DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 622 CG 023 615

AUTHOR Huyck, Margaret Hellie; And Others
TITLE Gender across Generations: Patterns of Similarity between Young Adults and Their Middle-Aged and Aging Parents.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Mental Health (DHHS), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE 8 Feb 91
CONTRACT ROI-MH36264
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Gender and the Family presented by the Women's Research Institute of Brigham Young University and the Utah Governor's Commmission for Women and Families (Provo, UT, February 7-10, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Children; Age Differences; *Middle Aged Adults; *Parent Child Relationship; Sex Differences; *Sex Role; *Socialization; Social Theories; *Young Adults
IDENTIFIERS Generation Effect

ABSTRACT

Biological sex remains a powerful source of differential socialization and experience. These studies were designed to enhance the understanding of gender identity, the psychosocial aspects of sexual differentiation. The focus was upon changes and continuities, in terms of development along the adult life course and as reflective of social change. Personal reports of characteristics that have been considered indicative of masculinity and femininity were compared for men and women in two generations. Respondents were drawn from a larger study of young adult children and their parents who lived in or around a Midwest suburb. The families were selected to represent the more stable, family-centered, "traditional" segment of contemporary American Society. Study I included analyses of responses by 115 triads of mother, father, and young adult child to a standard measure of gender-linked self-attributions. Study II drew upon personal interview data about gender conceptualizations, and utilized a coding system developed for this research to identify gender-congruent, gender-expanded, and gender-compromised styles of experiencing gender. The sample for Study II included 105 fathers, 134 mothers, 66 sons, and 67 daughters. The analyses provided evidence of differences between generations which may be linked to social changes or to developmental patterns, and continuities which seem to reflect transmission within families and the child's movement into adult family roles. (ABL)

GENDER ACROSS GENERATIONS:

PATTERNS OF SIMILARITY BETWEEN

YOUNG ADULTS AND THEIR MIDDLE-AGED AND AGING PARENTS

Prepared for discussion

Friday, February 8, 1991,

3:15-4:45 Session on Gender Issues Out of the Ordinary

International Conference on

GENDER AND THE FAMILY

Sponsored By
Women's Research Institute &
Conferences and Workshops
Brigham Young University, Provo Utah
Utah Governor's Commission for Women & Families

Margaret Hellie Huyck, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Illinois Institute of Technology
Chicago, Illinois 60616
Phone (312) 567-3517

Pninah Zucker, Ph.D.
Ravenswood Hospital, Chicago, Il.

Cheryl Angelaccio, M.S.
Illinois Institute of Technology

Christine de Grange, B.A.
Illinois Institute of Technology

[DRAFT of 1/21/91: Do not copy or cite without permission.]

GENDER ACROSS GENERATIONS:

PATTERNS OF SIMILARITY BETWEEN YOUNG ADULTS

AND THEIR MIDDLE AGED AND AGING PARENTS

Margaret Hellie Huyck
Illinois Institute of Technology

Pninah Zucker **Cheryl Angelaccio** **Christine de Grange**

[DRAFT of 1/21/91 prepared for discussion at the International Conference and Gender and The Family, Brigham Young University, February 6-8, 1991. DO NOT PUBLISH OR CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION.]

I. OVERVIEW AND INTRODUCTION

The research reported here is designed to enhance our understanding of gender identity, those psychosocial aspects of sexual differentiation. The focus is upon changes and continuities, in terms of development along the adult life course and as reflective of social change. Personal reports of characteristics which have been considered indicative of masculinity and femininity are compared for men and women in two generations. Respondents are drawn from a larger study of young adult children (aged 21-31) and their parents (aged 43-78). All respondents are caucasian Americans, living in or around Midwest "Parkville." The families were selected to represent the more stable, family-centered, "traditional" segment of contemporary American society. Two related studies are summarized here. Study I includes analyses of responses to a standard measure of gender-linked self attributions, the PRF-Andro; respondents include 115 triads of mother, father, and young adult child (57 sons and 58 daughters). Study II draws upon personal interview data about gender conceptualizations, and utilizes a coding system developed for this research to identify gender-congruent, gender-expanded, and gender-compromised styles of experiencing gender. The sample for this second analysis includes 105 fathers, 134 mothers, 66 sons, and 67 daughters; comparisons are made between generations, and within same-sex parent-child dyads. The analyses provide evidence of differences between generations which may be linked to social changes or to developmental patterns, and continuities which seem to reflect transmission within families and the child's movement into adult family roles.

GENDER ACROSS GENERATIONS

OUTLINE

A. Gender Development

It is no secret that biological sex remains a powerful source of differential socialization and experience. Biological dimorphism is reflected in gender, those social and psychological concomitants of sexual differentiation. Models attempting to explain the patterns of differentiation observed, across the lifecourse, historical periods, cultures, and subcultures, are varied (Huyck, 1989a, 1990). The basic arguments concern the relative importance of underlying biogenetic predispositions ("nature") and various kinds of experiences ("nurture"); the more contemporary models stress the interaction of both, focusing on ways in which individuals selectively respond to experiences and even evoke some experiences and avoid others (Loevinger, 1987; Plomin, 1990).

Biogenetic models assume that differential structures resulting from genetic coding carried on the 23rd chromosomal pair are implicated in complex expressions of sex-dimorphic behavior. Coding for internal and external reproductive structure and function differences, overall body appearance, and some immunities are carried on these chromosomes. Evidence from behavioral genetics (Plomin, 1990), which examines patterns of transmission of characteristics according to genetic relatedness, suggests that some personality dispositions have a genetic component; however, environmental influences are very important in shaping the potentials. There is little evidence that specific patterns of gender role beliefs or behavior are passed on genetically (Plomin, 1990), even though some of the appetites and inclinations that we associate with gender have an inherited component. In any event, this research is not focused on identifying patterns of genetic transmission (which requires comparing persons varying in genetic relatedness). Rather, the emphasis here is on describing some of the patterns which may be linked to "nurture".

All cultures (as far as we know) socialize males and females differently, where socialization is understood as the lifelong process of shaping an individual's behavioral patterns, values, standards, skills and motives to conform to those regarded as desirable in a particular society (Hetherington and Parke, 1975). Males are socialized with an emphasis on agency, an orientation based on the "concern for the organism as an individual" while women are socialized with an emphasis on communion, the orientation that is "concerned with the organism as part of a larger organism" (Bakan, 1966). This study is concerned with a particular dimension

of the socialization process, the development of gender role identity. Gender role, as defined by Block (1984), includes the constellation of qualities an individual understands to characterize males or females in the culture.

Two of the major models of socialization would lead us to expect substantial congruence on gender within each family, though with different rationales. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1969) assumes that individuals learn about appropriate gender behavior through observational learning. The earliest, and most influential models are assumed to be those within the family, particularly parents. Learning theory generally assumes that early learning is particularly influential, since responses learned early are generalized to subsequent similar situations. Psychodynamic theory also assumes that gender role learning occurs within the family, during the early childhood years; the process involves intense emotional relationships between the child and both parents. The child identifies with the same-sex parent, but presumably learns crucial lessons about appropriate interaction patterns from the opposite-sex parent (Johnson, 1963). While these models have important differences in the importance they place upon various processes, and participants, for the analyses presented here they are similar in predicting that we would find substantial same-sex congruence in parent-child dyads. While most of the research on these models has been done with young children (Block, 1984), the influence is presumed to extend into adulthood.

Social cohort theory (Baltes & Nesselroade, 1972) takes social cognitive learning further, by asserting that the generational cohort of an individual will have profound, lasting influence on socialization. This perspective emphasizes the influence of the larger social culture upon socialization, asserting that children and adolescents, particularly, are influenced by models and realities outside the family, as much as by those within it. Images of males and females presented in the media, economic opportunities and need for labor of various kinds, wars, the ratio of "marriage age" men to women, and availability of family planning may all be crucial in shaping gender roles. Each generational cohort is presumed to have experienced somewhat distinctive social norms, particularly in eras of marked social change. The cohort model would predict that generational differences in this study would be evident, with young adults showing less evidence of gender-stereotypic behaviors than the middle-aged parents; we would expect to see the most differences between mothers and daughters.

Another form of life span developmental model emphasizes the potential of continued learning throughout adulthood, with changes in any kind of behavior (including gender-linked behaviors) responsive to individual experiences. Such lifespan theorists postulate that different life situations call for differential gender role orientations, and that gender role orientations are determined by their utility to the individual in a given situation (Abrahams, Feldman, & Nash, 1978). Such models, unlike those of the socioevolutionary theories, postulate no innate or "necessary" patterns to change, or to the kinds of behaviors and attributes which might become associated with one sex or another. If such patterns are discovered, it is presumed that they reflect the influence of shared socialization and social realities, rather than internally-driven or constructed realities. To the extent that such models are accurate, we would expect to see no predictable patterns of similarity or difference between generations or within families, since the circumstances guiding gender development would be quite idiosyncratic.

One of the more recent models emphasizes a cognitive developmental or cognitive schema perspective on gender (Deaux & Kites, 1987; Kohlberg, 1966). The basic premise of these models is that the child develops a mental scheme for differentiating male and female at the same time and in the same ways that other cognitive distinctions and categorizing abilities are developing. Basic categories are developed early, beginning in the second year of life and elaborated quite impressively by the time most children go to formal school. Kohlberg (1966) based his model on Piaget's classic observations that young children are highly intelligent creatures, intent upon organizing their perceptions of the world--but that their reasoning is typically "illogical" (Loevinger, 1987). Thus, many (if not most) of the early organizing schemas about gender may be irrational, based upon flawed understandings of adult realities. In this model, these early cognitive conceptualizations continue to exert substantial influence over the course of life, because additional cognitions are assimilated into those "basic" conceptualizations, and all experiences are filtered through these early frameworks. Cognitive frameworks can be changed, of course, as Piaget pointed out; social interactions that are contrary to even firmly-held conceptions will modify those cognitions over the course of time. This model assumes that sex will continue to be an important categorizing reality, but that the content of those cognitions or schemas about males and females may well differ as observed realities change.

The models reviewed thus far all place substantial emphasis on the importance of contemporary social realities in shaping gender role identities, even though some think what was "contemporary" during the early years will endure, and some allow for continued learning throughout adulthood. One model places far more emphasis on the possibility of more universal patterns of behavior, differentiating males from females, and younger from older in broadly-predictable ways. Socioevolutionary models assume that characteristics which promote species or subgroup adaptations and survival are maintained genetically and socially, making such characteristics slow to change. Characteristics which are adaptive may change over the life course, in response to fairly widespread patterns of changed responsibilities.

For example, a number of theorists and researchers (summarized in Gutmann, 1987) have proposed that the gender-linked personality modes described as agentic (Bakan, 1966), active mastery (Gutmann, 1987), justice (Gilligan, 1982), or masculinity characterize males during their first half of adulthood much more than during the later years; and that the "feminine" stance of communion, passive-accommodative mastery or caring are more evident among younger women than among older women. Gutmann has proposed (1975, 1987) that such shifts are linked, through evolution, to responsibilities involved in parenting. His model is based upon the traditional, enduring realities that species and cultural survival requires adequate parenting (and willingness to fight for one's tribe); human infants demand both physical and emotional security to develop their potentials, and they require such securities for a relatively long time. He has argued that the 'parental imperatives' involved in providing emotional security for dependent children serve to reinforce the more accommodative, peacemaking capacities among mothers while encouraging repression of her more assertive (or assaultive) tendencies; good fathers, like the ones in this sample who take seriously their charge of providing physical security for their children, tend to repress their own dependency needs and focus on the active mastery aspects of their potential. However, as children demonstrate their ability to survive on their own, the parents can relax -- and reclaim those aspects of self repressed in the service of parenting. To the extent this is an accurate model, we will expect to find shifts in the gender role styles of the parents, whereby the fathers are less resolutely and stereotypically masculine than are their sons, and mothers are less restrictively feminine than their daughters.

B. Reciprocal Socialization

Most of models of socialization or "influence" imply that the senior generation is shaping or molding the younger generation; such models imply a one-direction model of influence. This is not the model which we regard as the only promising one, though we agree there is substantial evidence to support it. Two of the models reviewed hold open the possibility that influence may be mutual or reciprocal between the generations.

The general lifespan learning model would certainly assume that conditional reinforcements and modeling may be exercised by persons of any age; particularly when dealing with adults, persons of a younger age (such as one's own children, or younger employees) may model and/or reinforce behaviors which are contrary to those in one's traditional repertoire. Under the conditions of learning specified in general behavior modification models, there is no reason why younger persons should not be influential upon older persons. Thus, young adult daughters who challenged their husbands to share householding tasks, and their supervisors to promote them -- and succeeded without notable penalty -- would provide different models for both mothers and fathers.

With different explanatory premises, contemporary psychodynamic models would also assume that changes observed in either generation (or gender) might be predicated in changes in the other. For example, Gutmann's model is based on an assumption about the ways in which intimates project aspects of themselves onto others in order to deal with contemporary life realities. In his model, fathers often "project" their own vulnerability and desires for protection onto their wives and young children; this simply means that while they would find such tendencies intolerable in themselves because such desires (or fears) would threaten their capacity to feel like the reliable, confident provider, these tendencies are tolerable in those they cherish and protect. We are, thus, not talking about a form of psychopathological projection as much as a form of normal adaptive projection, recognizing and accepting in an other what is unacknowledgable and unacceptable in the self. He argues that women do similarly with aggressive/ competitive inclinations: they are delighted to see these qualities in their husbands, when directed at competitors and forces outside the family, but are often uncomfortable recognizing the extent of their own aggressive potential as mothers of vulnerable children.

However, in this system when children emerge into independence, the parents are freed up to reclaim the repressed aspects of self. For example, the father who has repressed his own more passive/accommodative inclinations and his own desires to be comforted and even indulged, may "relax" --when his own son has demonstrated his maturity by assuming adult vocational and family responsibilities. In this model, influence is certainly reciprocal, with generations influencing each other even though the influences may be covert and unconscious. Other analyses indicate that parenting responsibilities phase out gradually (Huyck, 1989b).

Our research designs acknowledge pragmatically the possibilities of mutual influence by accepting the 2-tailed level of significance in our tests of association; this indicates that we believe that influence could flow either way, or both ways.

C. Assessing Gender Transformations

There are two major challenges in meeting the stated goals of understanding patterns of change and continuity in gender roles between parents and children: measuring gender role, and measuring change.

1. Measuring Gender Deaux (1984) distinguished three approaches used in recent research on sex and gender. Most commonly, sex is used as a subject variable, to make categorical distinctions. Secondly, researchers (particularly cognitive developmental theorists and social psychologists) have focused on the ways individuals use sex as a social category, a cue to form judgements and choose actions. Finally, individual differences in masculinity, femininity, and androgyny have been assessed as presumed traits. In this project, we are focusing largely on this last aspect, in which attributes commonly associated with gende. are regarded as belonging to the self. Our second study includes aspects of the second approach, since we asked our respondents to think about the ways that their sex influences what they do and avoid, and what they do and are that they themselves consider to be incongruent with their sex. These provide guidelines to the ways in which they use sex as a guide to personal behavior and evaluations of the self.

Most personality-type assessments have utilized self-report check lists of characteristics that are either desirable for, or typical of each sex (Bem, 1974; Berzins, Welling, & Wetter, 1978; Heilbrun, 1976; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), and that were developed largely with young adult samples. Most includes scales which purport to measure masculinity and femininity. These measures have been criticized largely in terms of

social desirability response bias, content validity, and obscuring subdimensions by using total scores (see Pedhazur & Tetenbaum, 1979; Ruch, 1984; Zucker, 1988 for sample critiques). On the other hand, self-report measures, even if assessing consciously-controlled communications about the self, constitute one form of important information about self concepts. We will report on analyses using one of the standardized self report measures, the PRF-Andro (Berzins, et. al., 1978).

Another alternative is to ask the respondent to generate his or her own model of gender, to tell us what is relevant and how they feel about themselves along the dimensions of masculinity and femininity. This is a quite different approach. We report on our version of this measure, constructed for this research.

It is important to recognize that the assessment of an individual in terms of what we regard as "masculine", "feminine", (or androgynous, if we used that model or term) are not necessarily comparable when these two methods are used. Zucker (1988) compared the gender classifications of the middle-aged men and women in this sample, as gender typed or androgynous, using the PRF-Andro scales and the categorizations developed from respondent's own descriptions of gender; she found minimal overlap, which suggests that these measures are each tapping different aspects of gender role identity.

2. Measuring Change Our title and the opening discussion makes clear our interest in unraveling the possible influences on changes over the lifecourse: cohort, time of measurement, individual experience, and underlying (biosocial) developmental change (Schaie, Campbell, Meredith, & Rawlings, 1988). As is well established by now, it is extremely difficult to sort out these effects; it is impossible to do so with a single cross-sectional study. We recognize this at the outset. The sampling was designed to minimize some of the obvious potential sources of variability; we selected families from a single Midwestern community, who had been together as families for a long time; who shared broadly similar ethnic and socioeconomic characteristics; and who were not identified because of any obvious "deviant" behaviors. This research design strategy allows us to be a bit more confident in ruling out the kinds of blatant variability in life circumstances that may obscure more developmental patterns. Perhaps the best we can do is to suggest how our observed findings may be congruent with or incompatible with various models of change and intergenerational transmission.

II. RESEARCH STRATEGIES

A. Samples

The individuals included in these analyses participated in a larger study of young adult children and their parents. The sampling procedures were designed to include middle-aged and aging adults who are among the most stable Midwesterners, geographically and maritally. Participants were recruited by contacting a random sample of the community public high school graduating classes of 1970-71, 1973, and 1979 in order to obtain young adults who would be approximately 29, 26, or 23 at the time they were interviewed. The parents of the young adults randomly selected were invited to participate if the young adult lived within two hours of the parental home, if both mother and father of the young adult were still alive and married to each other, and if it seemed likely that we could get both parents to cooperate in the study.

The parents lived primarily in "Parkville," a middle-sized midwestern suburb. Parkville began as an independent village with strong settlement from Western European immigrants; until the past two decades, the community was almost entirely white, and the sample are all white. Among the parent generation, half of the sample are Catholic; most of the rest are Protestant. Using the Hollingshead and Redlich Two-Factor Index of Social Status (1957), with a five-class system where I is high, the mean of 2.65 indicates somewhat above middle class. Because of the way the sample were selected, all the middle-aged respondents were married at the time they were recruited into the study. The characteristics of the parent generation reflect the family-of-origin for the young adult generation.

Characteristics of parents and young adult children included in the current analyses are shown in Table 1. These include those who are utilized in Study I reported here: 115 family triads of mother, father, and young adult child (57 sons and 58 daughters) who all completed packets of self-report measures including the self-report gender measure. A somewhat different subsample from the larger group was used for Study II; respondents for this phase also completed two different personal interviews, one of which included the questions about gender used to construct our measure of gender role identity. The subsample for Study II includes 105 middle-aged father, 134 middle-aged mothers, 66 young adult sons, and 67 young adult daughters.

The middle-aged mothers range in age from 43-68 (M 53.9, SD 5.6 yrs). In terms of formal education, 10% have graduate degrees, 50% had at least some college or graduated, and 39% are high school graduates or less. Forty-two percent are employed full time; 17% part time. In terms of occupational status, 17% are in upper status executive, professional or managerial position; 24% are in administrative; and 14% are in clerical positions; 40.5% are employed full time. Assessing the occupational status of homemakers is problematic, at best. In this sample, 35.9% of the women identify themselves as homemakers, not employed full or part-time; they are classified according to the Hollingshead & Redlich (standard) convention with unskilled labor.

The fathers in the sample are, not unexpectedly, somewhat older, ranging in age from 44 to 78 (M 58, SD 6.7); more have graduate degrees (25%) and fewer are high school graduates (20%). The men have higher occupational status; 43% are (or were, if retired) in executive, professional, or managerial positions. Most (81%) are employed full time; 15% are retired.

The current marriage is the only one for most of parent sample; 95% of the women and 96% of the men have had only one marriage. The average duration of marriage in this sample is 32 years (SD 5.8), with a range of 21 to 47 years. The majority of them (79%) married between 1946-1959, often identified as the Post-War Baby Boom parents; 8% married 1960-61. Eleven per cent married during WWII, 1940-45 and 2% Pre War 1937-39. The average age at current marriage for the women was 23 (SD 3.7, range 17-37) and 26 for the men (SD 5.7, range 18-44). [Data on the parental marriage is summarized in Huyck, 1991a.]

There is only one single-child family in the parent sample. The average family has 4.3 children; the largest family has 11. Although all the families have at least one young adult child, only 28% of the families have no children living at home. Among the couples, 27% have one or more children under 18 living with them (a few of whom are grandchildren); 45% have one or more children aged 18-23 who are regarded as living in the parental home; and 30% have at least one child over 24 living with them.

The young adults range in age from 21-31, with an average of 25 years. Since they were selected from high school graduation lists of the local public high school, virtually all have at least high school education; 53% of the sons and 66% of the daughters had college degrees or more at the time of the study. The sons have not (yet?) achieved the occupational level of their fathers. The daughters look quite comparable to their mothers in occupational status, though fewer of them identify homemaking as their primary position. More sons (35%) than daughters (26%) live in the parental home. Some over half of the daughters are married, and 35% have at least one child; 37% of the sons are married, and 25% are fathers. The younger generation is far more likely to identify their religious affiliation as "none".

Table 1

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

	FATHERS	MOTHERS	SONS	DAUGHTERS
Number	115	115	57	58
AGE (M/SD/Range)	57.8/6.7/44-78	53.9/5.6/43-68	25.6/2.7/22-31	25.7/2.7/21-30
EDUCATION				
1. Graduate Work	25.7%	10.4%	10.5%	8.6%
2. College Graduate	26.5	26.1	36.8	56.9
3. Some College	20.4	34.8	47.4	24.1
4. High School Graduate	20.4	34.8	5.3	6.9
5. Some High School, Less	6.2	4.3	-0-	3.4
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS (M, SD)				
1. Executive, Professional, Manager	43.0	16.5	26.3	17.2
2. Administrative	32.5	24.3	29.8	27.6
3. Clerical	7.9	16.5	14.0	12.1
4. Skilled	9.6	2.6	10.5	1.7
5. Homemaker; Unskilled labor	2.6	39.1	8.8	25.8
6. Unemployed, seeking work	3.5	.9	10.5	15.5
PRESENT WORK STATUS				
Full Time Employed	80.5	41.7	84.2	57.4
Part Time Employed	.9	17.4	-0-	1.9
Homemaker	-0-	34.8	-0-	22.2
Retired	15.0	4.3	-0-	-0-
School, FT or PT	.9	.9	10.6	11.1
Unemployed	2.7	.9	5.3	7.4
RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION				
Catholic	49.1	52.6	40.0	35.8
Protestant	39.5	40.4	30.9	32.1
Jewish	3.5	2.6	1.8	3.8
Other	2.7	4.4	3.6	1.9
None	5.3	-0-	23.6	26.4

Table 1 (cont.)

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

	FATHERS	MOTHERS	SONS	DAUGHTERS
MARITAL STATUS				
% Married	100.0%	100.0%	36.8%	54.4%
Divorced	-0-	-0-	1.8	1.8
Single	-0-	-0-	61.4	43.9
RESIDENCE				
With parents	-0-	-0-	35.1	26.3
Own home	100.0	100.0	56.1	66.7
Other	-0-	-0-	8.9	7.0
CHILDREN				
% With Children	100.0	100.0	24.6	34.5
Number (M, Range)	4.3/1-11	4.3/1-11	.35/0-3	.53/0-4
COHORT				
1971-72	28.7	28.7	24.6	32.8
1973-74	33 9	33.9	36.8	31.0
1979	37.4	37.4	38.6	36.2

B. Data Collection Procedures

After the names of graduates were selected from the high school graduating lists, we tried to locate the family in the larger metropolitan area. If the family could be located, a letter was sent to the parents' home. This was followed by a telephone call to obtain information of the family's eligibility and the willingness of family members to participate in the research. Approximately 70% of those who were eligible agreed to participate in some phase of the intensive research; cooperation was greater among mothers than fathers. (Cooperation was substantially better among men who were contacted later in the study, when we had learned to contact them first; when the wife/mother was involved first, many men indicated that there was no

point in their being involved, since we had already talked to "her". Dr. Huyck got more cooperation from the men by stressing how important it is for them to speak for themselves about family issues...)

A brief interview at the time of the initial telephone contact provided information on the educational and occupational statuses of the middle-aged parents. Mothers and fathers completed a packet of questionnaires which took approximately one hour to complete; these included standardized measures of personality (including the PRF-Andro), psychosomatic symptoms, alcohol and drug use, ego development, and age norm expectations; questionnaires were counter-balanced to control for possible order effects. About half the parents completed the questionnaire battery at one of a number of small parent group meetings held in the community. At those meetings Dr. Huyck explained the study and answered questions. Parents and young adults participated in two separate semi-structured personal interviews. The parents received the Transitions Interview exploring their relationship with the study child, and the Life Structure Interview (LSI) exploring their own life; the young adults had a comparable Transitions Interview exploring their relationship with each parent, and an Identity Status interview exploring their commitments to work, politics, religion, gender roles, and intimacy.

The LSI was typically administered in two sessions, each lasting two to four hours. The interview covers (in order discussed) personal health, spouse's health, work, marriage, parenting in general, filial relationships, perceived past, religion, leisure, and gender roles. Data collected as part of the parent LSI interviews and the young adult Commitment interviews constitute the source of data for the gender style ratings reported here.

In order to maximize independence of the data, different interviewers were utilized for each person in the family and for each interview; no interviewer talked to both husband and wife in a couple, or to either parent and the study child; and no interviewer administered both the Transitions and Life Structure (or Commitment Interviews) to the same person. LSI interviewing was done by the Principal Investigator (Huyck), and by more mature, trained clinical psychology students. (Huyck interviewed 70 of the 238 midlife respondents.) Young adult interviews were carried out by same-sex young adult interviewers, advanced clinical psychology students. Most of the data were collected between 1982 and 1985.

III. STUDY I: GENDER-LINKED SELF ATTRIBUTIONS ON THE PRF-ANDRO SCALE

A. Sample

The subsample utilized for the analyses of family-congruence include 115 family triads of father, mother, and young adult child; 58 daughters and their parents, and 57 sons and their parents are included. Sociodemographic characteristics of this group are summarized in Table 1.

B. Measure: the PRF-Andro Scale

The PRF-Andro (Berzins, Welling, & Wetter, 1978; Berzins, Wetter, & Welling, 1981) asks respondents whether particular behavioral descriptions describe them or not. Because the behaviors have been linked to gender constructs, we can consider the measure one index of gender-linked self-attributions. The PRF-Andro was modeled after one of the most widely-used measures, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974). The Masculine and Feminine scales of items were derived from the Personality Research Form (PRF; Jackson, 1967) on a rational-intuitive basis to assess dominant-instrumental and nurturant-expressive dimensions, respectively (Ramanaiah & Martin, 1984). The BSRI was designed to reflect a heterogenecus array of attributes grouped into mutually exclusive categories according to social standards for desirable characteristics for the sexes (Bem, 1979). The BSRI asks respondents to indicate the extent to which the trait adjectives are characteristic of them. The PRF-Andro measure includes more behaviorally-anchored statements, which may be more interpretable than the trait adjectives used in the BSRI.

The two subscales of the BRF-Andro are composed of 29 Masculinity and 27 Femininity items, administered as part of an 85-item Interpersonal Disposition Inventory (Berzins et al., 1981). Each items consists of a sentence describing a particular behavior; participants answer true or false to indicate whether each item describes themselves. The authors of the scale recommend using the two whole-scale scores to reflect the composite constructs of masculinity and femininity; some analyses have utilized the items to identify factors (Huyck, 1991b). In the analyses discussed here we will use total M and F scale scores, and examine patterns of responses for particular items.

C. Analyses and Results

1. Sex by Gender Scales A confirmatory analysis was done to see whether the scales distinguished males and females in the predicted directions. Paired T-Tests were used for husband and wife dyads; and group T-Tests were performed to compare scores of the young adult men and women. All were significant in the predicted directions, as shown in Table 2.

It is important to remember that maximum scale scores are not equal and thus scores are not exactly comparable across scales (M maximum=29, F=27).

Table 2

SEX BY GENDER SCALE SCORES

		Mean PRF-Andro Scale Scores	
Group	N	Masculinity	Femininity
Fathers/Husbands	115	15.2	15.0
Mothers/Wives	115	11.9	17.1
		(p >.000)	(p >.000
YA Sons	57	18.4	15.1
YA Daughters	58	14.2	16.4
		(p >.000	(p >.025

2. Generation by Gender Scale Scores To assess whether the young adult generation is different than the parental generation on M and F scale scores, group T-Tests were performed for the scales separately. In these analyses, the young adults as a group are being compared with the groups of fathers and mothers; these are not within-family comparisons. Results are shown in Table 3. The young adult generation was higher on self-ascribed masculinity and lower on self ascribed femininity than the middle-aged women; the young adults are not significantly different from the middle-aged men.

Table 3

GENERATION BY GENDER SCALE SCORES

Group	N	Mean PRF-Andro Scale Scores: Masculinity	Femininity
Young Adults	115	16.3	15.7
Middle Aged Fathers	115	15.2	15.0
		(p >.056)	(p >.104
Young Adults	115	16.3	15.7
Middle Aged Mothers	115	11.9	17.1
		(p >.000	(p >.001

3. Parent-Child Dyad Comparisons To examine patterns of within-family congruence, each young adult child was compared with his or her own same-sex parent on the M and F scale scores, using paired T-Tests. In order to assess the potential consequences of the young adult's movement along the life course, we examined parent-child similarities in terms of three measures of the child's age: chronological age (21-25, and 26-31); marital status (single vs. married); and parental status (no children vs. one or more children). The general expectations was that young adults would become more similar to their parents as they move into the kinds of adult family responsibilities that have shaped their parent's lives. Results are shown in Table 4.

Younger daughters are significantly different from their mothers on the Masculinity scale, regardless of whether "youth" was assessed in terms of chronological age (under 26), marital status (not married), or parental stage (no children). On all three measures, the "more mature" daughters (26 years or older, married, or a mother herself) were not different from their own mothers in "masculinity." Regardless of age, daughters were very similar to their own mothers in Femininity scale levels.

For sons, patterns are less consistent. Sons have higher M scores than their own fathers regardless of son's marital status; older sons and nonparental sons score higher than younger sons or sons who have a child. Sons do not differ from fathers on Femininity scores.

Table 4

CONGRUENCE AND YOUNG ADULT DEVELOPMENT AGE:

PARENT-CHILD DYAD CONGRUENCE ON PRF GENDER SCALE SCORES

Mean Scores and Significance Level of Paired T-Test on Same-sex Dyads

		MASCULINITY SCALE			FEMININITY SCALE		
	(N)	Parent	Child	Sig.	Parent	Child	Sig.
MOTHER-DAUGHTER	(58)	12.2	14.1	(.01)	16.5	16.4	(.96)
Daughter Age:							
21-25	(25)	10.8	14.9	(.00)	16.3	16.3	(1.00)
26-30	(33)	12.8	13.7	(.44)	16.7	17.4	(.73)
Daughter Marital Status:							
Single	(27)	11.7	15.3	(.01)	15.7	15.6	(.97)
Married	(31)	12.2	13.2	(.37)	17.3	17.0	(.68)
Daughter Parental Status:							
No Children	(38)	12.2	15.2	(.01)	15.9	15.8	(.90)
Mother	(20)	11.6	12.4	(.56)	17.7	17.4	(.71)
FATHER-SON	(57)	15.8	18.2	(.01)	14.5	15.0	(.44)
Son Age:							
22-25	(23)	16.6	18.4	(.21)	14.3	14.6	(.79)
26-31	(34)	15.5	18.3	(.01)	14.6	15.3	(.37)
Son Marital Status:							
Single	(36)	16.4	18.3	(.06)	13.9	15.0	(.17)
Married	(21)	15.2	18.5	(.02)	15.6	15.2	(.67)
Son Parental Status:							
No Children	(43)	15.6	18.3	(.01)	14.5	14.7	(.71)
Father	(14)	16.7	18.6	(.32)	14.6	15.9	(.31)

Note: N = Number of parent-child dyads, not individuals

IV. STUDY II: GENDER STYLE RATINGS FROM INTERVIEWS

A. Sample

The sample for the second study includes only those individuals in each generation where interview data about gender role identity was available. This included 134 middle aged mothers, 105 middle aged fathers, 66 young adult sons, and 67 young adult daughters. Data from this full set is used to examine gender and generational differences in the ways they describe their own sense of gender. In addition, a subset of this group is used to examine family similarity; only cases where ratings are available for the young adult and the same-sex parent are used. This subsample includes 56 father-son and 58 mother-daughter dyads.

B. Measure: the Gender Style Ratings

The Gender Style ratings were developed to address two concerns of the PRF-Andro (and other global scale self report measures). First, there is a good deal of evidence that both "masculinity" and "femininity" are complex constructs with multiple dimensions. We wanted to capture the various ways in which individuals define themselves as being appropriate to their sex; equally, we wanted to understand the ways in which they themselves felt that they were not being congruent with their own gender role ideas -- regardless of how they evaluated such departures. That is, it was clear early on in the interviewing process that some men would say, in response to the question, "What characteristics do you associate with masculinity?", respond that they thought of the hard-drinking, womanizing jock -- but that was not <u>their</u> version of masculinity. They often felt quite securely "masculine", in terms of their own criteria, even while acknowledging other versions.

The second concern has to do with the self-report scales and what they assess. The responses on those scales are more subject to personal-ideal and social-desirability biases. This is one important kind of data, but we were interested in what sense we could derive from letting individuals define their own sense of gender rather than imposing a structure upon them. This seemed particularly important when we are studying middle aged and older adults, since most of the check-lists have been designed with younger adult concerns and validated on younger adult samples.

The data reported here were drawn from intensive interviews about the respondents perceptions about gender. The questions included:

(1) What characteristics do you associated with masculinity/ femininity?
(2) In what ways do you think men and women differ psychologically?
(3) Do you think of yourself as masculine (if male)/feminine (if female)?
(4) How does that influence what your do -- or don"t do?
(5) Are there any ways in which you are not so masculine (male)/feminine (female)? What are those ways? How do you feel about that? How do you account for it? (whether of not non-congruent aspects are acknowledged)

Personal attributions were obtained from these questions about how each respondent defined masculinity and femininity, the ways in which the respondent thought he (or she) was masculine (or feminine), and the ways the respondent thought he (or she) was not masculine (or feminine). Two ratings of the gender interview materials were obtained. First, discrete, gender-relevant self-attributions were identified by listing every one of the (91) different ways in which respondents described their gender. Second, more global styles were drawn from previous research and a general familiarity with the interviews from this sample. Because the results of the second measure were confirmed by the self-attributions, the findings reported here are in terms of the gender styles. (Details of the initial coding scheme developments are given in Zucker, 1988.)

Men were classified as experiencing a specific masculine style on the basis of their descriptions of how they were masculine, and women were classified as experiencing a specific feminine style on the basis of their descriptions of how they were feminine.

In addition, we were interested in how they experienced themselves in terms of having qualities which they themselves felt were "gender incongruent" or "gender expanded"; these were conceptualized on the basis of theory and research that suggests that men become more feminine and women become more masculine in their second half of life. We propose that such a change is probably not global, and that we should explore the unique ways in which different people experience cross-sex gender (or what are often seen as "androgynous" capacities). We identified two positive options, which we labeled Inner Androgyny and Task Androgyny; and an option of Denied Androgyny for those who said there was absolutely nothing about them that was not gender-congruent. Finally, we identified two options which reflected diminished or compromised gender-congruency, more than an expansion into the modalities associated with the "other" gender: persons who

indicated they felt "less of" a man or woman than they had been or than they wished they were in terms of their own internalized standards of masculinity or femininity; and those (few) who said that while they had "passed" as socially masculine or feminine, it had been a charade and a facade which they were now happy to drop.

Because of our desire to compare the parents and their young adult children, we tested the applicability of the coding scheme to the young adults (Angelaccio, 1990). That effort indicated that the codes were applicable, with minor modifications.

Due to the qualitative nature of the styles and the interviews, great caution was taken to establish inter-rater reliability of the initial classification into gender styles. Interrater reliability was calculated first prior to coding the data, after training; coders for the midlife data were checked after one-third and after two-thirds of the cases were coded, and coders for the young adult data were checked at midpoint. Interrater reliability coefficients (calculated by Chronbach's Alpha) was acceptable (nearly all being +.75) (see Angelaccio, 1990; Zucker, 1988).

Following are the gender style rating categories used, with notes on how the conceptualization was modified for the young adult generation. It is important to remember that this scheme places individuals into one or more gender congruent categories and one or more gender expanded categories; the categories are parallel for men and women.

MALE GENDER STYLES

Gender Congruent Styles:

Macho: The "Macho" man presents himself as tough, physically strong, and virile. Since he denies weaknesses within himself, he projects whatever weakness he may experience within onto women. He perceives himself as dominating his wife and children (or girlfriend), and reports that they depend on him and look up to him as a source of strength, while he himself is independent. He makes it a point to state he is heterosexual, and views women as objects of his sexual attraction and desire, rather incompetent people, and not as equal counterparts. His "masculinity" revolves around his inner aggression, which he finds difficult to channel into productive avenues. Instead, he accepts his aggression in its "raw" form and is even proud of it. He may drink, be loud, swear, and get involved in physical fights.

This style draws on the Dystonic Dependency man described in Gutmann, Griffin & Grunes (1982), of a man opposes his inner striving for nurturance, projects his "femininity" onto a "weak" wife, and adopts a counter-dependant stance. This style also draws on findings of studies that reported that physical attributes, behavioral characteristics, and sexual attitudes were salient to people's experience of gender (Myers & Gonda, 1982; Smith & Midlarsky, 1985).

Leader: The leader describes his gender identity in terms of the competitive work world. He is confident and assertive and finds it easy to take charge and to lead others. He is not afraid to voice his opinions, stands up for what he believes in, and for justice in general. He is not afraid of challenges and risks, and tasks requiring much effort do not scare him. On the contrary, he likes hard challenging work. His masculinity seems to revolve around his determination to preserve the social order and thus to protect society in general.

In this style aggressiveness is used to yield success in his occupation. This style corresponds to the popular view of masculinity which equates it with activity, instrumentality, dominance, achievement, independence, assertivity and aggressivity (Bakan, 1965; Gutmann, 1975).

Family Man was initially termed "Husband/Father" because these men defined themselves as masculine because they had proven to be responsible providers and protectors of their wives and children. He respects his wife and children, and believes it is his duty to provide for them and to protect them. He views himself as a source of strength for his family, so that they can come to him for support and for guidance. However, he does so not because he is strong and they are weak, and therefore he dominates them, but out of his sense of duty and responsibility for them. Some of the unmarried young adult men displayed similar conceptualizations when they talked about protecting their (real or anticipated) girlfriends. These men take pride in channeling aggressive potential into a protective role. The key to this style is the man who defines his masculinity in a positive interpersonal relationship.

The style was proposed since theory and studies have found that family roles are a critical component for men's experience in midlife (Barnett & Baruch, 1987; Farrell & Rosenberg, 1981; Levinson et al., 1978; Pleck, 1985; Veroff, Douvan, & Kulka, 1981).

Gender-Expanded Style Options:

Task Androgyny This man acknowledges his own potentials of affectivity and nurturance within himself in a guarded form by assuming tasks and roles that he associates with women's domain (sharing household chores, cleaning house, cooking, gardening). He is more sensually diffuse, and may indicate that he enjoys art, music, and theater, which he mentions when queried about ways in which he is "not so masculine." He may point out that he enjoys women's company (but not primarily as sexual partners); he likes talking to women, and enjoys listening to what they have to say. Younger men were often more apologetic that they still thought of certain tasks in gender-linked terms (e.g., laundry, cooking); but if they indicated that these activities remain gendered, they were coded as showing Task Androgyny if they did those activities. If they indicated they had grown up regarding such activities (as cooking, laundry, yard work, car maintenance) as gender-neutral signs of independence and self-sufficiency, they were not coded as androgynous even if they mentioned that they had come to realize, as adults, that many people considered these activities sex-typed.

Inner Androgyny This man is more in touch with his own gender bimodality. He more comfortably accepts his feminine qualities as part of his human potential, rather than as something foreign to him. He acknowledges his emotionality, and admits to feeling pain and being hurt on occasions. He also expresses his emotions; he may report he cries at sad movies and/or when slighted. Furthermore, he perceives himself as sensitive to the feelings and needs of others, as a good listener, as tender, and as friendly. He seems quite comfortable with his affectivity, affiliation, and nurturance.

Denial of Incongruence In response to the question of how he is not masculine, this man denies any feminine qualities, and does not consider his masculinity diminished or compromised in any way.

Compromised Gender Styles:

Diminished Stereotypical Masculinity: This man presents himself as either being less "masculine" than he used to be before, or as not being what he regards as stereotypically "masculine". The qualities which he had and lost, or never had, are seen as typically "masculine" and not feminine qualities; thus, this is not usefully regarded as a form of gender-expansion (or androgyny). He may feel that he is not as physically strong anymore; or does not chase women anymore or get involved in physical fights. He may also feel that his authority has diminished together with his leadership position. The younger men are more apt to emphasize how they are not the "stereotypic" man; their point of reference seems to be an image of Man rather than their own prior youth.

Facade This man relinquishes his masculine stance, indicating that it has been a strain or a facade all along. The middle-aged men indicated that they acted masculine in the past either because it was the social role that was expected of them, or because they felt obliged to do so for the benefit of their growing children. However, acting "masculine" was a role that he played and resented doing so because he did not feel that deep inside he was "masculine" or that he wanted the "masculine" role. He accepts his dependency on his wife, and would like her to take care of him just like she took care of their children. The younger men posed this issue in more ideological terms, claiming that sex had no relevance for behavior, that they were unwilling to acknowledge any ways in which their behaviors and choices were influenced by sex, and that they would not be willing to accept traditional male roles such as providing any kinds of security for women and children. That is, they did not identify with any of the "positive" aspects of either masculinity or femininity, but backed away from the issue.

FEMININE GENDER STYLES

Gender Congruent Styles

Femme This woman is concerned with the image she projects in public. She feels that her feminine qualities are reflected in how she dresses and wears her hair, and in her feminine manners. She feels feminine when she speaks softly, watches her language, and adheres to etiquette. She appreciates male chivalry, likes male attentions, and wants to be treated like a lady. She reports that she sees herself as dependent on her husband (or boyfriend, if unmarried), observes the traditional division of labor at home, and considers herself to be mechanically incompetent. At times, even though she is capable of more and does not think she is dependent, she chooses to pretend and assume the role of a docile and dependent wife/girlfriend. She may also be quite angry with women who are not like her, possibly because of what that may imply in regard to her own potential.

This style draws on research findings in which femininity was associated with appearance and clothes, attention to manners, and undesirable passivity (Myers & Gonda, 1982; Smith & Midlarsky, 1985).

Nurturer This woman's femininity is not specifically centered on her family. She describes herself as nurturant and affectionate toward people in general. She feels she is feminine because she is in touch with her emotions, and is not afraid to express them. People in general, and relationships in particular, are important to her, and she does much to foster them. She feels she is sensitive and responsive to the needs and feelings of others. She considers herself a good friend and a good listener. She is a woman who cares for others.

This style draws on views that associate femininity with affiliation, affectivity, and nurturance (Bakan, 1986; Gutmann, 1975; Smith & Midlarsky, 1985). Thus, in varying degrees, it reflects the Femininity scales on the various gender instruments.

Family Woman This style was termed the "Wife/Mother" style for the middle-aged generation; for the younger generation it was expanded to include those women who defined their femininity in relation to (real or potential) boyfriends, lovers, fiancees, husbands, or children. This woman's femininity revolves around her family. She considers herself as responsible for the emotional welfare of her husband/boyfriend and family, and at times lets their needs come before hers. She defines herself as feminine by nurturing them emotionally, being sensitive to their needs and feelings, listening to them, and responding to them. It is important to her to give them a feeling of a home, so she cleans the house, decorates it, does the laundry, and cooks for her family; doing so makes her feel more feminine, and not doing so makes her feel less feminine.

This style draws from theoretical views associating women's role with the emotional well-being of their children (Gutmann, 1975), as well as research findings that tie femininity to motherhood and being a homemaker (Smith & Midlarsky, 1985).

Gender Expanded Options

Task Androgyny This woman accepts her strengths and capacity for autonomy in a limited way, by doing what she herself views as "masculine" things (or tasks). Her strengths and capacities are mostly expressed as physical strength and mechanical capacity. Thus, she may consider herself physically strong, as having a strong physical build, and as liking or being involved in physical work and activities; consequently she may not observe the traditional division of labor in the house, and may do "hard" chores. She may paint the house, clean the yard, shovel snow, and put up storm windows; and she herself defines these as "masculine" activities. Her physical competence may make her feel competent in general and potentially independent. [While many of the middle-aged women have resented having to do such tasks in the past, many feel positive about the present and future benefits of their competence.]

Inner Androgyny This woman acknowledges the dynamic, assertive, and independent aspects of herself as part of her human potential, even though she implies or openly acknowledges that these are "masculine" qualities. She views herself as an assertive, outspoken person who is not afraid to voice her opinions. She considers herself to be a capable, achievement-oriented woman who gets the job done, and may easily assume leadership in groups, being the "take charge" person that she regards herself to be.

Gender Incongruence Denied This woman denies that there are any ways in which she is not feminine, either because she recognizes qualities in herself which she regards as "masculine" or because she is not as feminine as her internalized social stereotypes of acceptable femininity.

Gender Incongruent Styles

Diminished Stereotypical Femininity This woman views herself as less "feminine" than she used to be (if middle-aged, or even young adult), or in comparison to what she considers to be reasonable feminine stereotypes (including physical attributes, behaviors, and traits). Thus, the qualities that she may mention are not typically associated with masculinity. Rather, she may feel less/not attractive in general, and not attractive to men in particular. She may consider herself less/not invested in her house and family, or in her appearance.

Facade This woman is very uncomfortable with vulnerability, or with accommodating to the needs of others. The middle-aged mothers indicate that as long as she actively mothered children she managed to deny her assertiveness and needs for autonomy; as they become independent, she no longer finds it necessary to deny her true nature. She is relieved to finally be true to herself -- to be competitive, and even aggressive. The younger women focused more on the irrelevance of gender for behavior, and contended that they were unwilling (and unable) to act as if sex or social expectations had any bearing on their behavior. Some of them also indicated that they were quite willing and able to "fake it" and "pass" for appropriately feminine if it served their purpose, but they were very clear about the split between the pretense (facade) and the "real me".

C. Results

1. Gender Styles by Sex and Generation The proportion of each group endorsing each of the eight possible gender styles is shown in Table 5. (It is important to remember that an individual is coded as showing at least one gender congruent style, including the Facade option; and one or more options for gender expansion, including Diminished or Nonstereotypic gender. Percentages do not add up to 100% within the table; rather, each proportion reflects the % of that group who defined gender in that way.)

This analysis includes 105 middle-aged men, 134 middle aged women, 66 young adult men, and 67 young adult women. Several patterns are evident.

Among the middle-aged respondents, half (52.2%) of the women defined their femininity in terms of the Femme style (placing emphasis on dress, decorum, and appearance); only 27.6% of the middle-aged men described their masculinity in comparable Macho terms. The midlife men were most likely to describe themselves as masculine because of their family roles (46.7%); 23% of the women defined their femininity in this way. The men and women were equally likely to describe their gender identity in terms of actions outside the family domain (as Leader or Nurturer). One third of the middle-aged parents denied that there was any way in which they were not masculine/feminine. Among those who identified ways in which they had expanded their gender, about 30% indicated Inner Androgyny. Women were somewhat more likely (26%) than men (17%) to indicate Task Androgyny. Less than one-fifth of the middle-aged persons indicated they were not as masculine (19%) or feminine (15%) as they were or thought they should be. A distinct minority (4.8% of the men and 3.7% of the women) said that their gender was really a Facade.

Among the young adults, some similar patterns emerged. Young women were more likely than young men to define their gender in terms of appearance and demeanor (45% v. 30%); and young men were more likely (33%) than the women (19%) to define gender in terms of family roles. They were equally likely to experience gender in involvements outside the family (Leader/Nurturer). In terms of options for gender expansion, the young men were similar to the older generation in denying any incongruence (35%) and in acknowledging Inner Androgyny. The young women were markedly less likely (16%) to deny gender expansion, but also less likely to describe Inner Androgyny. This difference seems linked to the desire of the

young women to redefine qualities (such as competitiveness, assertiveness, and sometimes even indifference to the plight of disliked others) as "reasonably feminine", or gender neutral.

Very few young adult men or women described Task Androgyny (9% for each). On the basis of the interviews, the differences from the parent generation reflect somewhat the extent to which tasks, in particular, have been "degendered" for the younger generation. Some of the young adults indicated that they had grown up doing "everything", that their mothers had insisted that the boys make beds and wash dishes, and that the girls rake the lawn and gas up the car. Some clearly have redefined such tasks as activities required of competent persons who are interested in independent living; in this context, taking care of one's own meals and laundry can be assimilated quite well to the traditional "masculine" mandates for autonomy and self-sufficiency, just as well as to the "feminine" modes of facilitating and caring for needs on the domestic front. In addition, it is clear that the young adults, and some of their parents, recognize that sociopolitically it has become "sexist" and "unliberal" to believe that daily chores should legitimately be sex-typed (regardless of actual behavior). On the other hand, some of the young adults continue to sex type activities, and they avoid gender-incongruent things -- or if they do so, they are clear that they are being "bold", "non-stereotyped", or even defiant. Altogether, the results suggest that activities or tasks are not as gender-typed for the younger generation as for the older generation, but this suggestion merits further inquiry.

The clearest difference from the midlife generation is seen in the young adult responses to what we have termed "compromised gender congruence." While few in the older generation admitted to such departures, 36% of the young adult men and 60% of the young women said their gender style was non-stereotypic. They recognized and acknowledged the stereotypes (reflected in media ads, particularly) and indicated that they were not "masculine" or "feminine" like that; sometimes they also referred more generally to "social stereotypes", or "my parents" and indicated they had forged a gender style that was different. They were coded as compromised because there was a definite sense of not meeting some important standards, even though some of them claimed that they felt ok or fine about it. Substantially more of the young people (15% of the men and 16% of the women) were coded as Facade, mostly because they claimed that gender was really irrelevant to their life and they refused to think or act with any recognition of gender.

Table 5

GENDER STYLES BY SEX AND GENERATION

% Endorsing Various Styles, as Coded from Interviews

	MIDDLE AGED		YOUNG ADULT	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
N	(105)	(134)	(66)	(67)
Gender Congruent Styles				
Macho/Femme	27.6%	52.2%	30.3%	44.8%
Leader/Nurturer	25.7	29.9	27.3	31.3
Family Roles	46.7	23.1	33.3	19.4
Gender Expanded Styles				
Task Androgyny	17.1	26.1	9.1	9.0
Inner Androgyny	29.5	28.4	31.8	23.9
Denial of Androgyny	35.2	32.8	34.8	16.4
Gender Compromised Styles				
Nonstereotypic; Diminished	19.1	14.9	36.4	59.7
Facade	4.8	3.7	15.2	16.4

2. Gender Style Configurations Frequencies were also calculated to assess what percentage of persons who exhibited a certain style exhibited also other styles, and what those other styles were.

The results of the middle-aged men's concurrent gender style experiences indicated that although men could be classified into several concurrent Congruent masculine styles and several Expanded or Compromised styles, most were classified as having one congruent and one expanded style. No gender congruent style was exclusively associated with another style. For example, 36.7% of the 49 men who were classified as Family Man were also classified as experiencing Inner Androgyny; another 30.6% of the Family men denied any gender expanded styles. Frequencies of gender style configurations (concurrent classifications of the same person into various gender styles) were calculated, and revealed an impressive array of combinations. The most frequent configurations were: Family Man/Denial of Androgyny (14.0%), Family Man/Inner Androgyny (13.1%), Leader/Denial of Androgyny (10.3%), and Macho/Denial of Androgyny (10.3). (Full listing of the configurations is in Zucker, 1988.)

Similarly to the results for the middle-aged men, the findings indicate that although women could be classified into concurrent various Feminine, gender-congruent styles and gender-expanded (Androgenous or compromised) styles, most were classified as having one congruent and one expanded style. No gender congruent style was exclusively associated with a particular expanded style. Although 38% of the 71 women classified as Femme were also classified as denying any sense of non-femininity, the rest of the Femmes were classified as experiencing some sort of gender expanded style. Frequencies of gender style configurations (concurrent classifications of the same person into various gender styles) were obtained for women. The most frequent configurations were: Femme/Denial of Androgyny (16.9%), Femme/Task Androgyny (14.7%), and Nurturer/Inner Androgyny (11.8%).

The marked implication is that adult men and women develop complex and individualized ways of perceiving themselves to be masculine and feminine. Nearly all of the middle-aged respondents can easily describe ways in which they experience themselves as acceptably feminine or masculine in ways congruent with their sex. The women seem to rely substantially on controlling their appearance and demeanor (reflected in the Femme style); having "secured" their femininity, as it were, they are comfortable with actions

and stances which they regard as more "masculine." Behaving in such masculine ways, however, does not make them feel unfeminine as long as they have a secure sense of gender-congruent style. Similarly, even when men loose muscular strength (which nearly all the men associated with masculinity), or occupational power, they anchor their sense of masculinity in their willingness to be there for their families, to provide as best they can, to keep concerns to themselves which might worry their wife or children, and to serve as "head" of family to the best of their ability. As long as he can feel he is, or has done this reasonably well, he can feel secure in his gender congruent identity. From that stance, he can "expand" into other arenas without feeling "unmanned."

3. Parent-Child Dyad Congruence To continue our analysis of within-family congruence, each young adult child was compared with his or her own same-sex parent on the ways in which gender style was expressed. The sample for these analyses included only pairs where gender style ratings were available for both generations. As we did with the PRF-Andro scales, we wanted to assess the consequences of the young adult's movement along the life course. Thus, we examined parent-child similarities in terms of three measures of the child's age: chronological age (21-25, and 26-31); marital status (single vs. married); and parental status (no children vs. one or more children). The general expectation was that young adults would become more similar to their parents as they move into the kinds of adult family responsibilities that have shaped their parent's lives.

Results are shown in Table 6-A for father-son dyads and Table 6-B for mother-daughter dyads. Results for all gender measures are shown, including the PRF Masculinity and Femininity scales and the eight gender style ratings. Table 6 reflects a summary of the analyses for all ten gender measures (two scales on the PRF-Andro and eight possible gender style categories). Because of our desire to assess similarity of particular parent-child pairs, paired T-Tests were used; we recognize the exploratory nature of using this test with bi-categorical variables (style was evident or not evident). In Table 6, = indicates that the parent and same-sex child did not differ significantly on the measure; S (D) indicates that the son (or daughter) was more likely to endorse the style or be higher on the scale than the parent at .05 level of significance or better; s (d) indicates the same thing at a probability between .5 and .10. Similar notations are used to indicate where the father (F) or mother (M) are more likely to show the style.

Table 6

DEVELOPMENT OF GENDER CONGRUENCE:
PARENT-YOUNG ADULT SIMILARITY BY YOUNG ADULT AGE

	YOUNGER AGE SINGLE NO KIDS				OLDER AGE MARRIED PARENT			
6-A: FATHER/SON								
MEASURE / N*		(22)	(33)	(38)		(34)	(21)	(14)
PRF-Masculinity	=	s	S		S	S	=	
PRF-Femininity	=	=	=		=	=	=	
Gender Congruent Styles								
Macho	=	s	=		S	=	=	
Leader	=	=	=		=	=	=	
Family	F	=	=		=	=	=	
Gender Expanded Options								
Task Androgyny	=	=	=		=	=	=	
Inner Androgyny	=	=	=		F	=	=	
Denial of Androgyny	=	=	=		s	=	=	
Gender Compromised Styles								
Non-stereotypic; Diminished	s	s	s		s	=	=	
Facade	s	s	s		s	=	=	
6-B: MOTHER/DAUGHTER	(25)	(27)	(38)		(33)	(31)	(20)	
PRF-Masculinity	D	D	D		=	=	=	
PRF-Femininity	=	=	=		=	=	=	
Gender Congruent Styles								
Femme	=	D	=		=	=	=	
Nurturer	D	D	=		=	=	=	
Family	d	=	=		=	=	=	
Gender Expanded								
Task Androgyny	=	d	=		=	=	=	
Inner Androgyny	=	d	=		=	=	=	
Denial of Androgyny	=	d	=		=	=	=	
Gender Compromised								
Nonstereotypical; Diminished	D	D	=		=	=	=	
Facade	d	D	=		=	=	=	

* N = number of parent-child dyads
S,D,F = Son, Daughter, or Father more likely to have high score or style at $p > .05$
s,d = son or daughter more likely to have high score or style at $p > .10$

Table 6 reveals several interesting patterns of parent-child congruence in the eight measures of gender used in this study. The "D"s concentrated on the left side of the table seem to convey "differentiation" from the mother. Dissimilarity from the mother is evident only in the younger women, primarily when younger is measured by being unmarried or by younger chronological age (21-25). The more mature young women do not differ from their own mothers on any of the gender measures. This suggests that some of the apparent generational differences evident, particularly in studies utilizing college students, may be linked to developmental rather than social change issues.

The pattern of similarity to one's own mother reflect, we believe (on the basis of familiarity with the interviews and personal experiences) two processes. Probably most fundamental is the daughter's movement into the social role of wife/partner, where she has linked her life structure to a chosen man. Most of these young women also hope, and intend, to become mothers. The patterns of behavior which seem to have worked for her parents in realizing these desires are evoked when she herself assumes the responsibilities as wife and mother. Psychologically, there are different dynamics with the husband and with the mother. When young women fall in love and select a man to marry, particularly in these times when marriage is not as socially mandated, they do so with great desire to do as much as they can to facilitate their husband's advancement and well-being, and they are likely to (consciously or unconsciously) use whatever patterns seemed to work for her parents--who have sustained an enduring marriage. In addition, most young women seem to focus on developing autonomy from the mother during their adolescent and younger adult years; if they have done so adequately, they can become like their mother without feeling absorbed or merged. Many of the older young adult women described this transition in relation with their mother, indicating how they deliberately felt they had to be, or act, differently from their mother in order to gain a sense of their own identity; but that having done do, they could see the merits of their mother's position, and recognize their own similarity to their mother without feeling threatened. (See Frank, Avery, & Laman, 1988 for discussion of autonomy and relatedness between young adults and their parents in this sample.)

In addition, we know from interviews with both generations that daughters influence their mothers. The middle-aged mothers described ways in which they had modified their assumptions about what

was necessary or even desirable for feminine behavior, on the basis of discussions with daughters and daughters-in-law and on observations of how these younger women managed their lives. Such influences probably are not reflected in the measures here, but are evident more in the ways in which these general styles are enacted. It is also important to point out that some mothers are watching their daughters and are intensely uncomfortable with what they regard as "unfeminine" behavior, because they fear it will threaten the stability of the marriage or jeopardizes the emotional security of their grandchildren.

When we examine the pattern for the father-son dyads in Table 6, the younger sons seem to be differentiating themselves from their own fathers by psychologically distancing from gender issues generally. This is most evident in the relatively small group of young adult men who report gender-compromised styles, either Diminished Stereotypic Masculinity or Facade. These are young men who seem to be saying that the responsibilities of masculinity are too much for them; their interviews make it clear that they do not feel capable of assuming what they regard as the burdens of being a good provider and protector, and many of them seem to have fathers whom they regard as abusive. Masculine "strength" is seen as more brutalizing and intrusive than supportive, and they do not seem to have alternative, more positive images of masculinity.

The young adult men who have married are very similar to their own fathers. From Table 4, we can note that the more masculine (higher M score) middle-aged fathers are likely to have sons who marry (in their 20s), indicating another family influence on these patterns of movement into adulthood. The married sons are, however, even higher than their own fathers in the PRF Masculinity scale; this is congruent with the socioevolutionary models which posit that as a man moves into marriage (and even more, fatherhood), masculinity is emphasized (Gutmann, 1987).

Overall, the results from our summary Table 6 suggest that both younger sons and daughters differentiate from their own same-sex parent partly by redefining aspects of gender role behavior. These kinds of differentiation might suggest a "generation gap", or strong evidence of social change. However, the fact that the "gap" within family-dyads is no longer evident as the young person moves into adult family roles (of marriage and parenthood) strongly supports a family development model of gender style.

V. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

A. Research Design

The research reported here includes assessments of gender identity for a sample of middle-aged parents (aged 43-78) and their young adult daughters and sons (aged 21-31). All respondents are caucasian Americans; the young adults attended public high school in "Parkville", an old broadly middle class community in Midwest America. The families were selected for a larger study to represent the more stable, family-centered, "traditional" segment of contemporary American society. Two related studies were reported. Study I includes responses to the PRF-Andro self report measure of Masculinity and Femininity, utilizing 115 triads of mother, father, and young adult child (57 sons and 58 daughters). Study II reports coding schemes developed for personal interviews about gender, coding for gender-congruent, gender-expanded, and gender-compromised ways of experiencing the psychosocial aspects of sexual difference. Gender style ratings are available for 134 middle aged mothers, 105 middle aged fathers, 67 young adult daughters, and 66 young adult sons. The final analysis compared congruence between same-sex parent-child dyads on all ten measures of gender.

B. Findings

1. Gender Styles Identified for Both Generations

- Three major ways in which adults experience themselves as being gender congruent were identified. Most men described their masculinity in terms of styles we summarized as *Macho, Leader, or Family Man*; most women described their femininity in terms of *Femme, Nurturer, or Family Woman* styles. The Femme style was most common for women in both generations; Family Man was most common for middle-aged men, and all three were equally common for young adult men.
- Three options for acknowledging gender expansion or incongruence were identified, with similar styles for men and women. Approximately 30% of each group described *Inner Androgyny*; few of the young adults and about one-fifth of the middle-aged generation described *Task Androgyny*; and about one-third showed *Denial* of any non-congruent aspects of the self.

- Two forms of gender compromised identity were evident. *Diminished or Nonstereotypic* masculinity or femininity was described by less than one-fifth of the middle-aged sample, one-third of the young men, and over half of the young women. In addition, a very small minority (under 5%) of the middle-aged group and a small (c.15%) group of young adults indicated that their gender style was a *Facade*.

2. Generational Differences

- The young adult generation was higher on self-ascribed masculinity and lower on self-ascribed femininity than the middle-aged women; the young adults are not significantly different from the middle-aged men.
- The young adults show some evidence of having "degendered" tasks, so that performing personal and household maintenance, earning income, managing money, and automobile maintenance are not as linked to gender identity as they are for the parent generation.

3. Congruence Between Generations Within a Family

- Younger unmarried adult daughters differentiate themselves from their own mothers on eight of the ten gender measures; daughters who are over 26, married, and/or parents do not differ from their own mothers on any of the gender measures.
- Unmarried young adult sons differentiate themselves from their own fathers by questioning their own masculinity in stereotypic terms, being more likely to define their masculinity as Macho and less likely to define it in terms of Family roles or Inner Androgyny, all of which suggest a more defensive posture of masculinity. Young men who have married are similar to their own fathers on nine of the ten gender measures; they have higher Masculinity scores on the self-report measure.

C. Theoretical Implications

1. Models of Gender Development One of the interests of this research is in seeing how the results from these analyses fit or seem incompatible with various models describing the development of gender identity and patterns of family socialization. In particular, we wondered whether the widespread efforts to challenge the cultural definitions of masculinity and femininity would be reflected in something resembling a generation gap between parents and their young adult children.

The data do not offer much support for a cohort effects model of development. Rather, young adults seem to show ways of differentiating themselves from their own same-sex parent, but this differentiation virtually disappears when the young person marries. While there is clear variability in the ways that the men and women in this study experience their own gender identity, their own children seem to follow whatever "family style" has been laid down. These patterns support the socioevolutionary model, which assumes that behaviors which are adaptive for family functioning are preserved and activated at the developmentally appropriate points in the life course. The results are also congruent with psychodynamic theories which postulate that identification with the same-sex parent is a mark of mature, adaptive behavior; and with social learning theories which describe the mechanisms through which behaviors might be acquired once the emotional identification specified by dynamic theory has been accomplished.

2. Gender Expansion vs. "Androgyny" One of the issues which has emerged in discussions of gender style has been the concept of androgyny. Conceptually, androgyny is based on a model of two separate dimensions, "masculinity" and "femininity", along which each person can vary. The "androgynous" person presumably has an equal balance between the "masculine" and "feminine" components of the person (Heilbrun, 1973; Jung, 1933/71). Bem (1974) did a great deal to enter this construct into the popular psychology vocabulary, though Gutmann used a similar term ("unisex") in his early descriptions of changes of later life (Gutmann, 1975). A great deal of research over the past two decades has been directed at identifying characteristics of persons who are androgynous compared with those who are sex-typed (high on the gender-congruent measure and low on the other) or undifferentiated (low on both dimensions).

While we have done some analyses using this framework (Angelaccio, 1990; Zucker, 1988), reflections on the gender interviews suggests that this is not the most useful model. Except for the minority of young adults who are having obvious difficulty in coming to terms with their basic gender, and who almost refuse to admit that being male or female has any social or psychological consequences, the men and women in this study are clear about the ways in which they experience themselves primarily in terms of their gender-congruent style. Their first experience of self has to do with how they deal with their own maleness or femaleness. The persons represented here have developed varied ways of recognizing themselves as "masculine" or "feminine", but the underlying theme is how much and how comfortably they can feel and behave in ways which they believe are congruent with their sex. The primacy of this sense of sex-congruent gender makes good sense in terms of cognitive-schema theories, such as that described by Deaux and her colleagues (Deaux & Kites, 1987). She observes that categorization based upon sex is one of the earliest cognitive accomplishments (along with recognizing other dimensions for categorizing objects), and remains a powerful organizing principle throughout life. The primacy of sex-congruent perceptions about the self also makes sense psychodynamically, since we need to deal with the realities imposed by differing reproductive potentials, hormones, aggressive potential, fantasies, and social-stimulus value.

We argue that this sex-congruent sense of gender forms the basis for adding (or rejecting) any interests, behaviors, etc. which are associated with the "other" gender. Recognizing a desire to propensity to confront criticism by direct challenge is typically experienced as gender-confirming by males because it affirms a very core aspect of masculinity; women who recognize the "same" propensity in themselves generally feel ambivalent about it, and may control the desire in order to remain gender-congruent or act on the desire in order to demonstrate that they are not limited by their gender. In any event, such actions are not neutral. Similarly, individuals are not regarded as sexless "persons" by others.

The "same" behavior will be evaluated, and responded to, by others in terms of the sex and presumed gender of the actor. Thus, it seems unrealistic and unreasonable to think in terms of "androgyny", "unisex" or "gender-free" realities. The degree to which behaviors and evaluations of behaviors are linked to gender certainly varies, between persons and probably by historical period and culture; in this sample, analyses

indicate that the older middle-aged men are relatively "gender sensitive" and the older, upper status women are relatively "gender transcendent" (Huyck, 1991b). However, the basic template for personal awareness and social interactions remains gendered.

D. Clinical Implications

1. Diversity in Gender Styles The ratings based on interviews about gender make it clear that adults develop varied ways of defining themselves as appropriately masculine or feminine. While acknowledging media stereotypes, they are not necessarily coerced by them. This is a positive sign, since it means that we can help persons identify the diverse ways in which they can be, and are, gender-congruent. From this base of security, it seems easier to acknowledge aspects of the self which are not congruent with personal or stereotypic gender, and to take pleasure in those expansions.

2. Family Patterning of Gender The results suggest that "the apple doesn't fall far from the tree" and that protestations of marked differences in gender style may reflect efforts to differentiate from the parent in order to mature. Thus, counselors should not be beguiled into automatically accepting the report of conflict linked to gender roles without examining the underlying issues of autonomy which may be played out in this socially-acceptable form. Personal and familial modifications seem to occur by mutual influence within more mature family systems, evolving revised but familiar ways of expressing masculinity and femininity.

E. Research Implications

We need to re-emphasize that the important distinctions between socioevolutionary patterns and cohort influences can only be addressed fully with cross-sequential, cross-cultural research.

Any research on gender should assume that gender-congruent styles are primary, and explore the variety of styles evident. Gender is a multi-dimensional phenomena, difficult to capture in any single scale or even set of ratings. The patterns and prevalence of various patterns should be explored in groups which differ from the current ones in terms of age, marital and family history, sexual orientation, ethnicity, and other characteristics which may well influence gender development over the life course.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS The intergenerational research project, "Aging Parents, Young Adult Children and Mental Health" was funded by a U.S. Public Health Services grant from the Center on Aging, National Institute of Mental Health, Grant Number ROI MH36264, to the Illinois Institute of Technology from 1982-1986, M. Huyck and S. Frank, Co-Principal Investigators. We especially appreciate the guidance of Dr. Nancy Miller and Dr. Barry Lebowitz from NIMH for their guidance in establishing the project. I would like to thank all the respondents who participated; Susan Frank for her contributions in establishing the data set; Amy Shapiro for her work as Project Coordinator; and the students who have helped collect the data and prepare it for analysis. Interviewers included Cathy Butler Avery, Scott Andrews, Jeffrey Angevine, Larry Antoz, Mike Bloomquist, Yael Buchsbaum, Paul Carney, Lidia Cardone, Rita Decker, Jim Duchon, Helen Dredze, Susan Frank, Gail Grossman, Dee Heinrich, Jeri Hosick, Margaret Huyck, Mark Laman, Hunter Leggitt, Bill Pace, Kate Philben, Timothy Pedigo, Martha Scott, and Mary Jane Thiel.

REFERENCES

Abraham, B. Feldman, S., & Nash, S. (1978). Sex role self-concept and sex role attitudes: enduring personality characteristics or adaptations to changing life situations? Developmental Psychology, 14(4), 393-400.

Angelaccio, C. (1990). Gender Identity of Young Adults. Masters Degree Thesis, Department of Psychology, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Bakan, D. (1966). The Duality of Human Existence. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Baltes, P. & Nesselroade, J. (1972). Cultural change and adolescent personality development: An application of longitudinal sequences. Developmental Psychology, 7(3), 244-256.

Bandura, A. (1969). Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Barnett, R.C & Baruch, G.K. (1987). Social Roles, Gender, and Psychological Distress. In R.C. Barnett, L. Bieneer, & G.K. Baruch (Eds.), Gender and Stress (pp 122-143). New York: Free Press.

Bem, S. (1974). the measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Berzins, J., Welling, M., & Wetter, R. (1978). A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the Personality Research Form. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(1).

Berzins, J., Wetter, R., & Welling, M. (1981). User's Manual for the PRF Andro Scale. Unpublished Manual, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Dept. of Psychology.

Block, J. (1984). Sex Role Identity and Ego Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decade's research on gender. American Psychologist, 39(2), 105-116.

Deaux, K. & Kites, M. E. (1987). Thinking about gender. In B. B. Hess & M. M. Feree (Eds.), Analyzing Gender (pp 92-117). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Farrell, M. & Rosenberg, S. (1981). Men at Midlife. Boston: Auburn House.

Frank, S.F., Avery, C.B., & Laman, M. (1988). Young adults' perceptions of their relationships with their parents: Individual differences in connectedness, competence, and emotional autonomy. Developmental Psychology, 24(5), 729-737.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.

Gutmann, D.L. (1975). Parenthood: A key to the comparative study of the life cycle? In N. Datan & R. Levine (Eds.), Life-Span Developmental Psychology: Normative Life Crises. N.Y.: Academic Press.

Gutmann, D.L. (1987). Reclaimed Powers: Toward a New Psychology of Men and Women in Later Life. N.Y.: Basic Books.

Gutmann, D., Griffin, B., & Grunes, J. (1982). Developmental contributions to the late-onset affective disorders. In O. Brim, Jr. & P. Baltes (Eds.), Life-Span Development and Behavior, V. I. New York: Academic Press.

Heatherington, E.M. & Parke, R.D. (1975). Child Psychology: A Contemporary Viewpoint. New York: McGraw Hill.

Heilbrun, C. G. (1973). Toward a Recognition of Androgyny. New York: Harper & Row.

Heilbrun, C. G. (1976). Measurement of masculine and feminine sex-role identifies as independent dimensions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 183-190.

Hollingshead, A. (1957) The two factor index of social position. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University, New Haven, Ct.

Huyck, M.H. (1989a). Models of midlife. In R. Kalish (Ed.), Midlife Loss: Coping Strategies, 10-34. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.

Huyck, M.H. (1989b). Midlife parental imperatives. In R. Kalish (Ed.), Midlife Loss: Coping Strategies, 115-148. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.

Huyck, M.H. (1990a). Gender differences in aging. In J. Birren & W.W. Schaie (Eds.), Handbook of the Psychology of Aging (3rd Ed.), 124-134. N.Y.: Academic Press.

Huyck, M.H. (1991a, February). Thirtysomething Years of Marriage: Understanding Experiences of Women and Men in Enduring Family Relationships. Paper presented at the International Conference on Gender and the Family, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Huyck, M.H. (1991b). Gender-linked self-attributions and mental health among middle-aged parents. Journal of Aging Studies, 5 (1), 111-123.

Jackson, D.N. (1967). Manual for the Personality Research Form. Goshen, N.Y.: Research Psychologists Press.

Johnson, M.J. (1963). Sex role learning in the nuclear family. Child Development, 34, 319-333.

Jung, C.G. (1971). The stages of life (1933). In J. Campbell (Ed.), The Portable Jung. New York: Viking.

Kohlberg, L. (1966). A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E.E. Maccoby & C. Jacklin (Eds.), The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Levinson, D. with Darrow, C., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H., & McKee, B. (1978). The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Knopf.

Loevinger, J. (1987). Paradigms of Personality. N.Y.: W.H. Freeman.

Myers, A.M. & Gonda, G. (1982). Utility of the Masculinity-Femininity construct: Comparison of traditional and androgyny approaches. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(3), 514-522.

Pedhazur, E. J. & Tetenbaum, T.J. (1979). Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 996-1016.

Pearlin, L. (1979). Life strains and psychological distress among adults. in N. Smelser & E. Erikson (Eds.), Themes of Work and Love in Adulthood. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.

Pearlin, L. & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19, 2-21.

Pleck, J. H. (1985). Working Wives/ Working Husbands. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Plomin, R. (1990). Nature and Nurture: An Introduction to Human Behavioral Genetics. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Ramanaih, N.V. & Martin, H.J. (1984). Convergent and discriminant validity of selected masculinity and femininity scales. Sex Roles, 10(7/8), 493-504.

Ruch, L.O. (1984). Dimensionality of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A multidimensional analysis. Sex Roles, 10(1/2), 99-117.

Schaie, K.W., Campbell, R.T., Meredith, W., & Rawlings, S.C. (Eds.). Methodological Issues in Aging Research. New York: Springer.

Smith, P.A., & Midlarsky, E. (1985). Empirically derived conceptions of femaleness and maleness: A current view. Sex Roles, 12(3/4), 313-328.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Veroff, J., Douvan, E., & Kulka, R.A. (1981). The Inner American. New York: Basic Books.

Zucker, P. (1988). A Typology of Gender Styles Applicable to the Second Half of Life. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, Illinois, 1988. (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International.)

REFERENCES

Abraham, B. Feldman, S., & Nash, S. (1978). Sex role self-concept and sex role attitudes: enduring personality characteristics or adaptations to changing life situations? Developmental Psychology, 14(4), 393-400.

Angelaccio, C. (1990). Gender Identity of Young Adults. Masters Degree Thesis, Department of Psychology, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Bakan, D. (1966). The Duality of Human Existence. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Baltes, P. & Nesselroade, J. (1972). Cultural change and adolescent personality development: An application of longitudinal sequences. Developmental Psychology, 7(3), 244-256.

Bandura, A. (1969). Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Barnett, R.C. & Baruch, G.K. (1987). Social Roles, Gender, and Psychological Distress. In R.C. Barnett, L. Bieneer, & G.K. Baruch (Eds.), Gender and Stress (pp 122-143). New York: Free Press.

Bem, S. (1974). the measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Berzins, J., Welling, M., & Wetter, R. (1978). A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the Personality Research Form. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(1).

Berzins, J., Wetter, R., & Welling, M. (1981). User's Manual for the PRF Andro Scale. Unpublished Manual, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Dept. of Psychology.

Block, J. (1984). Sex Role Identity and Ego Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Deaux, K. (1984). From individual differences to social categories: Analysis of a decade's research on gender. American Psychologist, 39(2), 105-116.

Deaux, K. & Kites, M. E. (1987). Thinking about gender. In B. B. Hess & M. M. Feree (Eds.), Analyzing Gender (pp 92-117). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Farrell, M. & Rosenberg, S. (1981). Men at Midlife. Boston: Auburn House.

Frank, S.F., Avery, C.B., & Laman, M. (1988). Young adults' perceptions of their relationships with their parents: Individual differences in connectedness, competence, and emotional autonomy. Developmental Psychology, 24(5), 729-737.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.

Gutmann, D.L. (1975). Parenthood: A key to the comparative study of the life cycle? In N. Datan & R. Levine (Eds.), Life-Span Developmental Psychology: Normative Life Crises. N.Y.: Academic Press.

Gutmann, D.L. (1987). Reclaimed Powers: Toward a New Psychology of Men and Women in Later Life. N.Y.: Basic Books.

Gutmann, D., Griffin, B., & Grunes, J. (1982). Developmental contributions to the late-onset affective disorders. In O. Brim, Jr. & P. Baltes (Eds.), Life-Span Development and Behavior, V. I. New York: Academic Press.

Heatherington, E.M. & Parke, R.D. (1975). Child Psychology: A Contemporary Viewpoint. New York: McGraw Hill.

Heilbrun, C. G. (1973). Toward a Recognition of Androgyny. New York: Harper & Row.

Heilbrun, C. G. (1976). Measurement of masculine and feminine sex-role identifies as independent dimensions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, 183-190.

Hollingshead, A. (1957) The two factor index of social position. Unpublished manuscript, Yale University, New Haven, Ct.

Huyck, M.H. (1989a). Models of midlife. In R. Kalish (Ed.), Midlife Loss: Coping Strategies, 10-34. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.

Huyck, M.H. (1989b). Midlife parental imperatives. In R. Kalish (Ed.), Midlife Loss: Coping Strategies, 115-148. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.

Huyck, M.H. (1990a). Gender differences in aging. In J. Birren & W.W. Schaie (Eds.), Handbook of the Psychology of Aging (3rd Ed.), 124-134. N.Y.: Academic Press.

Huyck, M.H. (1991a, February). Thirtysomething Years of Marriage: Understanding Experiences of Women and Men in Enduring Family Relationships. Paper presented at the International Conference on Gender and the Family, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Huyck, M.H. (1991b). Gender-linked self-attributions and mental health among middle-aged parents. Journal of Aging Studies, 5 (1), 111-123.

Jackson, D.N. (1967). Manual for the Personality Research Form. Goshen, N.Y.: Research Psychologists Press.

Johnson, M.J. (1963). Sex role learning in the nuclear family. Child Development, 34, 319-333.

Jung, C.G. (1971). The stages of life (1933). In J. Campbell (Ed.), The Portable Jung. New York: Viking.

Kohlberg, L. (1966). A cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes. In E.E. Maccoby & C. Jacklin (Eds.), The Development of Sex Differences. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Levinson, D. with Darrow, C., Klein, E.B., Levinson, M.H., & McKee, B. (1978). The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Knopf.

Loevinger, J. (1987). Paradigms of Personality. N.Y.: W.H. Freeman.

Myers, A.M. & Gonda, G. (1982). Utility of the Masculinity-Femininity construct: Comparison of traditional and androgyny approaches. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43(3), 514-522.

Pedhazur, E. J. & Tetenbaum, T.J. (1979). Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 996-1016.

Pearlin, L. (1979). Life strains and psychological distress among adults. In N. Smelser & E. Erikson (Eds.), Themes of Work and Love in Adulthood. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press.

Pearlin, L. & Schooler, C. (1978). The structure of coping. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 19, 2-21.

Pleck, J. H. (1985). Working Wives/ Working Husbands. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Plomin, R. (1990). Nature and Nurture: An Introduction to Human Behavioral Genetics. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Ramanaih, N.V. & Martin, H.J. (1984). Convergent and discriminant validity of selected masculinity and femininity scales. Sex Roles, 10(7/8), 493-504.

Ruch, L.O. (1984). Dimensionality of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A multidimensional analysis. Sex Roles, 10(1/2), 99-117.

Schaie, K.W., Campbell, R.T., Meredith, W., & Rawlings, S.C. (Eds.). Methodological Issues in Aging Research. New York: Springer.

Smith, P.A., & Midlarsky, E. (1985). Empirically derived conceptions of femaleness and maleness: A current view. Sex Roles, 12(3/4), 313-328.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and Femininity: Their Psychological Dimensions, Correlates, and Antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Veroff, J., Douvan, E., & Kulka, R.A. (1981). The Inner American. New York: Basic Books.

Zucker, P. (1988). A Typology of Gender Styles Applicable to the Second Half of Life. Doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, Illinois, 1988. (Abstracted in Dissertation Abstracts International.)