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The Uneveness of Social Change

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

Simultaneously, this traditional lock-step career path, characteristic of so many middle-class men in the middle of the 20th century, is becoming a shakier
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proposition, even for white, educated, male professionals, is the often implicit social contract between employer and employee is being rewritten. Workers of all ages and stages find themselves vulnerable to restructuring and downsizing, with seniority no longer necessarily meaning security. Young, new entrants to the workforce can no longer plan to stay in the same job or with the same company for very many years.

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

Socialization and Behavior

“Path dependence” is a term characterizing continuity in behavior, with actors tending to behave in the present and future much the same way as they have in the past. Socializing new generations to follow prescribed and predictable trajectories helps to ensure continuity in lives, organizations, and communities. But such blueprints become obsolete in the throws of a transition in progress, enabling (or requiring) individuals to forge their own trials, create their own scripts. In these circumstances, it is men’s and women’s actual experiences, not simply past socialization processes, that become forces of self-discovery and self-construction. A case in point is the baby boom generation of women born in the 1950s. What they learned at their mothers’ knees—at least in white middle-class homes—were the traditional gendered roles of nurturer, caregiver, homemaker. But they grew up with the women’s movement and the shift to a service economy, both of which opened educational and occupational doors closed to women of earlier generations. In the “Women’s Roles and Well Being
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Study: Dempster-McClain, Moen and Williams followed women first inter-
viewing in upstate New York in the mid-1950s, re-viewing them and their
adult daughters thirty years later (Dempster-McClain & Moen, 1998; Moen,
Dempster-McClain & Williams, 1989, 1992). They found that the daughters'
own experiences as students, workers, wives, and mothers became the powerful
socializing force in their lives, frequently contradicting lessons from childhood
and creating new patterns and possibilities. At the same time, the mothers of
the adult daughters in the study also benefitted from the changing opportunity
structure, many choosing to return to school, pursue paid or unpaid careers,
and/or divorce (Bradburn, Moen & Dempster-McClain, 1995; Etzioni, Moen
& Dempster-McClain, 1994; Moen & Erickson, 1995; Moen, Erickson &

Structure

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

But the contemporary economy is itself a transition-in-progress, transforming
occupational career paths and producing structural uncertainties for today’s
workers. Since waves of downsizing and restructuring began affecting the
middle class during the 1980s, managers and professionals, as well as produc-
tion and service workers, have been encouraged to follow a new set of career
rules. Those rules relate to remaining open as changing employment situations
and new opportunities, and to letting go of expectations for long-term employ-
ment security (Handy, 1980; Koner, 1995; Koner, 1995). The competitive
economic environment is such that many firms (and not simply manufacturers)
now follow lean production models (Harrison, 1994), as the markets in which many operate are increasingly global in scope, and such expanded competition often feature winner-take-all outcomes (Frank & Cook, 1995). Given the new economic environment, firms are more likely to retain small cores of valued employees over the long-term, while striving to maintain more flexible arrangements with others, either by hiring temporary contract employees or by sub-contracting portions of their operations with smaller firms. There is also a powerful ideological component to new employment relationships between workers and employers. Perhaps to a greater extent than in the past, business culture has an especially prominent position in American society, with business elites achieving celebrity status in the mass media. As a result, more recent generations of young adults are being socialized via the mass media to the excitement, glamour, and uncompromising needs of business (Frank, 1997).

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

**GENDER AS SOCIALIZATION AND STRUCTURATION**

Reconstructing Gender

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

The fact is that variants of traditional gender roles continue to be constructed and reconstructed (Ben, 1998; Moe & Yu, 2000; Rothen, 1998; Williams, 2000), despite the fact that ever fewer numbers of households can afford or even want the traditional male breadwinner/female homemaker lifestyle. Dual-earner households now outnumber traditional ones by roughly three to one (Chalkburg & Moe, 2001). What has changed is women's paid work role, not their carework role. And men are still expected, and expect themselves, to be full-time breadwinners. Thus, the lock-step career template persists in the organization of work and the structure of occupational careers, despite the reality of a changing workforce and changing economy. This structural lag is an impediment to the work-life effectiveness of all contemporary workers, male and female, as well as to their spouses and families (Moe, 2001; Riley & Riley, 1994). For example, this blueprint makes the prospect of reduced-hour work, even on a temporary basis in order to handle early childrearing responsibilities, highly problematic — in terms of benefits, advancement, and long-term job security (Hochschild, 1997; Moe, 2001; Epstein, 1999). Workplace and tenure security and success remain predicated upon a highly competitive model in which workers are expected to exhibit single-minded devotion to organizational goals. As a result, at least one adult in contemporary households tends to put in the long hours that "good" jobs in white-collar and blue-collar occupations require (Clarkberg & Moe, 2001; Moe & Yu, 2000).
Gendered assumptions and expectations are more than just ideas that individuals are socialized to embrace, they are embedded in the functioning of institutions, framing the parameters for social interaction. Nowhere is this more apparent in the opportunity structures of contemporary careers. As Williams (2000) and Moen (2001) argue, basic assumptions about ideal male workers having no caretaking responsibilities have defined the ways in which careers/work get defined both legally and in practice. Gender assumptions therefore shape and bend the passageways through which individuals must pass in order to be successful in their careers. Similarly, Rismas (1998) argues that we must conceptualize gender as social structure, along the lines of West and Zimmerman’s (1987) “doing gender” approach. She points out the way gender-based assumptions shape institutional, interactional, and individual contours of life. These assumptions, in tandem with a half-changed world, make negotiating work and family dimensions of life increasingly problematic.

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

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

Dual-career couples and single parents seek to forge at best creative and at worst livable adaptations to a career template that is at odds with their family goals and responsibilities. The dilemmas of single parents — fulfilling two roles simultaneously — means for many the absence of secure, stable career paths. Many couples adopt strategies in response to the structural reality of the breadwinner career template and, in effect but not necessarily in intent, reproduce a variant of the traditional gendered division of labor. This typically involves nontraditional arrangements in which husbands pursue careers largely
in the manner of good providers, with their wives arranging their own employment around their husbands' careers (Moen, 2001; Moen & Yu, 2000; Quick & Moen, 2002; Schwartz, 1994). This strategy, in turn, reproduces gendered roles and relationships, with women expected, and often expecting, to manage paid work and carework while men are expected, and typically expect, to concentrate principally on paid work.

The More Things Change . . .

There remains deep ambivalence about child rearing, especially given the difficulties of negotiating both full-time work and full-time parenting. Moreover, individuals and couples negotiating contemporary occupational and family career paths are doing so in the face of outmoded institutional arrangements. Most resistant to change is the structure and culture of work and of career paths. Employers typically gauge the performance, commitment, and productivity of their employees based on input (hours worked) rather than output (the end result of their labors). Government wage and hour laws are geared to "at least" full-time employment. The perpetuation of gendered work and family responsibilities may therefore reflect early socialization in the form of mixed messages at home, in the media, and in school. Yet equally important is ongoing adult socialization in workplace and household climates of cultural contradictions and structural lag laden with gendered prescriptions, options, and constraints. Individuals shape and revise their goals and expectations through observation and experience, on the job and in the family throughout adulthood, accompanied by self-socialization in the form of adaptive strategies to a world of work grounded in the traditional lock-step model of careers.

SOCIALIZATION AS A LIFE COURSE PROCESS

Cohort Replacement and Adult Socialization

Socially defined life course and career patterns provide continuity in roles, relationships, and institutions across cohorts and over time. Processes of socialization (by example, exhortation, experience) and various agents of socialization (parents, spouses, schools, media, bosses, coworkers) serve to prepare each generation for the rules, roles, and relationships of adulthood. Socialization explanations are central to theories of social stability; what is more problematic is the role of socialization in times of fundamental transformations in the nature of the life course.
“Cohort replacement” is a key explanation of social change as young cohorts of individuals, socialized to new ways of thinking, gradually replace older cohorts. From this viewpoint, younger adults should expect to pursue more egalitarian occupation and family career paths than was true of the generations before them. And it is certainly the case that younger cohorts hold more egalitarian gender beliefs than do older cohorts. But the outdated breadwinner/homemaker template still structures occupational careers and the privatization of carework (for families and women) means that young people continue to confront hard choices (e.g., Gerson, 1985; Orenstein, 2000) in constructing their life course. Hard choices that also contribute to their ongoing adult socialization. As Gerson (1985) found, adolescent plans and expectations tend to get overwhelmed by the structural realities that individuals (and couples) confront.

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

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

**Life Course Themes**

The life course focus on the agentic self (e.g., Elder, 1998; Marshall, 2000) conforms with both traditional career development literature and the rational choice theory of decision-making (e.g., Becker, 1981). Individuals are assumed to make optimal choices in the context of constraints, once we make allowances for the fact that gender shapes these options and constraints. Men and women therefore choose career paths that best match their goals and values, in light of...
the gender roles of the world in which they live. What is the life course approach really, however, are four key propositions related to the choice process. First is the issue of timing. When individuals move in or out of school or the workforce, in or out of family roles, can have tremendous implications for their life chances and life quality, with early choices shaping the biographical pacing of lives (see Bradburn, Moon & Dempster- McClain, 1995; Han & Moon, 1999a; Han & Moon, 2001; Hogan, 1981). Thus, women and men who enter, exit, or reenter educational or career paths at various life stages, as well as those who precipitate or postpone marriage or parenthood (or forego one or the other altogether), experience the opening up of some options and the closing of others.

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

Third, socialization, allocation, structure, and choice are all ongoing, dynamic processes, occurring throughout adulthood (see George, 1993; Jacobs, 1989; O’Rand, 1995, 1996a, b; Pavalko, 1997). The biographical pacing of work and family career trajectories and transitions reflect not only one or two choice points, but a series of adaptive strategies over the life course. Adult socialization on the job and in the home are often neglected by investigators who focus exclusively on socialization as fundamental only to the transition into adulthood (but see Kohn & Schooler, 1983; Mortimer & Simmons, 1978; Mortimer, Finch & Kumka, 1982; Mortimer, Lawrence & Kumka, 1980; Mortimer, 1986).

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

Important as well is historical context, especially the changing economy and the changing workforce (see Moen, 2001; Newman, 1993), as well as both stable and changing social policies (see Mayer & Schoepf, 1989) at the dawn of the 21st century, men and women are making educational, career, and
family choices in the context of economic uncertainty. They also do so within the context of structural and cultural lag in the organization of work and career paths, the absence of any major work/family policies in either the public or corporate sectors, and often their own learned ambivalence regarding gender, work, and family. As a result, individuals, couples, and households often make pragmatic rather than optimal choices (c.f. Breiger, 1995; Moen & Wethington, 1992).

Role and Stress Theories

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

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

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

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

In contemporary times, we witness uneven changes and pragmatic strategizing in the work/family arena emerging alongside of what has often been referred to as the postmodern predicament. This concept highlights how, given contemporary social and cultural transformations, the self has fractured, fragmented and split into multiple and contradictory self-investments. In his thesis about the malleable self, Zurcher (1972, 1977) describes the shifting nature of the self in response to institutional uncertainty and social change. During the peak of the tumultuous cultural and political revolutions of the 1960s and coinciding with the emergence of a powerful movement for
The centrality of both work and family life highlight how, for many, the struggle for self-definition emerges at the intersection of these life domains. In line with Zurcher's thesis (1972), the uneven changes in gender roles and career paths within the broader society can act to create tensions surrounding the previously taken-for-granted ways in which individuals come to understand and define themselves. As research on young adults demonstrates (Orange, 1999, 2002), individuals struggle over how to forge coherent sets of institutional commitments given perceived uncertainties in, and ambiguities related to, structural and cultural lag in gender and career options and scripts. As young adults strategize as to how to integrate the multiple aspects of their lives, and do so with significant others, they face structural conditions and uncertainties which, in turn, force them into a reflective stance with respect to their own self definitions — including their own uncertainty, ambiguity, and ambivalence about the viability of sustaining various work/family role commitments. Research (described in the next section) suggests that this process of working out the relationships between work and family roles occurs in the form of an ongoing dialog between institutional and reflexive components of self. The individuals we interviewed desire to forge institutional commitments, while at the same time harboring feelings of uncertainty, ambiguity, and ambivalence. Given uneven transformations in the institutions of gender, work, family, and the contemporary life course, the issue of defining the future — the flip side of ongoing socialization into adulthood — is not simply one of deciding what one wants, but also of struggling to come to terms with workable alternatives, and of having some idea of what one might realistically sacrifice in the process. And, given conditions of rapid social change, this shift toward a reflective self-orientation may prove adaptive for the individual. The capacity to view one's role involvements from a reflective distance permits individuals to move beyond old scripts, strategizing to creatively adapt to novel situations.

In the following sections we draw upon in-depth interviews with members of middle-class couples from the Cornell Couples and Careers Study and from a sample of advanced professional school students (for more information on the sample, see Orange, 1999, 2002 and accompanying essays). As the title suggests, this volume is not a call for more relational work and ambiguity in workplace policies; it is an appeal to more relational work and ambiguity in workplace policies. The sample is an unrepresentative one of those engaged in corporate careers. The women and men we interviewed are typically in their early thirties, and many are in their mid-thirties, having an average of over ten years on corporate staffs. However, these interviewees were often called on to be role models for their children, who are in their early thirties, following what they have learned at work. The reason is that a substantial number of women still do not have children. Why do they not have children? If they do have children, why do they not have more? The answers to these questions are usually complex, and the role of work play in these answers is often ignored.
the samples and studies see Becker & Moen, 1999; Clausen, 1993; Moen, 2003; Orange, 1999). We seek to highlight the plans and aspirations of middle-class men and women who are in the anticipatory phase of the life course, one that encompasses those in their 20s who are either single or married, but all soon to embark upon occupational careers. Most also plan to soon to begin families. As the illustrative case materials will show, their plans for the future reflect socialization in a half-changed world (see also Clausen, 2000).

CASE EXAMPLES: WORK AND FAMILY “CAREERS”

Men’s Expectations: Double Vision

The Neotraditionals

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

Consider Tom, a law student who aspires to build a career in finance and corporate law, and is already engaged, planning to marry over the next five years. He envisions himself as “always being the provider,” yet he also hopes to invest a great deal of time and energy in family life. He does not claim to speak for his fiancée’s career expectations, but notes that she does not think she will want to “stay at home all the time, or even for too long after having children.” He also admits that he does not imagine himself as being a “house-husband,” running a legal office out of the house and staying home with the kids. However, he also notes that, should the need arise, they would find a way to make sure that at least one of them was home with the kids. His ideal would be for his wife to find some type of flexible occupation where she could work out of the house on a part-time basis, in order to be available for the
children. About his own career prospects, he expects to move from firm to firm over the years, assessing that long-term careers in any one firm are possible for only about 5 to 10% of professionals nowadays. Tom therefore sees a neotraditional lifestyle, with himself as breadwinner and his wife, employed in a less demanding job, accommodating to their family and his career needs. There is ambiguity related to his wife's role and ambivalence concerning his own role investments: he wants to work hard, engaging in career hopping to move up the occupational ladder but also wants to spend time with his family.

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

These men seem fairly typical in that they seem to have been socialized to a good many of ideals we normally associate with women's equality. They are not, in theory, against the progressive ideals embodied in prescriptions of equal options in the workforce, regardless of gender. However, as they begin to reflect upon the actual practice of egalitarianism, and how their own plans for the future might be implicated by the actualization of these ideals, these men become more vague and less specific, conveying an ambivalence about their wives' occupational careers, especially when children enter the picture. These result in movement toward a nontraditional model. Nonetheless, they do seem to have a real degree of flexibility about their views of the future, and how they might make arrangements with their spouses in order to accommodate both their separate and shared role demands for the betterment of all. On the one hand, they do not have a gut or nearly defined views about how their roles will be allocated. On the other hand, they remain driven by modified visions of the provider role, visions grounding in the recognition of the lock-step breadwinner career template as the measure of productivity and success.
move from firm to firm in any one firm are days. Tom therefore is the same. Tom, then his wife, is hard, engaging in his work and also wants to spend time with his wife and children. It feels that they would be "great." It is not being earned. And while corporate attorney, or it would be "great," they feel that they would like their roles. But, more if "we want to say to the kids, "if they want to care of themselves" at the same time. This is the acceptance of the kids in what is feasible. They have been socialized to the equality. They are in equal terms of equal, they begin to reflect on their own plans for the future, these men and women, intimacy and work. They reflect their future, and how they will accommodate both of all. On the one hand they will have the clear dream of the role of breadwinner.
"if it comes down to it, she will sacrifice the career." Such ambiguity and ambivalence in confronting the dilemmas of work and family life among the women we interviewed are fairly common. But, for now, she is prepared to move full-speed ahead. Jennifer talked about how she plans to have children, and hopes to do so without interrupting her career plans. She, like many others interviewed, does not expect a great deal of mutual loyalty between herself and the firm she will work for. And she imagines a scenario in which she develops a good deal of expertise in her field of law over a period of about five years, or so, and then takes some maternity leave, begins retooling, and makes the switch over to consulting. Clearly this is a fragile scenario; however, given the structure of the labor market and of professional careers, one cannot extract much more from an uncertain future.

Alternative Arrangements
Amy is another MBA student, in her mid-twenties, who wants to have a professional career and someday a family as well. Her future aspirations involve hedging between her hopes verses expectations in terms of the kinds of family involvement that she might expect from a future husband, as she already has a serious boyfriend/fiancee who is also in professional school. In describing the kind of relationship she would like to have with a future spouse, Amy notes that her “preference would be that both myself and my husband want to take time off [to care for children] and would want to share” family responsibilit

1. However she “anticipates” that a “lot of them still consider the woman to be more of a caretaker.” Like Jennifer, Amy also has imagined a scenario in which she might be able to take time off upon having children, yet maintain her professional status and not get sidetracked from her career. During her previous work experience she knew “people who have had positions that [she] would love to be able to emulate where they have worked hard, they have gained a reputation, and so now they can create their own work arrangements [such as] working from home part of the time.”

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

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

Couples' Strategies: Double Divisions

Gendered Biographies, Uncertain Futures

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

Consider the case of Molly and John, both of whom have advanced degrees and are in their late twenties. They do not as of yet have children, but we can see how Molly's career decision-making process has already undergone a shift toward greater uncertainty and ambivalence, given her husband's more definite plans. Molly speaks of her husband John's career plans as having been "totally certain ever since he was three." She reports becoming more uncertain about her own career plans, noting that she is not really sure "sometimes whether I am
making a decision purely because of myself, or because of [their relationship] and how it might work out, which is frustrating." She also notes that part of the problem lies in the fact that they have come together during a time in which she is "still indecisive" about career and hasn't "known what I wanted as much, and he has known all along what he’s wanted." Therefore, she feels that "for him there’s no question of compromise because he’s not making any decisions," yet for her, "there’s always a question of compromise, because I am constantly revising what I want to be doing ten years from now." As she notes, "It’s hard to make those decisions without taking into account where I know my husband will be, or what he will be wanting to do in any case." In effect, Molly’s spouse John is an agent of socialization, creating a framework out of which Molly believes she will have to develop and fit her own career aspirations.

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

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

**Gendered Transitions**

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

The case of Brenda, a woman in her mid-thirties, and her husband Jeff, who is in his late-thirties, illustrates how contradictory, submerged, or unrealized expectations early in a marriage can create problems once children are no longer hypothetical. They have two children, both preschoolers nearing school age. Brenda talks about how when she was an undergraduate minoring in women's studies, she was determined not to let the "second shift" (Hochschild, 1989) happen to her. However, after their first child was born, Brenda took fifteen months off from work, while Jeff did not make any such change — "a more subject" between them. Brenda notes that she feels as though much of her life "has been dictated by his academic and employment plans," noting that she does "not think he would agree with that," but that is what she thinks. From Brenda's point of view, "she is the cog that makes everything turn" in their family life. However, she is not sure that this is a good thing because the children demand more from her as a result of it, as she has become even more the central focus of their attention. Furthermore, Brenda feels that Jeff has invested even more in his work in recent times. Brenda's ambivalence is manifest; she is torn between work and family goals and responsibilities, while her husband's growing commitment to work seems to exacerbate her problems. Still, as she points out, someone must take care of the family, and she feels left holding the bag. 

Jeff, on the other hand, reports much more satisfaction with the way in which they have negotiated their work and family responsibilities. He, too, admits that having children "locked them into more traditional gender-stereotyped roles," even though "philosophically" they did not plan life that way. He currently is pursuing a second advanced degree, in addition to working about 60 hours each week as a departmental director. But Jeff views the heavy workload as no problem as he "loves" his job and "can't wait to get to work in the morning" and would "stay forever" if he did not have family responsibilities. His career provides him with a real source of "meaning and identity." In effect, while Jeff and Brenda have similar ideals about gender roles in the abstract, in practice they have gravitated towards rather different standards, which
seems to reflect the pragmatic constraints of a work world still geared toward the lock-step career template of workers uncannily experienced by family responsibilities (see also Moen, 2001; Williams, 1999). In the face of these constraints, the couple strategizes in terms of cultural models of carework and paid work, deeper gendered processes of socialization to different sets of rewards and commitments.

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

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

Gina and Gregg

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

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

The interviews of family-oriented couples conducted by us several years ago might broadly be working to improve the world we would have preconceived. By contrast, the interviews of young married couples in the sample remained unanswered.

Beth and John

While one of the family-oriented couples, Elizabeth and James, have not immediately generated feelings of ambivalence, she has recently been pursuing graduate studies, and he has been working in a very demanding job. Their decision to remain together during this period was, in part, an attempt to maintain their current lifestyle. Elizabeth has recently become pregnant, and they are planning to have a baby in the near future.
the interviewer asked whether she views herself as being more work-centered or family-centered. She replied, "I must say that right now I am more family-centered because I am expecting twins in three months. Maybe about six months ago I might have answered differently. I was still getting my master's and working to improve myself. I love my job, and I love working with people. I would probably say work then, but now my life has taken a twist."

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

Beth and James

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

Consider Beth and James. While both have been employed since the time they were married, they began their marriage in a rather conventional mold. James struggled to get his career on track and, due to the highly specialized nature of his work, the couple made several moves in the hopes that James would ultimately find a good position. James never found that perfect niche. However, Beth's career as a manager did eventually take off. And, while James' career had entailed making numerous moves, the position in which he has ultimately settled, while not ideal in terms of prestige and success, does allow for a good measure of flexibility. Beth's high-level, demanding managerial
position allows for little flexibility. In fact, she often must work long hours in order to get the job done. But James has the flexibility in his workplace to be able to do a lot of the pick-ups and drop-offs with child-care providers, school and social activities, and has also been able to spend a great deal of time with their ten-year-old son, something James has come to greatly value. As Belz notes, "My husband spent a lot of time with our son and that made it easier for me to pursue my work. Because our wonderful nanny and my husband felt very supported in my career. If my husband had had a job like mine, it would have bothered me terribly." In effect, this couple had been socialized to one set of complimentary roles and priorities, but the nature of the job market was such that they had to shift into a new set of roles and priorities, which, upon enactment, has proved to be satisfying for both.

CONCLUSIONS

These case examples underscore the complexity of socialization processes in times of social change. Work and family no longer represent taken-for-granted roles that are learned through anticipatory socialization and played out according to conventional scripts, even though the heavy hand of these scripts continues to shape institutions and behavior. We have described three key processes we believe perpetuate the gendered life course: socialization, structuring, and the unevenness (structural lag) of social change. Our case materials demonstrate that old road maps to the work/family nexus may be obsolete but still permeate the culture and structure of paid work and caretaking, limiting individuals’ and families’ ad hoc strategies in a world in which both egalitarianism and gendered lock-step career templates coexist in individuals’ motivations and opportunities. Socially learned cultural norms and scripts as well as practical experience continue to influence the choices individuals and couples make in the face of these outmoded blueprints of caretaking and paid work. Our thesis is that the shifting nature of gender, families, and occupational careers, along with the structural and cultural lag in all three, are generating a good measure of uncertainty, ambiguity and ambivalence in individuals and couples of all ages, but especially those in their 20s and 30s, anticipating or launching both occupational and family life paths. A life course model leads to a dynamic, contextual, and relational focus on work and family careers. From this vantage point, the work/family nexus has become both the progeny of outmoded career blueprints and the lightning rod of gender negotiations and strategies. It can also be the harbinger of innovative structural leads – less gendered blueprints for the life course (Moen, 2001, 2003). We conclude by discussing connotations of the contemporary work/family career conundrum for both scholarship and society.
Sociologists remind us that individuals live in society, but also that society exists within the hearts and minds of individuals, in the taken-for-granted expectations and roles for living absorbed directly and indirectly through the rich and varied formal and informal socialization processes that operate to make human beings human. Thus, as Riley (1987) points out, individuals are both allocated into certain social categories and positions and socialized to choose them. Some of the most fundamental allocation processes and deeply ingrained lessons learned are the roles, rules, relationships, expectations and identities related to age and gender, paid work and carework, and their multiple intersections. This is dramatically illustrated in Setterssen and Hagestad’s research on people’s subjective timelines for work and family events (Setterssen & Hagestad, 1996a, b; Setterssen, 1997).

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

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

The life course theme of human agency points to the strategic adaptations of individuals and families confronting social institutions and cultural templates filtered for the middle of the 20th century, not the dawn of the 21st. Thus, men and women strategize to construct their own life courses, their own career paths, taking from the mixed messages of multiple agents of childhood and adult socialization what best fits their own goals and circumstances. In doing so they are struggling to create new realities in a world of less gendered options and distinctions (Espelie, 1988), but a half-changed world nevertheless, where wives still tend to make occupational career sacrifices in order to do the families’ – and societies’ – carework. Scholars can fruitfully reexamine their own taken-for-granted assumptions about linear, individual, and lock-step (typically male)
occupation career paths and about the work/family nexus itself, which is too often coached as a “women’s” issue (see also Moen & Han, 2001).

Implications for Policy and Practice

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

We have seen that individuals and couples strategize ways in which to live and to make a living on an ad hoc basis, taking the structure of work and occupational career paths as given. Thus, workers (typically women) may “scale back” on their career goals and obligations in order to better meet family goals and obligations, and/or couples may invest in one spouse’s (typically his) career (Becker & Moen, 1995; Clausen, 1993; Pavalko & Elder, 1993; Sorenson, 1985; Moen & Yu, 2000) or else relocate to accommodate to their spouse’s jobs (Lichter, 1982; Markham & Pleck, 1986).

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

What is required is a reassessment of the organization of work and of occupational careers, restructuring both to better recognize the domestic realities of contemporary workers’ lives. Most workers are married to other workers, and someone else, often the wife, provides relief to the breadworker. 5-day, 40-hour career paths become unrealistic. Part-time work does not provide sufficient income. Greater flexibility would socialize their occupation.

This is sometimes a conflict between the ways that family supports the one, and the ways that families themselves support the other: the means built into the institutionalization of work and family needs to be grasped, and couples need to be able to grasp those needs and to act accordingly.

1. Consider the extreme cost of prolonged maternal absence to employed men.
2. For further discussion, see Moen (1998).
3. See the conclusion.
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Contemporary life template: from the absence of hours expected and lived (Sorensen, 2003; Moen, 2003; Meus, 2001) to the consequences of new work/family arrangements and work/family lives, in which to live and to work and to be. It is easy to see why "carework" (Moore, 2001) may "scale up" family growth and socialize new generations. The workplace still operates upon implicit assumptions and cultural norms built up around the male breadwinner ideal. Removing the constraints of hegemonic policies and practices, and inventing structural leads geared specifically to greater coherency of paid work and carework, will enable individuals and couples to create social change through devising effective strategies, but will no longer be possible in contemporary life courses.

NOTES
1. Considerable research remains to be done before the debate can be settled as to how extensively this new employment model prevails (Sullivan, 1999). It seems reasonable to assume that these will likely continue to need groups of organization men and women to ensure their smooth operation.
2. For further discussion of the concept of ambivalence, see Lisschey and Pilliner (1999).
3. See the discussion of these ideals in Hay (1996) and Moe (1992).
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