women are making educational, career, and

family choices in the context of economic uncertainty. They also do so within the context of structural and cultural lag in the organization of work and career paths, the absence of any major work/family policies in either the public or corporate sectors, and often their own learned ambivalence regarding gender, work, and family. As a result, individuals, couples, and households often make *pragmatic* rather than optimal choices (c.f. Breiger, 1995; Moen & Wethington, 1992).

Role and Stress Theories

Both social interactionism (e.g. Stryker & Statham, 1985) and other social role theories (e.g. Goode, 1960; Merton, 1957), as well as theories of the stress process (e.g. Pearlin et al., 1981; Pearlin & Skaff, 1996) emphasize the ways conflicting role demands and expectations can create cognitive dissonance and emotional distress. There is a gap between: (1) the reality of rising individual and societal expectations about gender equality and expanding options for women at work and men at home, and (2) the persisting organization of work based on the outmoded male breadwinner/ female homemaker template. This is reflected in a *socialization of ambivalence* – producing expectations, values, and goals directly at variance with one another.²

As they draw upon ideal expectations in actualizing adult roles, young adults may experience role- or status-set conflict, a response presaged by this sense of ambivalence. Nearly half a century ago, Merton (1957) defined such conflicts as occurring when two or more statuses occupied by a person involve expectations that clearly conflict with another. The obsolete breadwinner/homemaker template – evident both in the organization of work and family career paths and in the socialization of norms and expectations – produces for all but the few who can actually follow such a blueprint precisely such conflicts. Consider new parents who want to be attentive to the needs of their children while struggling to move up career ladders (which themselves are less stable than in the middle of the 20th century). New mothers especially, but also new fathers, may find themselves torn between the highly demanding and contradictory expectations of these two divergent institutions.

In addition to ambivalence, young adults today also experience a good deal of *ambiguity* about how to perform key adult roles (Bush & Simmons, 1982; Eccles, 1987). The absence of clearly defined, taken-for-granted life patterns raises questions as to what the nature and extent of their investment in each of these roles should be. Given the conflicting opportunity structure and potentially unrealizable cultural ideals for work and family roles (e.g. the “good mother,” the “good worker”),³ consider how individuals and couples must

grapple with
(Merton,
only a fuzz

Given (I
the uncertain
and job sec
pate in an
course, you
gize to env
(1998) in-d
his middle-
one of amb
arranging th

We have d
work/family
But there is
ization. Wit
course, wh
for some, t
and exits o
objective ro
to develop
orientations
understandi
a view of th
1979) and
commensur
the life cou

In contex
gizing in th
referred to
contempora
fragmented.

In his th
shifting nat
During the
1960s, and

grapple with their *uncertain futures*. The process of anticipatory socialization (Merton, 1957) that used to ease the transition into adulthood today provides only a fuzzy roadmap.

Given (1) the ambiguity of mixed messages and conflicting expectations, (2) the uncertainty of the future (especially in terms of occupational career ladders and job security), and (3) the ambivalence associated with wanting to participate in and succeed in both occupational and family dimensions of the life course, young adults often engage in pragmatic experimentation as they strategize to envision and forge workable life paths. This is captured in Wolfe's (1998) in-depth study in which he found that the modal work/family pattern of his middle-class respondents was neither traditional nor modern, but, rather, one of ambivalence, a blend of both modern and traditional ideals, along with arranging their lives in a "whatever works" approach.

Socialization for Uncertainty: The Mutable Self

We have discussed two key transformations-in-progress that have shaped the work/family interface: changing gender roles and the changing career contract. But there is yet another, related, transformation: the trend toward individualization. With the absence of taken-for-granted scripts for the contemporary life course, what is increasingly evident is an expansion of individual choice (or, for some, the semblance of choice) in terms of whether and when role entries and exits occur (related to jobs, education, marriage, and parenthood). But such objective role shifts have a subjective component as well, as individuals struggle to develop and sustain a sense of self and to cope with change in terms of orientations and commitments to role-based identities over the life course. An understanding of contemporary socialization into work and family roles requires a view of the self as both social product and social force (Ryff, 1985; Rosenberg, 1979) and theories of self conceptualization and personal identity that are commensurate with the assumption of continuous socialization and change over the life course.

In contemporary times, we witness uneven changes and pragmatic strategizing in the work/family arena emerging alongside of what has often been referred to as the *postmodern predicament*. This concept highlights how, given contemporary social and cultural transformations, the self has fractured, fragmented, and split into multiple and contradictory self-investments.

In his thesis about the mutable self, Zurcher (1972, 1977) describes the shifting nature of self in response to institutional uncertainty and social change. During the peak of the tumultuous cultural and political revolutions of the 1960s, and coinciding with the emergence of a powerful movement for

women's liberation, Zurcher (1972) was among the first to note a shift in the reported self-conceptions of college students. This shift involved movement away from self-conceptions based solidly in social/institutional roles to ones rooted more in styles of behavior, ambivalence, and the questioning of neatly ordered role paths. His notion of the mutable self is highly complementary with the focus on choice, reflexivity and risk associated with the dilemmas of the self in the late modern age by such European social theorists as Giddens (1991) and Beck (1992), along with Heinz's thesis about self-socialization (this volume).

The centrality of both work and family life highlight how, for many, the struggle for self-definition emerges at the intersection of these core life domains. In line with Zurcher's thesis (1972), the uneven changes in gender roles and career paths within the broader society can act to create tensions surrounding the previously taken-for-granted ways in which individuals come to understand and define themselves. As research on young adults demonstrates (Orrange, 1999, 2002), individuals struggle over how to forge coherent sets of institutional commitments given perceived uncertainties in, and ambiguities related to, structural and cultural lag in gender and career options and scripts. As young adults strategize as to how to integrate the multiple aspects of their lives, and do so with significant others, they face structural conditions and uncertainties which, in turn, force them into a reflective stance with respect to their own self definitions – including their own uncertainty, ambiguity, and ambivalence about the viability of sustaining various work/family role commitments. Research (described in the next section) suggests that this process of working out the relationships between work and family roles occurs in the form of an ongoing dialog between institutional and reflective components of self. The individuals we interviewed desire to forge institutional commitments, while at the same time harboring feelings of uncertainty, ambiguity, and ambivalence. Given uneven transformations in the institutions of gender, work, family, and the contemporary life course, the issue of defining the future – the flip side of ongoing socialization into adulthood – is not simply one of deciding what one wants, but also of struggling to come to terms with workable alternatives, and of having some idea of what one might realistically sacrifice in the process. And, given conditions of rapid social change, this shift toward a reflective self-orientation may prove adaptive for the individual. The capacity to view one's role involvements from a reflective distance permits individuals to move beyond old scripts, strategizing to creatively adapt to novel situations.

In the following sections we draw upon in-depth interviews with members of middle-class couples from the Cornell Couples and Careers Study and from a sample of advanced professional school students (for more information on

Careers a
the samp
Orange,
men and
encompa
to embar
As the i
socializa

CASH

The Neo
Young, c
in a wor
tion in t
relations
learned t
their own
and inter
far more
relations
the ranks
work an
ambiguit
policies
workers
unpaid c
Consid
corporat
years. H
to invest
to speak
she will
children
husband
kids." H
way to r
would fo
work ou

the samples and studies see Becker & Moen, 1999; Clausen, 1993; Moen, 2003; Orange, 1999). We seek to highlight the plans and aspirations of middle-class men and women who are in the *anticipatory* phases of the life course, one that encompasses those in their 20s who are either single or married, but all soon to embark upon occupational careers. Most also plan to soon to begin families. As the illustrative case materials will show, their plans for the future reflect socialization in a half-changed world (see also Orenstein, 2000).

CASE EXAMPLES: WORK AND FAMILY "CAREERS"

Men's Expectations: Double Visions

The Neotraditionals

Young, educated, middle-class adults in their mid-twenties have come of age in a world in which ideas about women's equality, with respect to participation in the public sphere of work as well as the value placed on egalitarian relationships between spouses, are commonplace. Thus, many young men have learned these values either at home (through observations of or lessons from their own parents), or, more likely, in school (through educational experiences and interaction with women, particularly in higher education). It has also become far more acceptable for men to express desires to have families and close relationships with children. However, among the privileged men soon to join the ranks of professionals, we observed some contradictory expectations about work and family roles for men and women. These reflect the uncertainty, ambiguity, and ambivalence we see emanating from the structural lag in policies and practices that have failed to keep pace with the fact that most paid workers are married to other paid workers, and most workers are or will be unpaid careworkers at some point in their lives.

Consider Tom, a law student who aspires to build a career in finance and corporate law, and is already engaged, planning to marry over the next five years. He envisions himself as "always being the provider," yet he also hopes to invest a great deal of time and energy in family life. He does not claim to speak for his fiancée's career expectations, but notes that he does not think she will want to "stay at home all the time, or even for too long after having children." He also admits that he does not imagine himself as being a "house-husband, running a legal office out of the house and staying home with the kids." However, he also notes that, should the need arise, they would find a way to make sure that at least one of them was home with the kids. His ideal would for his wife to find some type of flexible occupation where she could work out of the house on a part-time basis, in order to be available for the

children. About his own career prospects, he expects to move from firm to firm over the years, assessing that long-term careers in any one firm are possible for only about 5 to 10% of professionals nowadays. Tom therefore sees a neotraditional lifestyle, with himself as breadwinner and his wife, employed in a less demanding job, accommodating to their family and his career needs. There is ambiguity related to his wife's role and ambivalence concerning his own role investments: he wants to work hard, engaging in career hopping to move up the occupational ladder but also wants to spend time with his family.

Along similar lines, Gary, an MBA student interested in working as an independent financial investment agent, talked about his hopes that his wife will pursue her own satisfying job in her own special area of interest. And while he feels that his wife would not want to be a "big corporate attorney, or anything like that," he would "love to see her work" that it would be "great." When he discussed having children, he said he honestly feels that they would move towards more "traditional worker and homemaker roles." But, more importantly, he would like her to have options, such that "if she wants to stay home and take care of the kids, more power to her." But, "if she wants to work, and get some help until they are old enough to take care of themselves" that would be fine too. He would support her, while at the same time "realizing that the family would be the most important consideration." This neotraditional lifestyle Gary envisions is grounded in total acceptance of the male as provider. Ambiguity and ambivalence, for Gary, lie in what is feasible for his wife.

These men seem fairly typical in that they seem to have been socialized to a good many of ideals we normally associate with women's equality. They are not, in theory, against the progressive ideals embodied in prescriptions of equal options in the workforce, regardless of gender. However, as they begin to reflect upon the actual practice of egalitarianism, and how their own plans for the future might be implicated by the actualization of these ideals, these men become more vague and less specific, conveying an ambivalence about their wives' occupational careers, especially when children enter the picture. These result in movement toward a *neotraditional* model. Nonetheless, they do seem to have a real degree of flexibility about their views of the future, and how they might make arrangements with their spouses in order to accommodate both their separate and shared role demands for the betterment of all. On the one hand, they do not have pat or neatly defined views about how their roles will be allocated. On the other hand, they remain driven by modified visions of the provider role, visions grounded in the recognition of the lock-step breadwinner career template as the measure of productivity and success.

While most identify with the idea of law degree, was serious considering "never married" very important professional demands advantages professional to bring in if one spouse

But, in work kids "who with "latch and his future and even at home and discussion, become a p associates. lot of uncertainty of reflectivity ships. The anything for

Consider Je it big - either law school aspirations. spouse, and blocks she the kind of and be will order," and

move from firm to firm. In any one firm are many days. Tom therefore is a winner and his wife, a loser. Their family and his ambivalence make it hard, engaging in work. He also wants to spend

working as an independent contractor. He feels that his wife will be of interest. And while she is a corporate attorney, or a consultant, it would be "great." He feels that they would have different roles." But, more important, "if she wants to stay at home, but, "if she wants to work, she can care of themselves" and he can do the same time. This is a consideration." This is a consideration of the feasibility of the arrangement in what is feasible

have been socialized to value gender equality. They are given prescriptions of equal roles. As they begin to reflect on their own plans for the future, these men show ambivalence about their roles in the picture. These men, regardless, they do seem to have a vision of the future, and how to accommodate both roles. Of all. On the one hand, they know their roles will be defined visions of the breadwinner

Dual Committed or Alternative Paths?

While most of the men soon to graduate with law and MBA degrees seem to identify with "providing," there are a few who clearly desire and grapple with the idea of forging egalitarian relationships. Mark, a student finishing up his law degree, is one of these men. While single at the time of our interview, he was seriously involved with another professional school student, and they were considering marriage at some point in the future. He discussed how he could "never marry" somebody who would want to stay at home, as he feels it is very important to marry someone who could understand the kinds of professional demands that he is bound to face. He talked about what he imagines the advantages would be of both spouses working, such as having a lot in common professionally, and also that there would be a "lot less pressure on who is going to bring in the money if you have two people bringing in two paychecks. Then, if one spouse is unemployed, it "isn't the end of the world."

But, in wanting to be part of a dual-career couple, Mark worries about having kids "who know their nanny better" than their parents, that he might end up with "latch-key kids." He also struggles over whether, upon having kids, he and his future spouse would be able to continue to function as professionals, and even cut back their hours, so that they could "leave at five o'clock and be home and have the family dinner and have weekends together too." In a later discussion, he talked about how he has grave uncertainties about trying to become a partner with a large law firm, given the demands placed upon young associates. As we have discussed, operating in a world in flux can generate a lot of uncertainty and ambivalence, and at the same time, demand a good deal of reflectivity from individuals with respect to their future roles and relationships. The people we interviewed find they are unable or unwilling to take anything for granted!

Women's Expectations: Double Binds

High Commitment – and Hedging – at Work and at Home

Consider Jennifer, a law student in her mid-twenties, who is intent upon making it big – either in the field of law or consulting. She decided not to date during law school so that relationship issues would not interfere with her career aspirations. She is one of the women who strive to have it all in terms of career, spouse, and children; yet she is particularly aware of some of the stumbling blocks she may face over time. First, she has "very definite standards" as to the kind of person she hopes to marry, in that he would have to be "successful" and be willing to "help out half" at home. She admits that this is a very "tall order," and should she not be able to actualize her aspirations, she notes that

"if it comes down to it, [she will] sacrifice the career." Such ambiguity and ambivalence in confronting the dilemmas of work and family life among the women we interviewed are fairly common. But, for now, she is prepared to move full-speed ahead. Jennifer talked about how she plans to have children, and hopes to do so without interrupting her career plans. She, like many others interviewed, does not expect a great deal of mutual loyalty between herself and the firms she will work for. And she imagines a scenario in which she develops a good deal of expertise in her field of law over a period of about five years or so, and then takes some maternity leave, begins retooling, and makes the switch over to consulting. Clearly this is a fragile scenario; however, given the structure of the labor market and of professional careers, one cannot extract much more from an uncertain future.

Alternative Arrangements

Amy is another MBA student, in her mid-twenties, who wants to have a professional career and someday a family as well. Her future aspirations involve hedging between her hopes versus expectations in terms of the kinds of family involvement that she might expect from a future husband, as she already has a serious boyfriend/fiancé who is also in professional school. In describing the kind of relationship she would like to have with a future spouse, Amy notes that her "preference would be that both myself and my husband want to take time off [to care for children] and would want to share" family responsibilities. However she "anticipates" that a "lot of men still consider the woman to be more of a caretaker." Like Jennifer, Amy also has imagined a scenario in which she might be able to take time off upon having children, yet maintain her professional status and not get sidetracked from her career. During her previous work experience she knew "people who have had positions that [she] would love to be able to emulate where they have worked hard, they have gained a reputation, and so now they can create their own work arrangements [such as] working from home part of the time."

Interestingly, Amy also imagines another creative alternative to starting a family with a spouse someday, and that is to live near a group of close friends whom she has known since she was a teenager. She plans to locate near to these friends upon graduating from business school, and emphasizes that they "have always been at the core of [her] life." In fact, should she not be married by age thirty-five, she imagines herself having or adopting a child and relying upon close friends to provide social support.

A small segment of students in professional schools we interviewed are interested in finding ways to invest large amounts of time in their families when their children are young, yet simultaneously worry about whether they will be able

Careers a
to do so,
profession
orientation
in such a
other." E
always w
describing
children,
planet, be
she would
around fir
after havin
her back o
her limited
lawyer she
not take a
she gets h
be someth
ambiguity

Gendered
While the
individual
anticipatin
dual-earne
capture a
a couple
of the nee
interest he
career plan
We find, i
Consider
and are in
see how M
toward gre
plans. Mo
constant e
her own ca

"Such ambiguity and family life among the low, she is prepared to plans to have children, She, like many others ty between herself and in which she develops od of about five years ooling, and makes the nario; however, given ers, one cannot extract

wants to have a profes- re aspirations involve of the kinds of family nd, as she already has hool. In describing the re spouse, Amy notes husband want to take e" family responsibili- consider the woman to imagined a scenario in children, yet maintain er career. During her ad positions that [she] orked hard, they have wn work arrangements

ternative to starting a group of close friends plans to locate near to emphasizes that they uld she not be married ng a child and relying

s we interviewed are in their families when hether they will be able

to do so, either for financial reasons or because fear they will be marginalized professionally. Liz, a young law student, represents a good illustration of this orientation. She envisions allocating work and family roles with a future spouse in such a way that "they're the same." He works, [she] works, they "help each other." Except, upon having kids, she envisions things will "shift a little," but always within the context of "a lot of give and take, a partnership really." But in describing her views about what she would like to arrange once she begins having children, Liz notes that she "would probably get chastised by everybody on the planet, because it is no longer PC," but if she "were in the position not to work, she would like not to work until [the kids] are big." Her main concerns revolved around finding a way to maintain a hand in her professional career; hoping that, after having worked with a law firm for a number of years, they might want to hire her back on a part-time basis as a consultant. However, she has also learned from her limited work experience that this is not always possible, and mentions a female lawyer she came to know who has a small child and works a long day. She "does not take a lunch, and she goes full out those twelve hours that she is there, and then she goes home and that is her time with her baby." Liz commented how that would be something she would be "willing to do," but her ambivalence and general ambiguity around how to manage it all is clearly evident.

Couples' Strategies: Double Divisions

Gendered Biographies, Uncertain Futures

While the study of law and MBA students provides insights as to how individual young men and women aiming for professional careers go about anticipating their own futures, in-depth interviews with both members of dual-earner couples from the Cornell Couples and Careers study allow us to capture a process of mutual strategizing and socialization, as each member of a couple modifies or adjusts his or her own aspirations for the future in light of the needs and goals of their spouse and their gender. What is of greatest interest here is the process by which wives have historically modified their own career plans and aspirations to protect or accommodate their husbands' careers. We find, in effect, that the more things change, the more they stay the same.

Consider the case of Molly and John, both of whom have advanced degrees and are in their late twenties. They do not as of yet have children, but we can see how Molly's career decision-making process has already undergone a shift toward greater uncertainty and ambivalence, given her husband's more definite plans. Molly speaks of her husband John's career plans as having been "totally constant ever since he was three." She reports becoming more uncertain about her own career plans, noting that she is not really sure "sometimes whether I am

making a decision purely because of myself, or because of [their relationship] and how it might work out, which is frustrating." She also notes that part of the problem lies in the fact that they have come together during a time in which she is "still indecisive" about career and hasn't "known what I wanted as much, and he has known all along what he's wanted." Therefore, she feels that "for him there's no question of compromise because he's not making any decisions," yet for her, "there's always a question of compromise, because I am constantly revising what I want to be doing ten years from now." As she notes, "It's hard to make those decisions without taking into account where I know my husband will be, or what he will be wanting to do in any case." In effect, Molly's spouse John is an agent of socialization, creating a framework out of which Molly believes she will have to develop and fit her own career aspirations.

But the reverse is not the case. In a separate interview, John discusses how, despite Molly's traditional upbringing, he has always encouraged her to pursue a career. However, in describing his own career plans, it seems as though his more egalitarian ideals get squeezed out. He notes that while he "wants her to have one, sometimes she's ambivalent about whether she even wants a career - she goes through stages where she would like to be a housewife. Her mom is a housewife, and so, she fights that instinct." Ideally, he would "want her to have a career, and then take care of the kids, and then have a career again." And he notes "being happy in my mind is to have a career. And in some ways, I'm really not your sensitive 90s guy. I think I really should want her to have a career and us to like flip a coin to see who stays home with the kids. But I would die, I would just shrivel up and die if I had to do that." Perhaps it would be possible for both of them to pursue careers; however, John claims "we are not making enough to have a nanny, but neither of us wants a nanny, and neither of us likes day care either. So I don't know that we've really figured it out what we're going to do, but I'm assuming that she's going to give up what she's doing when we have kids."

These two interviews (occurring separately and privately) reflect what was common in the Cornell Couples and Careers Study: the dilemmas of young (and older) couples confronting a world of mixed messages and lagging possibilities. During times of rapid social change, socialization and, hence, expectations about the future, can create contradictory, ambivalent expectations between both members of a couple, as well as within each person.

Gendered Transitions

While the case materials just presented provide some indication of socialization for uncertainty and ambiguity in the plans and aspirations of young adults, other

in-depth into individuals and into how social a variety of to have conflicts tap and occupational

Brenda and
The case of is in his late expectations hypothetical.

Brenda tall studies, she happen to he months off f subject" between "has been di does "not thi Brenda's poi family life. I children dem the central f invested ever manifest; she her husband's Still, as she left holding t

Jeff, on the they have neg having childr even though is pursuing a each week a as no proble morning" and His career pr while Jeff an in practice t

of [their relationship] notes that part of the time in which she wanted as much, and she feels that "for him making any decisions," yet she is constantly revising. She notes, "It's hard to know my husband will do it, Molly's spouse John, which Molly believes as.

John discusses how, encouraged her to pursue it seems as though his while he "wants her to even want a career housewife. Her mom would "want her to have a career again." er. And in some ways, would want her to have with the kids. But I hat." Perhaps it would, John claims "we are wants a nanny, and t we've really figured he's going to give up

tely) reflect what was e dilemmas of young ges and lagging possi- alization and, hence, mbivalent expectations ch person.

ication of socialization of young adults, other

in-depth interviews (also from the Cornell Couples and Career Study) with individuals and couples at various stages of the life course offer key insights into how socialization processes interact with important life transitions, eliciting a variety of responses. Recall how John and Molly, only in their 20s, appear to have conflicts looming on the horizon as they contemplate parenthood. These conflicts tap into deeply ingrained beliefs about gender in the areas of family and occupational career, along with beliefs about gender equity.

Brenda and Jeff

The case of Brenda, a woman in her mid-thirties, and her husband Jeff, who is in his late-thirties, illustrates how contradictory, submerged, or unrealized expectations early in a marriage can create problems once children are no longer hypothetical. They have two children, both preschoolers nearing school age.

Brenda talks about how when she was an undergraduate minoring in women's studies, she was determined not to let the "second shift" (Hochschild, 1989) happen to her. However, after their first child was born, Brenda took fifteen months off from work, while Jeff did not make any such change – "a sore subject" between them. Brenda notes that she feels as though much of her life "has been dictated by his academic and employment plans," noting that she does "not think he would agree with that" but that is what she thinks. From Brenda's point of view, "she is the cog that makes everything turn" in their family life. However, she is not sure that this is a good thing because the children demand more from her as a result of it, as she has become even more the central focus of their attention. Furthermore, Brenda feels that Jeff has invested even more in his work in recent times. Brenda's ambivalence is manifest; she is torn between work and family goals and responsibilities, while her husband's growing commitment to work seems to exacerbate her problems. Still, as she points out, someone must take care of the family, and she feels left holding the bag.

Jeff, on the other hand, reports much more satisfaction with the way in which they have negotiated their work and family responsibilities. He, too, admits that having children "locked them into more traditional gender-stereotyped roles," even though "philosophically" they did not plan life that way. He currently is pursuing a second advanced degree, in addition to working about 60 hours each week as a departmental director. But Jeff views the heavy workload as no problem as he "loves" his job and "can't wait to get to work in the morning" and would "stay forever" if he did not have family responsibilities. His career provides him with a real source of "meaning and identity." In effect, while Jeff and Brenda have similar ideals about gender roles in the abstract, in practice they have gravitated towards rather different standards, which

seems to reflect the pragmatic constraints of a work world still geared toward the lock-step career template of workers unencumbered by family responsibilities (see also Moen, 2001; Williams, 1999). In the face of these constraints, the couple strategizes in terms of cultural models of carework and paid work, deeper gendered processes of socialization to different sets of rewards and commitments.

Jeff's experiences also speak to the fact that, in a world in which socialization messages are multiple and contradictory, there is greater opportunity to self-socialize (Heinz this volume) through experience. However, one person's unrestrained pursuit of what they come to realize as their life's fulfillment can actually place quite a burden upon their partner, should their life plans diverge. Brenda had hoped that both she and Jeff would be able to make a balanced commitment to both family and career upon having children; she resists the neotraditional arrangement he is so comfortable with.

Given their discrepant expectations about how to allocate work and family roles, it is not surprising that parenthood has left Brenda and Jeff in a conflictual arrangement. But, even for couples whose expectations are more in alignment, the transition into parenthood typically results in wives increasing their investment in the family while husbands increase their commitment to work (see also Becker & Moen, 1999). This shift toward more traditional gender roles often generates feelings of ambivalence on the part of wives more than husbands in dual-earner couples.

Gina and Gregg

A case in point is Gina, a woman in her late twenties expecting twins at the time of our interview. She was experiencing a good deal of ambivalence about her situation, which she describes in terms of the contradictory messages and experiences internalized over the years pertaining to both the importance of occupational careers and the importance of commitment to one's family. Gina is grappling with the dilemma over whether to continue with her career or to take an extended leave in order to stay home to be with the twins. She mentions how her mother worked outside of the home the entire time she was growing up, commenting, "I have always known that I would be in somewhat of a dilemma when it came time [to have children] because I love children and because I didn't have that [someone waiting at home]. I felt I had missed out on something." Like the respondents in Gerson's (1985) study, Gina is reacting (not conforming) to early socialization by her mother, contributing to her current feelings of ambivalence.

Gina describes her husband as being "open minded" about whatever she decides to do. The depth of her ambivalence became especially apparent when

the interviewer
or family-cente
centered becau
ago I might h
working to im
would have pr

By contrast,
to any type o
family roles. I
means for us t
and raise our
our succeeding
I have to. I lo
he does not h
one income. T
Gregg, we find
of the associat
fact, unencum
rary middle-cl

Beth and Jame

While one the
based socializa
of change in th
source of this
androgynous r
uncertainties a
of lifetime em
to see more ca
tional careers
occupational p

Consider B
they were mar
James struggle
nature of his
would ultimate
However, Beth
career had en
ultimately sett
for a good m

ld still geared toward
y family responsibil-
of these constraints,
work and paid work,
sets of rewards and

d in which socializa-
reater opportunity to
owever, one person's
life's fulfillment can
eir life plans diverge.
to make a balanced
ldren; she resists the

ate work and family
d Jeff in a conflictual
e more in alignment,
creasing their invest-
ent to work (see also
al gender roles often
ore than husbands in

pecting twins at the
of ambivalence about
dictory messages and
h the importance of
o one's family. Gina
with her career or to
twins. She mentions
ne she was growing
e in somewhat of a
I love children and
felt I had missed out
udy, Gina is reacting
buting to her current

about whatever she
cially apparent when

the interviewer asked whether she views herself as being more work-centered or family-centered. She replied, "I must say that right now I am more family-centered because I am expecting twins in three months. Maybe about six months ago I might have answered differently. I was still getting my master's and working to improve myself. I love my job, and I love working with people. I would have probably said work then, but now my life has taken a twist."

By contrast, her husband Gregg, a man in his early thirties, does not allude to any type of dilemma with respect to their plans for allocating work and family roles. He notes, "First and foremost, my work will hopefully be the means for us to survive and raise a family. I hope that my wife can stay home and raise our children as a housewife. That's going to be an integral part of our succeeding as a family. I don't expect to spend more time at my job than I have to. I look forward to being at home with her and the babies." However, he does note how difficult it is in this day and age for a family to survive on one income. That doing so can create a lot of "pressure." As with Gina and Gregg, we find the lock-step (male) breadwinner template, along with a variant of the associated (female) careworker template enabling breadwinners to be, in fact, unencumbered workers, continues to drive the views of many contemporary middle-class, professional dual-earner couples (Moen, 2003).

Beth and James

While one theme of this chapter involves the persistence of traditional gender-based socialization processes and outcomes, there has also been a good measure of change in the way in which gender roles are allocated among spouses. One source of this change involves socialization of both males and females to more androgynous roles; another important source of change is experience. Given the uncertainties associated with contemporary career trajectories and the demise of lifetime employment contracts between firms and employees, we can expect to see more cases in which couples give some initial priorities to the occupational careers of husbands, but over time that priority shifts to wives' occupational prospects.

Consider Beth and James. While both have been employed since the time they were married, they began their marriage in a rather conventional mold. James struggled to get his career on track and, due to the highly specialized nature of his work, the couple made several moves in the hopes that James would ultimately find a good position. James never found that perfect niche. However, Beth's career as a manager did eventually take off. And, while James' career had entailed making numerous moves, the position in which he has ultimately settled, while not ideal in terms of prestige and success, does allow for a good measure of flexibility. Beth's high-level, demanding managerial

position allows for little flexibility. In fact, she often must work long hours in order to get the job done. But James has the flexibility in his workplace to be able to do a lot of the pick-ups and drop-offs with child-care providers, school and social activities, and has also been able to spend a great deal of time with their ten-year old son, something James has come to greatly value. As Beth notes, "My husband spent a lot of time with our son and that made it easier for me to pursue my work. Between our wonderful nanny and my husband I felt very supported in my career. If my husband had had a job like mine, it would have bothered me terribly." In effect, this couple had been socialized to one set of complimentary roles and priorities, but the nature of the job market was such that they had to shift into a new set of roles and priorities, which, upon enactment, has proved to be satisfying for both.

CONCLUSIONS

These case examples underscore the complexity of socialization processes in times of social change. Work and family no longer represent taken-for-granted roles that are learned through anticipatory socialization and played out according to conventional scripts, even though the heavy hand of these scripts continues to shape institutions and behavior. We have described three key processes we believe perpetuate the gendered life course: socialization, structuration, and the unevenness (structural lag) of social change. Our case materials demonstrate that old road maps to the work/family nexus may be obsolete but still permeate the culture and structure of paid work and carework, limiting individuals' and families' *ad hoc* strategies in a world in which both egalitarianism and gendered lock-step career templates coexist in individuals' motivations and opportunities. Socially learned cultural norms and scripts as well as practical experience continue to influence the choices individuals and couples make in the face of these outmoded blueprints of carework and paid work. Our thesis is that the shifting nature of gender, families and occupational careers, along with the structural and cultural lag in all three, are generating a good measure of uncertainty, ambiguity and ambivalence in individuals and couples of all ages, but especially those in their 20s and 30s, anticipating or launching both occupational and family life paths. A life course model leads to a dynamic, contextual, and relational focus on work and family careers. From this vantagepoint, the work/family nexus has become both the progeny of outmoded career blueprints and the lightening rod of gender negotiations and strategies. It can also be the harbinger of innovative structural leads – less gendered blueprints for the life course (Moen, 2001, 2003). We conclude by discussing connotations of the contemporary work/family career conundrum for both scholarship and society.

Sociologi
exists wit
tations ar
varied fo
beings hu
into certa
of the m
learned a
age and
is drama
subjectiv
b; Setters

But in
experien
tion), an
contradic
taken-for
more con

Gender
thus prov
The soci
life path
a vivid i
well as
complex
socializa
there are

The li
of indivi
geared fo
and wom
taking fr
socializa
are strug
distincti
still tend
and soci
for-grant

Implications for Socialization Theory and Research

Sociologists remind us that individuals live *in society*, but also that society exists *within* the hearts and minds of individuals, in the taken-for-granted expectations and rules for living absorbed directly and indirectly through the rich and varied formal and informal socialization processes that operate to make human beings human. Thus, as Riley (1987) points out, individuals are both allocated into certain social categories and positions and socialized to choose them. Some of the most fundamental allocation processes and deeply ingrained lessons learned are the rules, roles, relationships, expectations and identities related to age and gender, paid work and carework, and their **multiple intersections**. This is dramatically illustrated in Settersten and Hagestad's research on people's subjective timetables for work and family events (Settersten & Hagestad, 1996a, b; Settersten, 1997).

But in times of major social upheaval – such as those we are currently experiencing in gender, work, and family roles – the *society within* (socialization), and the *society without* (structuration) each signal multiple and contradictory messages, making what might have been men's and women's taken-for-granted work and family career paths in more stable conditions now more confusing, complicated and controversial.

Gendered occupational and family careers as they intersect over the life course thus provide a strategic site for the study of both socialization and social change. The socialization to – and structuration of – the fundamental role-identities and life paths associated with gender, paid work, and carework are in flux, offering a vivid illustration of the intricate interplay between biography and history, as well as the negotiated life courses of individual men and women. The complexity and constructed nature of gendered life course patterns through socialization and structuration processes are easier to discern at times when there are ambiguous, even conflicting, rules of the game.

The life course theme of human agency points to the strategic adaptations of individuals and families confronting social institutions and cultural templates geared for the middle of the 20th century, not the dawn of the 21st. Thus, men and women strategize to construct their own life courses, their own career paths, taking from the mixed messages of multiple agents of childhood and adult socialization what best fits their own goals and circumstances. In doing so they are struggling to create new realities in a world of less gendered options and distinctions (Epstein, 1988), but a half-changed world nevertheless, where wives still tend to make occupational career sacrifices in order to do the families' – and societies' – carework. Scholars can fruitfully reexamine their own taken-for-granted assumptions about linear, individual, and lock-step (typically male)

occupation career paths and about the work/family nexus itself, which is too often couched as a "women's" issue (see also Moen & Han, 2001).

Implications for Policy and Practice

Social and organizational policies and practices structure the contemporary life course to follow the traditional breadwinner/homemaker template: from schooling as preparation for occupational careers, through the absence of supports for workers with family responsibilities, to the long hours expected for advancement and security, and to Social Security benefits figured around a scenario of uninterrupted full-time employment (Kim & Moen, 2001; Moen, 2001). Women's typically more intermittent pathways are a consequence of both white middle-class men's and women's socialization to breadwinner/homemaker scripts (assigning to women the brunt of domestic responsibilities even when they are in the workforce), and a strategy to deal with the contradictions and work/family conflicts this blueprint engenders.

We have seen that individuals and couples strategize ways in which to live and to make a living on an ad hoc basis, taking the structure of work and occupational career paths as given. Thus, workers (typically women) may "scale back" on their career goals and obligations in order to better meet family goals and obligations, and/or couples may invest in one spouse's (typically his) career (Becker & Moen, 1999; Clausen, 1993; Pavalko & Elder, 1993; Sorensen, 1983; Moen & Yu, 2000) or else relocate to accommodate to their spouse's jobs (Lichter, 1982; Markham & Pleck, 1986).

What is less readily acknowledged – by governments, corporations, and workers themselves – is the degree to which the male breadwinner/female homemaker script is embedded in social and corporate policy and the degree to which this no longer fits the experiences of the contemporary workforce (Moen, 2001; Moen & Forest, 1999). Even the landmark Family and Medical Leave Act (passed by President Clinton in 1993) is predicated on the traditional template – offering a brief, unpaid reprieve from the demands of what are typically highly demanding and draining jobs. The nature of the jobs themselves, and the career paths they constitute, remain unchanged. And, because leaves are unpaid, the spouse with the lower income (typically the wife) is most apt to take such leave, thus reinforcing gendered divisions and inequalities. Family strategies are often private solutions to what are really public issues related to the outmoded breadwinner/homemaker career templates.

What is required is a reassessment of the organization of work and of occupational careers, restructuring both to better recognize the domestic realities of contemporary workers' lives. Most workers are married to other

workers, and
someone else
relatives, dai
career paths
bered worker
5-day, 40-ho
policies mor
part-time wo

Greater flex
would sociali
their occupat
This is somet
gap between
nity supports
on the other.
norms built
of lagging po
ically to grea
and couples
with no singl

1. Consider
how extensivel
able to assume
women to ensu

2. For furth
(1998).

3. See the d

This research
(Sloan FDN

Beck, U. (1992).
Becker, P. E.,

Journal

self, which is too (2001).

contemporary life template: from the absence of hours expected figured around a en, 2001; Moen, consequence of adwinner/home- responsibilities even the contradictions

in which to live work and occu- (men) may "scale meet family goals (ally his) career Sorensen, 1983; r spouse's jobs

corporations, and er/female home- degree to which ce (Moen, 2001; ical Leave Act itional template at are typically hemselves, and ause leaves are is most apt to alities. Family ssues related to

f work and of the domestic arried to other

workers, and few – married or single, male or female – have the luxury of someone else to take on full time the carework associated with children, aging relatives, daily living. But most policies around work hours and occupational career paths still presume the lock-step breadwinner template of the unencumbered worker. For example, the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act established the 5-day, 40-hour work week as the norm. It, along with ways ERISA, and pension policies more generally, makes it more costly for employers to hire two part-time workers than one full-time one.

Greater flexibility and multiple pathways to success in the occupational sphere would socialize young men and women to the true possibilities of integrating their occupational and personal lives and relationships in less gendered ways. This is something to which many aspire but are unable to implement given the gap between the organization of occupational careers and the absence of community supports for working families on the one hand, and the reality of their lives on the other. The workplace still operates upon implicit assumptions and cultural norms built up around the male breadwinner ideal. Removing the constraints of lagging policies and practices, and inventing structural leads geared specifically to greater coherence of paid work and carework, will enable individuals and couples to create social change through devising effective strategies, but with no single pattern dominating men's or women's contemporary life course.

NOTES

1. Considerable research remains to be done before the debate can be settled as to how extensively this new employment model prevails (Sullivan, 1999). It seems reasonable to assume that firms will likely continue to need groups of organization men and women to ensure their smooth operation.

2. For further discussion of the concept of ambivalence, see Lüscher and Pillemer (1998).

3. See the discussion of these ideals in Hays (1996) and Moen (1992).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by grants from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation (Sloan FDN #96-6-9 and #99-6-23, Phyllis Moen, principal investigator).

REFERENCES

- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. Translated by Mark Ritter. London: Sage.
- Becker, P. E., & Moen, P. (1999). Scaling back: Dual-career couples' work-family strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 995-1007.

- Bem, S. L. (1999). Gender, sexuality, and inequality: When many become one, who is the one and what happens to the others? In: P. Moen, D. Dempster-McClain & H. A. Walker (Eds), *A Nation Divided: Diversity, Inequality, and Community in American Society* (pp. 70-86). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bielby, W. T., & Bielby, D. D. (1992). I will follow him: Family ties, gender-role beliefs, and reluctance to relocate for a better job. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1241-1267.
- Bradburn, E. M., Moen, P., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1995). An event history analysis of women's return to school. *Social Forces*, 73, 1517-1551.
- Breiger, R. (1995). Social structure and the phenomenology of attainment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 21, 155-236.
- Bush, D. M., & Simmons, R. G. (1982). Socialization processes over the life course. In: R. H. Turner & M. Rosenberg (Eds), *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives* (pp. 133-164). New York: Basic Books.
- Clarkberg, M., & Moen, P. (2001). Understanding the time-squeeze: Married couples preferred and actual work-hour strategies. *American Behavioral Scientist*.
- Clausen, J. A. (1986). *The life course: A sociological perspective*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Clausen, J. A. (1993). *American lives*. New York: Free Press.
- Dempster-McClain, D., & Moen, P. (1998). Finding respondents in a follow up study. In: J. Z. Giele & G. H. Elder, Jr. (Eds), *Methods of Life Course Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (pp. 128-151). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Eccles, J. S. (1987). Gender roles and women's achievement-related decisions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11, 135-172.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. (1998). The life course as developmental theory. *Child Development*, 69, 1-12.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27, 31-41.
- Epstein, C. F. (1988). *Deceptive distinctions: Sex, gender, and the social order*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Epstein, C. F. (1999). *The part-time paradox: Time norms, professional lives, family, and gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Esterberg, K. G., Moen, P., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1994). Transition to divorce: A life course approach to women's marital duration and dissolution. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 35, 289-307.
- Frank, R. H., & Cook, P. J. (1995). *The winner-take-all society: How more and more Americans compete for ever fewer and bigger prizes, encouraging economic waste, income inequality, and an impoverished cultural life*. New York: Free Press.
- Frank, T. (1997). *The conquest of cool*. Chicago: The University Press.
- George, L. K. (1993). Sociological perspectives on life transitions. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 19, 353-373.
- Gerson, K. (1985). *Hard choices: How women decide about work, career, and motherhood*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the later modern age*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Giele, J., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (1998). *Methods of life course research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Goode, W. I. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 483-496.
- Han, S.-K., & Moen, P. (1999a). Clocking out: Temporal patterning of retirement. *American Journal of Sociology*, 105, 191-236.
- Han, S.-K., & Moen, P. (1999b). Work and family over time: A life course approach. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences*, 562, 98-110.

- Handy, C. (1990). *The age of consent*. New York: Basic Books.
- Harrison, B. (1990). *flexibility and the gender divide*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hays, S. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Heinz, W. R. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- T. J. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- (Vol. 1) (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hochschild, A. (1997). *The time bind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hochschild, A. (1997). *The time bind*. New York: Basic Books.
- York: Basic Books.
- Hogan, D. P. (1992). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Academy Press.
- Homans, G. C. (1950). *The social behaviorist*. New York: Free Press.
- Jacobs, J. A. (1993). *American lives*. New York: Free Press.
- University Press.
- Kanter, R. M. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schuster, J. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kim, J., & Merton, R. K. (1992). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- In: M. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Wiley-Interscience.
- Kohn, M. L., & Schoen, R. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schoen, R. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- stratification. New York: Basic Books.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Free Press.
- Lichter, D. T. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Science Press.
- Linton, R. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lüscher, K., & (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- of parenthood. New York: Basic Books.
- Markham, W. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- ment: S. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Marshall, V. (2000). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Paper presented at the 15th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, 15, Washington, DC, 1995.
- Mayer, K. U., & (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- 15, 187-190.
- Merton, R. K. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Moen, P. (1992). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Moen, P. (1999). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- M. W. R. (1995). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- People's Choice Award. New York: Basic Books.
- John Wiley & Sons.
- Moen, P. (2000). *The new work ethic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cornell University Press.
- Burdens of Work. New York: Basic Books.
- Economic Journal. New York: Basic Books.

- Handy, C. (1990). *The age of unreason*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Harrison, B. (1994). *Lean and mean: The changing landscape of corporate power in the age of flexibility*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hays, S. (1996). *The cultural contradictions of motherhood*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Heinz, W. R. (2001). Self-socialization and post-traditional society. In: R. A. Settersten Jr. & T. J. Owens (Eds), *Advances in Life Course Research: New Frontiers of Socialization* (Vol. 7, pp 41-64). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Hochschild, A. (1989). *The second shift*. New York: Avon Books.
- Hochschild, A. (1997). *The time bind: When work becomes home and home becomes work*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Hogan, D. P. (1981). *Transitions and social change: The early lives of American men*. New York: Academic Press.
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social behavior as exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 597-606.
- Jacobs, J. A. (1989). *Revolving doors: Sex segregation and women's lives*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kanter, R. M. (1995). *World class: Thriving locally in the global economy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kim, J., & Moen, P. (2001). Moving into retirement: Preparation and transitions in late midlife. In: M. Lachman (Ed.), *Handbook of Midlife Development* (pp. 487-527). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kohn, M. L., & Schooler, C. (with collaboration of Miller, J., Miller, K. A., Schoeback, C., & Schoenberg, R.). (1983). *Work and personality: An inquiry into the impact of social stratification*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). *The new rules: How to succeed in today's post-corporate world*. New York: Free Press.
- Lichter, D. T. (1982). The migration of dual-worker families: Does the wife's job matter? *Social Science Quarterly*, 63, 48-57.
- Linton, R. (1942). Age and sex categories. *American Sociological Review*, 7, 589-603.
- Lüscher, K., & Pillemer, K. (1998). Intergenerational ambivalence: A new approach to the study of parent-child relations in later life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 413-445.
- Markham, W. T., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). Sex and willingness to move for occupational advancement: Some national sample results. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 27, 121-143.
- Marshall, V. (2000). Agency, structure, and the life course in the era of reflexive modernization. Paper presented at 95th annual meeting of the *American Sociological Association* (August 15), Washington, D.C.
- Mayer, K. U., & Schoepflin, U. (1989). The state and the life course. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 187-209.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Moen, P. (1992). Women's two roles: A contemporary dilemma. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Moen, P. (1994). Women, work and family: A sociological perspective on changing roles. In: M. W. Riley, R. L. Kahn & A. Foner (Eds), *Age and Structural Lag: The Mismatch Between People's Lives and Opportunities in Work, Family, and Leisure* (pp. 151-170). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moen, P. (2000). Promoting workforce effectiveness and life quality: Early evidence from the Cornell couples and careers study. In: E. Appelbaum (Ed.), *Balancing Acts: Easing the Burdens and Improving the Options for Working Families* (pp. 61-84). Washington, D.C.: Economic Policy Institute.

- Moen, P. (2001). The Career Quandary. *Population Reference Bureau Reports on America*, 2(1)(Feb.).
- Moen, P. (Ed.) (2002). *It's about time: Couples and Careers*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Moen, P., Dempster-McClain, D., & Williams, R., Jr. (1989). Social integration and longevity: An event history analysis of women's roles and resilience. *American Sociological Review*, 54, 635-647.
- Moen, P., Dempster-McClain, D., & Williams, R., Jr. (1992). Successful aging: A life course perspective on women's roles and health. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1612-1638.
- Moen, P., & Erickson, M. A. (1995). Linked lives: A trans-generational approach to resiliency. In: P. Moen, G. H. Elder, Jr. & K. Lüscher (Eds), *Examining Lives in Context: Perspectives on the Ecology of Human Development* (pp. 169-210). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Moen, P., Erickson, M. A., & Dempster-McClain, D. (1997). Their mother's daughters? The inter-generational transmission of gender role orientations. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 281-293.
- Moen, P., & Forest, K. B. (1999). Strengthening families; Policy issues for the twenty-first century. In: M. B. Sussman, S. K. Steinmetz & G. W. Peterson (Eds), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family* (pp. 633-663). New York: Plenum Press.
- Moen, P., & Forest, K. B. (1990). Working parents, workplace supports, and well-being: The Swedish experience. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53, 117-131.
- Moen, P., & Han, S.-K. (2001). Gendered careers: A life course perspective. In: R. Hertz (Ed.), *Work and Family: Today's Realities and Tomorrow's Visions* (pp. 42-57). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Moen, P., Harris-Abbott, D., Lee, S., & Roehling, P. (1999). *The Cornell couples and careers study*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Employment and Family Careers Institute.
- Moen, P., & Wethington, E. (1992). The concept of family adaptive strategies. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 233-251.
- Moen, P., & Yu, Y. (2000). Effective work/life strategies: Working couples, work conditions, gender and life quality. *Social Problems*, 47, 291-326.
- Mortimer, J. T., & Simmons, R. G. (1978). Adult socialization. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 4, 421-454.
- Mortimer, J. T., Finch, M. D., & Kumka, D. S. (1982). Persistence and change in development: The multidimensional self-concept. In: P. Baltes (Ed.), *Life-Span Development and Behavior* (Vol. 4, pp. 263-313). Monterey, CA : Brooks/Cole Publishing.
- Mortimer, J. T., Lorence, J., & Kumka, D. S. (1986). *Work, family, and personality: Transition to adulthood*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Mortimer, J. T. (1996). Social psychological aspects of achievement. In: A. C. Kerkoff (Ed.), *Generating Social Stratification: Toward a New Generation of Research* (pp. 17-36). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Musick, M. A., Herzog, A. R., & House, J. S. (1999). Volunteering and mortality among older adults: Findings from a national sample. *Journal of Gerontology*, 54B, S173-S180.
- Newman, K. S. (1993). *Declining fortunes: The withering of the American dream*. New York: Harper Collins.
- O'Rand, A. M. (1995). The cumulative stratification of the life course. In: R. H. Binstock & L. K. George (Eds), *The Handbook of Aging and the Social Sciences* (4th ed.). San Diego: Academic Press.
- O'Rand, A. M. (1996a). Linking social structures to personal development. In: A. Weymann & W. R. Heinz (Eds), *Society and Biography: Interrelationships Between Social Structure, Institutions and the Life Course* (pp. 67-81). Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag.

- O'Rand, A. M. (1996b). T and cumulative adv
- Orenstein, P. (2000). *Flux*: Press: New York.
- Orrange, R. M. (1999). S family life. (Unpubl Institute) Revised M
- Orrange, R. M. (2002). A life. *Journal of Fam*
- Pavalko, E. K., & Elder, C of husbands' career
- Pavalko, E. K. (1997). Bey M. A. Hardy (Ed.). *Issues* (pp. 129-147
- Pearlin, L. I., Menaghan, E of Health and Socie
- Pearlin, L. I., & Skaff, M Gerontologist, 38, 2
- Quick, H., & Moen, P. (trajectories. (unpubl
- Riley, M. W. (1987). On t 1-14.
- Riley, M. W., Kahn, R. L., meaningful opportu
- Riley, M. W., & Riley, R. L. Kahn & A. Meaningful Opport & Sons.
- Risman, B. J. (1998). *Gene*
- Rosen, R. (2000). *The wor* New York: Penguin
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Cor*
- Ryff, C. D. (1985). The su and the Life Course
- Schor, J. B. (1991). *The ove* Books.
- Schor, J. B. (1998). *The ove* York: Basic Books.
- Schwartz, P. (1994). *Peer n*
- Settersten, R. A., Jr. (1997).
- Settersten, R. A., Jr. (1999); science. Amityville,
- Settersten, R. A., Jr., & Hag transitions. *The Ger*
- Settersten, R. A., Jr., & Ha educational and wor
- Settersten, R. A., Jr., & Ma course. *Annual Revi*

- merica, 2(1)(Feb.). University Press.
- and longevity: An *Sociological Review*, 54,
- ng: A life course, 97, 1612-1638.
- to resiliency. In: *Text: Perspectives* D.C.: American
- ghters? The inter- *e and the Family*,
- enty-first century. *of Marriage and*
- well-being: The
- n: R. Hertz (Ed.), 42-57). Berkeley:
- ples and careers
- Annual Review of*
- conditions, gender
- of Sociology*, 4,
- e in development: *ment and Behavior*
- lity: *Transition to*
- C. Kerkoff (Ed.), *urch* (pp. 17-36).
- ality among older 173-S180.
- ream. New York:
- r. H. Binstock & n ed.). San Diego:
- A. Weymann & *Social Structure*, en Verlag.
- O'Rand, A. M. (1996b). The precious and the precocious: Understanding cumulative disadvantage and cumulative advantage over the life course. *The Gerontologist*, 36, 230-238.
- Orenstein, P. (2000). *Flux: Women on sex, work, love, and life in a half-changed world*. Doubleday Press: New York.
- Orrange, R. M. (1999). Self, reflectivity and the life course: Making adaptations for work and family life. (Unpublished Manuscript of the Cornell Employment and Family Careers Institute) Revised March 2000.
- Orrange, R. M. (2002). Aspiring law and business professionals' orientations to work and family life. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23, 287-317.
- Pavalko, E. K., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (1993). Women behind the men: Variations in wives' support of husbands' careers. *Gender and Society*, 7, 548-567.
- Pavalko, E. K. (1997). Beyond trajectories: Multiple concepts for analyzing long-term process. In: M. A. Hardy (Ed.), *Studying Aging and Social Change: Conceptual and Methodological Issues* (pp. 129-147). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pearlin, L. I., Menaghan, E., Liberman, M. A., & Mullan, J. T. (1981). The stress process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 22, 337-356.
- Pearlin, L. I., & Skaff, M. M. (1996). Stress and the life course: A paradigmatic alliance. *The Gerontologist*, 38, 239-247.
- Quick, H., & Moen, P. (2002). Careers in competition? An analysis of couples' employment trajectories. (unpublished manuscript).
- Riley, M. W. (1987). On the significance of age in sociology. *American Sociological Review*, 52, 1-14.
- Riley, M. W., Kahn, R. L., & Foner, A. (1994). *Age and structural lag: Society's failure to provide meaningful opportunities in work, family, and leisure*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Riley, M. W., & Riley, J. W., Jr. (1994). Structural lag: Past and future. In: M. W. Riley, R. L. Kahn & A. Foner (Eds), *Age and Structural Lag: Society's Failure to Provide Meaningful Opportunities in Work, Family, and Leisure* (pp. 15-36). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Risman, B. J. (1998). *Gender vertigo*. New Haven: Yale.
- Rosen, R. (2000). *The world split open: How the modern women's movement changed America*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Rosenberg, M. (1979). *Conceiving the self*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ryff, C. D. (1985). The subjective experience of life-span transitions. In: A. S. Rossi (Ed.), *Gender and the Life Course* (pp. 97-113). New York: Aldine Publishers.
- Schor, J. B. (1991). *The overworked American: The unexpected decline of leisure*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schor, J. B. (1998). *The overspent American: Upscaling, downshifting, and the new consumer*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schwartz, P. (1994). *Peer marriage: How love between equals really works*. New York: Free Press.
- Settersten, R. A., Jr. (1997). The salience of age in the life course. *Human Development*, 40, 257-281.
- Settersten, R. A., Jr. (1999). *Lives in time and place: The problems and promises of developmental science*. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing.
- Settersten, R. A., Jr., & Hagestad, G. O. (1996a). What's the latest? Cultural age deadlines for family transitions. *The Gerontologist*, 36, 178-188.
- Settersten, R. A., Jr., & Hagestad, G. O. (1996b). What's the latest? II. Cultural age deadlines for educational and work transitions. *The Gerontologist*, 36, 602-613.
- Settersten, R. A., Jr., & Mayer, K. U. (1997). The measurement of age, age structuring, and the life course. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 233-261.

- Sewell, W. H., Jr. (1992). A theory of structure: Duality, agency, and transformations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 98, 1-29.
- Sorensen, A. (1983). Women's employment patterns after marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 311-321.
- Stryker, S., & Statham, A. (1985). Symbolic interaction in role theory. In: G. Lindsey & E. Aronson (Eds), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 311-378). Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum.
- Sullivan, S. E. (1999). The changing nature of careers: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Management*, 25, 457-484.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society*, 1, 125-151.
- White, H. C. (1970). *Chains of opportunity: System models of mobility in organizations*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Williams, J. (2000). *Unbending gender*. New York: Oxford.
- Wolfe, A. (1998). *One nation after all*. New York: Viking.
- Zurcher, L. A. (1972). The mutable self: An adaptation to accelerated socio-cultural change. *Et Al*, 1, 3-15.
- Zurcher, L. A. (1977). *The mutable self: A self-concept for social change*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.