

14

**Adolescence: Gateway to Gender-Role
Transcendence**
Jacquelynne S. Eccles

As concern over traditional gender-role identity has increased, there has been a growth in alternative theoretical views, androgyny being the most prominent. Several models of androgyny and gender-role transcendence have been proposed (e.g., Bem, 1976, 1985; Pleck, 1975; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975; Rebecca, Hefner, & Oleshansky, 1976a). These models assume that gender-role transcendence is more mature developmentally than is traditional gender-typed identity and role structure. In general, empirical evidence supports this value judgment. Adults endorsing both masculine and feminine personality traits as true of themselves are psychologically healthier than adults endorsing more gender-stereotyped personality traits (Bem, 1975, 1976; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Similarly, women who both work and have a family have higher self-esteem than full-time homemakers (see Rabin, this volume). In our complex culture the costs of following traditional roles now appear to exceed the rewards of the traditional gender-role identity. Why? And under what conditions will an individual's identity continue to develop toward androgyny? This chapter addresses these questions.

In order to describe how gender-roles develop—let alone speculate about factors necessary to ensure optimal development—we must first review the function of traditional gender roles and discuss the interaction of the individual and society in the process of gender-role acquisition and change. This goal is accomplished in the first section. In the second section, relevant models of both social development and gender-role development are discussed. In the final section, the social-psychological perspective outlined in section 1 and the developmental perspectives outlined in section 2 are integrated into a model of gender-role development that focuses primarily on identifying characteristics of

the developing individual and social environments that influence growth toward androgyny.

TRADITIONAL GENDER ROLES

Gender roles are based on the assignment of duties according to theoretically different but complementary clusters of traits and interest patterns commonly labelled masculinity and femininity. The "masculine" cluster refers to several related traits and roles linked to what Bakan (1966) labelled "agency," i.e., an orientation toward oneself as an individual against the world, a concern with self-protection, self-assertion, and self-expansion, and what Parsons and Bales (1955) labelled *instrumental* competence. The essence of "femininity" has been described by Bakan as a "communal" orientation toward self, as being at one with the larger social organism, as an affective caring concern for others and for social relationships, and as an expressive sense of feeling and nurturance. Parsons and Bales (1955) equated this cluster with *expressive* competence.

Since both sets of characteristics are essential for survival of the "group," societies must ensure the availability of both. One solution to this need has been the separation and isolation of these characteristics and socialization of the associated values and goals resulting in traditional systems of gender differentiated role ascriptions. These ascriptions are based on the differences in the two realms that are assumed to be intrinsic to males and females and consequently to adapt them better to specific types of occupations and social roles. As a result of these assumptions, gender-role division is seen as both natural and functional (see Bem & Bem, 1970).

These beliefs are passed along as basic components of the indoctrination into society's system of role differentiation and assignment (Inkeles, 1968) so that they become "zero-order" beliefs (Bem & Bem, 1970). Since gender is among the most concrete and fundamental of social categories, children have little difficulty learning gender-role stereotypes as their social understanding develops (Huston, 1983). Furthermore, given that children are motivated to become socially competent (Kohlberg, 1969) and that both peers and adults around them model and reinforce gender-stereotyped behavior (Huston, 1983), they readily acquire the particular abilities and preferences associated with their own gender. And, finally, in seeking competence through social conformity, many people simply do not distinguish between the descriptive and prescriptive functions of gender-role stereotypes—the difference between the way things are and other ways they possibly could and perhaps should be.

This system has developed and been maintained for a variety of social, economic, and political reasons. Holter (1970) notes that as one of society's functional distributive systems, gender-roles imply a differentiation and specialization of particular tasks, which increases overall efficiency, provided that the specialized efforts are coordinated. On an individual level, knowing one's "abilities," responsibilities, and "place" on the basis of one's gender lends structure

and security to that part of the personal identity based on gender. Examples of such division of labor are common and need not be elaborated here; in general, both the efficiency and security arguments are strong. A system in which one sex specializes in caring for the children and household while the other is responsible for supporting and maintaining the family unit makes more sense, in theory, than a system in which both sexes share equally in all tasks with less specialization and fewer clear-cut responsibilities. As a consequence, everyone knows their roles and can expect to mate with someone who shares a complementary view of their own role.

Difficulties arise when individuals grow up thinking that they *cannot* perform the other's tasks, or express both their instrumental and expressive abilities, but realize that they have both sets of abilities. At a societal level such a rigid system diminishes substitutability, increases status incongruities, and limits the number of situations in which members' talents and preferences are used to their fullest potential (Holter, 1970). But society can withstand these problems if its socialization processes are successful in filling all of its required role slots. On the individual level, however, the costs of limited potential, increased frustration due to poor fit with traditional role prescriptions, and restricted relations with others can well exceed the rewards of functional efficiency and simplified role patterns. And so it is at the individual level that we can expect pressure for change to emerge. It is the *individual* who will look for alternatives to the traditional system.

Some people eventually discover that they do not fit into the normative behavioral and attitudinal categories established for them. They reach a point of cognitive and ego development at which personal competence becomes separated from, and more important than, social acceptance. Self-schemas (Markus, 1977) may come to transcend gender-role defined identity and individuals may no longer rely on societal definitions of masculinity and femininity for evaluating their actions or those of others. While gender identity, the personal sense of what it means to be a man or a woman, will still be an important source of self-definition, gender *role* identity may not.

Of course, reaching this level calls for a very special person in a very special set of circumstances. "Special" here refers to the unique matching between both person and circumstance antecedent to gender-role transcendence. Many potential transcendants may never face a situation in which they feel restricted; that is, the restrictive environment may feel quite comfortable. The potential to change comes only when the person and the environment no longer match, reaching a state of "gender-role strain" (Garnets & Pleck, in press, p. 8). This condition of "strain" or crisis is necessary in establishing the potential for growth, in the sense that all human development is a process of resolving such crises, or restoring synchrony between the biological, social, and psychological aspects of a whole individual (Riegel, 1975).

The key issue in this regard, though, is that *not everyone resolves such crises* (if experiencing them at all) *in the same way*. Depending on the personal and

situational variables leading up to the gender-role strain condition, one may indeed reject social limitations and seek personally chosen values or may resolve the crisis in a traditional social direction by falling back even more rigidly into the traditional role structure, becoming a "Total Woman" or a "Marathon Man." The outcome depends on both the person and the social situation. While a cultural shift away from gender-typing will encourage and validate gender-role transcendence in some, it may increase pressure and thus rigidify the traditional roles and traits in others. But regardless of the outcome, the resolution of the gender-role conflict is fundamentally an individual developmental matter. It is to these developmental processes that we now turn.

INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT

Development as conceptualized by Riegel (1975) progresses along four interdependent dimensions: (1) the inner-biological; (2) the individual-psychological; (3) the cultural-sociological; and (4) the outer-physical. The changing progression of events along each of these four dimensions is not always synchronized and the loss of synchrony at any time in an individual's life is assumed to result in conflict or crisis. Through the process of restoring the lost balance, the individual matures—is internally strengthened. Erikson (1968) described this concept of crisis not "as a threat of catastrophe, but a turning point, a crucial period of increased vulnerability and heightened potential, and therefore, the ontogenetic source of generational strength and maladjustment. . . ." (p. 96).

Thus development is assumed to proceed through a hierarchical series of crisis formations and resolutions. By attaining new levels of synchrony across the four dimensions and by successfully adapting to new contexts, individuals gradually broaden their repertoire of cognitive schemas and become increasingly capable of dealing with more complex situations. Exposure to more complex situations and to maturational and social changes, in turn, can produce new crises and new resolutions (see Higgins & Parsons, 1983). The nature and direction of this sequential hierarchy has been described in similar terms by different cognitive and ego stage theorists (e.g., Kohlberg, Erikson, and Loevinger). These theorists all describe a graduated, dialectical process of inner psychological growth, mediated by active individual/environment interaction, culminating in autonomous levels of functioning in which the individual integrates once conflicting and differentiated aspects of personality to satisfy self-realized needs. Furthermore, each of these theorists points to adolescence as a critical period in the formation and solidification of a post-conventional identity—an identity reflecting one's own goals and experiences rather than being based on socially prescribed roles. Because Erikson and Loevinger have so directly influenced thinking about identity development, we will discuss their work as well as reviewing the gender-role development theories derived from their perspective.

Erikson. Erikson (1968) conceptualizes development as a series of stages, each representing a crisis created by the individual's level of development and

the socialization demands faced. Optimal growth depends on the successful resolution of each of these crises. Unsuccessful resolution can lead to stagnation and continuing functional preoccupation with that particular level. Important here is that this process reflects dialectical growth, in which the individual is able to incorporate factors of lower stages into current schemas, even while forming newly transcendent ones.

Erikson's stage of Identity vs. Role Confusion is particularly relevant for our understanding of gender-role development. During this stage the individual develops a stable self-schema that will guide subsequent role choices and goals. Central to this process is the individual's resolution of gender-role identity. To the extent that stereotyped gender-role definitions are incorporated into one's self-schema, one's identity will be stereotyped. To the extent that the individual does not rely on societal definitions of appropriate identities, the individual may move away from a stereotyped gender-role identity.

What is important to note about Erikson's model is the predicted crisis around identity formation and its timing. Erikson focuses on adolescence as the life period during which the opportunity for the development of the individual identity arises. He does not, however, specifically deal with the issue of gender-role transcendence and probably believed that the integration of society's gender-role definitions into one's identity was the healthy developmental course.

Loevinger and Block. Loevinger (1966, 1976) proposed a stage model of development characterized by an invariant hierarchical sequence of irreversible structural and qualitative change, marked by particular turning points or "milestones." Moving from milestone to milestone was assumed to be a dialectical process involving many interacting systems. Like Erikson, she points to adolescence as an important period for the movement away from a conforming ego identity toward a more individualized identity.

Block (1973) extrapolated from Loevinger's model to include a person's conceptions of gender role (see Table 14.1). Since we are primarily interested in adolescence and gender-role transcendence we will focus on Block's discussion of the passage from the Conformity to the Integrated stage. According to Block, conforming individuals are most concerned with accepting the ways of their social order first and understanding them later. Thus their behavior is influenced by the prescriptive function of gender-role stereotypes. At the conscientious level, the individual is more concerned with the growing differences between these traditional gender roles and changing sets of values. Block (1973) explains that at this level:

a self-conscious process of evaluating oneself relative to one's own internalized values and the prevailing expectations of the culture begins. Awareness of the deviance of one's own values from the societal values appears and both are examined critically.

This, I propose, is the beginning of the process of balancing agency and communion that will occupy the individual through the autonomous level as he

Table 14.1
Extensions of Stage Models to Gender Role Development

Loevinger/Block	Peck/Rebecca, Hefner & Okeshansky (1976)	Rebecca, Okeshansky, Hefner and Nordin	Ullian	Parsons and Bryan
<i>Pre-Social</i>	Undifferentiated gender role	Undifferentiated sex role		Undifferentiated gender role
<i>Impulsive</i> Development of gender identity, self-assertion, self-expression, self-interest	Gender-role polarization	Hyper-differentiated sex role	Biological Orientation Level I Masculinity and femininity conceptualized in biological terms and seen as biologically based	Hyper-gender role differentiation
<i>Self-Protective</i> Gender role as extension of self, self-enhancement		Stage IIA: Transitional Stage I Some sense of sex roles but no differential value attached; children are forced to comply with their knowledge of sex differences	Level II Masculinity and femininity seen as separable from biology	
<i>Conformity</i> Conformity to external role, development of sex role stereotypes, bifurcation of sex role		Stage IIB Children come to accept polarized differentially valued view of traditional sex roles; masculinity and femininity seen as mutually exclusive, polar opposites	Societal Orientation Level I Masculinity and femininity seen as inherent in social role and as essential for maintenance of social order	Gender role differentiation

Table 14.1—Continued

Loevinger/Block	Peck/Rebecca, Hefner & Okeshansky (1976)	Rebecca, Okeshansky, Hefner and Nordin	Ullian	Parsons and Bryan
<i>Conscientious—conformity</i> Examination of self as sex role exemplar vis-à-vis internalized values			Level II Growing awareness of arbitrariness of social roles	Transition Phase I
<i>Individualistic Autonomous</i> Differentiation of sex role, coping with conflicting masculine/feminine parts of self	Transition to androgyny	Stage IIC Transitional Stage 2 Androgyny Individual moves away from rigid conceptualization of sex roles; masculinity and femininity, while still salient, are not seen as mutually exclusive prescriptive roles	Psychological Orientation Level I Masculinity and femininity, while not biologically based, are essential to mental health	Transition, Phase II
<i>Integrated</i> Achievement of individually defined sex role	Gender-role transcendence	Sex Role Transcendence Sex roles become irrelevant social categories	Level II Rejection of Level I and endorsement of personally defined identity	Gender-role transcendence

attempts to cope with the competing demands and costs of agency and communion. This process will, for some individuals, ultimately eventuate in the integration of the two modalities in the highest developmental stage (p. 515).

The Autonomous stage, then, is a time of continuing attempts to resolve the questions, conflicts, and crises originated in the Conscientious period. The individual heads toward a resolution that can create the integrated morality of self-chosen values, which in terms of gender-role development involves the integration of one's masculine and feminine selves into a self-defined gender-role identity.

While stressing the importance of change, neither Erikson, Block, nor Loevinger were very specific about the nature of these transitions, what takes place during them, and why. In general, stage theories of social development present a logical sequence of stages that are assumed to emerge in a sociocultural vacuum. That is, they are an idealized sequence. Little attention is given to sociocultural effects on the sequencing and on the final stage of development each individual reaches. Given that adolescence takes place in a highly charged sociocultural milieu, the extension of these models to the development of gender-role identity needs to be evaluated very carefully.

The potential importance of adolescence as a gateway to gender-role transcendence is made even more salient if one assesses it within the context of Riegel's dialectical model. Viewed from this crisis resolution model, adolescence has to be seen as a period in which the simultaneous changes occurring in all levels create a stage with great potential for rapid growth. On the inner-biological level, adolescence begins with the first glimmers of puberty. Among the many other rapid physiological changes of this period, the appearance of secondary sex characteristics and the maturation of the primary sex organs transform the young adolescent into a fully sexual being. It is in adolescence that the capacity to engage in sexual intercourse emerges most dramatically to influence thoughts and to direct purposive behaviors (Sorenson, 1973). As with other aspects of growth, the development of sexuality is a many-faceted jewel, each side a different perspective, a different way of looking at the matter. With sexuality, strong and distinct conflicts between viewpoints produce some of the greatest ambivalences in the emerging adult.

On the individual-psychological level, sexuality becomes a social and moral conflict between what is proper and improper for the expression of these powerful biological drives and what constitutes meaningful, honest human relationships. Synchrony often is lost as persons may become physically mature before becoming emotionally capable of handling related psychological issues. In gradually resolving this crisis, adolescents strive toward a renewed balance between their sexual desires, their need to establish personal relationships, and their moral principles. In this process, they may accommodate the social ascriptions of others and turn strongly to their peer group both to obtain and to evaluate norms. In seeking a personally autonomous viewpoint they don't disregard the morality of their parents so much as deem that morality less relevant to a world in which

their parents are no longer central. Peers may become the more important, more compelling, and more "real" influence in the building of an individual adaptive schema (Kohlberg & Gilligan, 1971; Matteson, 1975).

Adolescent adaptation in the context of sexuality expands beyond peer group society into the perceived cultural milieu. Adolescents are concerned with shaping their rapidly developing identity into a socially acceptable role. On the sociocultural level, then, gender role surfaces as a major determinant of acceptability during this period. The influence of gender role on lifestyle includes beliefs about how one "should" walk, talk, eat, dress, laugh, cry, compete, work, shake hands . . . and even think, judged according to adolescent conceptions of what is "appropriate" for a man or a woman. For the adolescent, placing one's sense of a physical male or female body into what is perceived as a socially acceptable package is what developing gender-role identity is all about. That society's ideal of masculine and feminine traits may not apply to what the individual ultimately wishes to make of him/herself is a discovery that may or may not come with further maturation and identity development.

Extending the dialectic interpretation, all the many sides of the adolescent's evolving identity are shaped by the sociocultural context, and the importance of these sociocultural factors has been well noted. Studies of political socialization have shown that major transgenerational shifts in political attitude change come about when adolescents are placed in a sociocultural environment that confronts them with new beliefs and provides normative support for attitude change (Sears, 1969). Thus it is clear that the sociocultural milieu in which adolescent growth takes place will influence directly the course of that development.

At a still higher level, the sociocultural milieu of adolescence also has an indirect long-range impact on development. Our complex society places heavy consequences on the wide variety of choices adolescents must make about their lives. Significant choices have to be made, choices that will lay out the direction of one's future life. Adolescents must make their choices regarding marriage, career, a moral code, and perhaps a political ideology, all of which help form their adult social cohort. And because these decisions indirectly influence an individual's adult sociocultural milieu, life choices and new attitudes tend to become permanent throughout the adult years (Newcombe 1967; Rogers, 1972). All in all then, the dialectical products of adolescence are decisive in forming and shaping the adult-to-be and in providing the impetus to growth beyond the level of conformity.

DEVELOPMENT OF GENDER-ROLE TRANSCENDENCE

As we have seen, the theoretical similarities between the cognitive- and ego-developmental approaches to adolescent growth and psychological maturity are quite striking. Each has presented a model of development that characterizes the individual as moving from a pre-adolescent orientation of avoiding punishment and gratifying impulses as the basic criteria of morality, through a rigid con-

formity to and defense of perceived societal norms, through a questioning period of ambivalence and conflict between once-accepted norms and new self-evolved beliefs, to an integrated level of resolution, identity, and self-accepted moral principles.

Several psychologists have noted that these general processes should influence gender-role development and that androgyny or gender-role transcendence is a more mature developmental end point than acceptance of traditional gender roles (Block, 1973; Parsons & Bryant, 1978; Pleck, 1975; Rebecca, et al., 1976a; Rebecca, Oleshansky, Hefner, & Nordin, 1976b; Ullian, 1976). Empirical data have supported the utility of an extension of a cognitive-developmental model to the development of gender-role identity. For example, Block (1973) has shown that greater ego maturity as measured by Loewinger's sentence completion index is related to more androgynous, less gender-role-stereotyped definitions of the self, especially in males. Similar results were reported by Haan, Smith, and Block (1968) in a study relating college students' Q-sort descriptions of their personalities to their level of moral reasoning. Students judged to be at the conventional level of moral reasoning chose adjectives stressing conformity to the social order, that is, gender-role-consistent adjectives. In contrast, post-conventional males endorsed more communal, but fewer agenic, self-descriptions. Similarly, post-conventional females endorsed more agenic characteristics, although not fewer communal adjectives.

Several individuals have proposed new sequential models of gender-role development, based either on the stage models of cognitive and ego development or on a more intuitive description of changing developmental tasks over the lifespan (e.g., Block, 1973; Huston, 1983; Parsons & Bryant, 1978; Pleck, 1975; Rebecca and her associates, 1976a, 1976b, 1978; Ullian, 1976). All point to adolescence as an important period of gender-role development. But few have explicitly dealt with the social forces that either facilitate or retard development toward gender-role transcendence. But as is the case with the models from which they grew, these extensions both have understated the importance of the vast array of sociocultural forces that are impinging on the adolescent and have not dealt sufficiently with the period of transition and the forces that must be present to ensure "successful" development to a "higher" stage.

Cognitive- and ego-developmental stage theories describe the optimal pattern for development. Cognitive maturational changes may be necessary for the emergence of an androgynous gender role identity, but are they sufficient? A dialectical analysis suggests not. Growth and development depend on several factors: maturational change being only one. While one's cognitive maturity may make gender-role transcendence a possibility, cognitive growth on the content level depends on the availability of "discrepant" input that would lead to accommodation of existing stereotypic schemas. In addition, behavioral rewards and punishments must be such that gender-role transcendence is a better alternative for the adolescent than gender-role conformity. If gender-role transcendence does not offer an attractive alternative, or if the adolescent sees no conflict

between his/her own abilities and goals and the behaviors and goals perceived by a stereotypic gender role, or if the stereotypic gender role is not important to the individual, then no conflict will occur and growth will be delayed. Again, sociocultural factors influence the likelihood of each of these events. As such, they must be key factors in one's development toward gender-role transcendence. Given both the theoretical arguments presented above and the supporting empirical evidence, it is surprising that more attention has not been given to the issue of transition from a conventional gender-role identity to gender-role transcendence, and to sociocultural factors that influence transition. It is to these issues that the final two models are addressed.

Rebecca, Oleshansky, Hefner, and Nordin (1976). Building on the three stage model (undifferentiated, polarized, and androgynous) of gender-role development proposed by Pleck (1975), Rebecca and her colleagues (1976a, 1976b) outlined a more detailed sequence of development that both added an additional fourth stage to the sequence (gender-role transcendence) and divided the second or middle gender-role polarized phase into three subperiods: a transitional period in which gender-role schemas are not yet rigid cognitive structures motivating behavioral compliance; a solidified period in which gender-role schemas have become rigid standards for self-evaluation; and a second transitional period in which gender-role schemas lose their prescriptive function, allowing the individual greater behavioral latitude.

Rebecca et al. (1976a) argued that development will not necessarily reflect a linear progression from undifferentiated to differentiated to undifferentiated and pointed out the importance of the social milieu in determining changes in the rigidity of one's gender-role schemas. Furthermore, they noted the importance of the early adolescent subculture in producing an increase in the rigidity of the gender-role schemas. Their emphasis on the role of social forces in interaction with individual development provides one of the first clear articulations of the processes that may accelerate or impede gender-role development.

Parsons and Bryant (1978). Building on the work discussed thus far and on work in social psychology stressing the importance of the social context both as a precursor of change and as the environmental factor that supports change once it has occurred, we proposed a model of gender-role development that focuses on adolescence as an important developmental "window" and on the social forces that will influence change during this period and later in life.

Our model is built on the following assumptions:

1. Growth is multiplidetermined and is based on a conflict between the various internal and external forces impinging on an individual across the lifespan (cf. Riegel, 1975).
2. Adolescence is a period in which the following three forces are almost always in conflict: biological (both cognitive and sexual maturational), psychological (emotional and moral), and sociocultural. In addition, it is a time when cognitive development has proceeded far enough that the individual is able and motivated to imagine alternative social orders and when shifts in one's subculture are likely to increase one's

sensitivity to the arbitrariness of social rules (Higgins & Parsons, 1983). Finally, it is also a period in which adult roles are still being chosen and one's future life is still flexible. Consequently, it is likely to be one period well suited for the development of gender-role transcendence.

3. The relationship between sociocultural milieu and development is interactive. That is, while the sociocultural milieu influences development, one's development also influences the sociocultural milieu to which one is exposed. As a consequence, large scale change can be produced by and, in many cases may depend on, externally-induced political-historical changes. These changes may alter the individual's immediate sociocultural milieu in a way that initiates conflict between the milieu and the individual's psychological frame (or in this case one's gender-role identity).
4. Because so many forces influence development, the surface manifestations of growth will be irregular. For example, with the potential for change comes the potential for regression to early modes of thought (Mehrabian, 1968). Therefore, the very same forces that can induce growth—expanding one's peer group to include both sexes, for example—can initially induce anxiety and regression to well practiced, less sophisticated schemas.
5. Growth depends on a sociocultural milieu that provides both the basis for conflict to emerge and the supports for growth to a higher level of development.
6. The potential for growth, once it has emerged, continues to be present despite apparent rigidification of the system. That is, growth potential, while optimal in adolescence, is not lost once one enters adulthood. Continued adult development is inhibited more by the rigidity of the social roles in which one finds oneself than by the passage to another developmental stage. Consequently, major shifts in adult social roles can be expected to have an impact on gender-role identity comparable to the impact of adolescence (see Sinnott, this volume). The outcome of these crises will depend on the individual's sociocultural milieu at the time of each crisis.
7. Growth toward gender-role transcendence depends on the following psychological shifts:
 - a) The differentiation of gender identity from gender-role identity so that one's confidence in one's gender identity is not tied to the adherence to the culturally prescribed gender-role;
 - b) The differentiation of the descriptive and prescriptive functions of stereotypes;
 - c) The questioning of the validity of prescriptive functions of stereotypes for both the individual and for society at large;
 - d) The reduction of gender-role salience as a defining property of one's ego identity and of one's evaluative system for others.

Based on these assumptions, we propose the following sequence as one possible developmental course toward gender-role transcendence. It is important to note that we are not proposing this as a stage model of development. Given the dialectical view outlined above, we believe that gender-role development will be an individual process driven by both cognitive maturation and social experience. The sequence outlined below reflects a probabilistic assessment of the likely sequence of events in this culture for an average, white, middle-class child growing up in a fairly traditional family and neighborhood.

Step I: Undifferentiated gender roles (0–2.5 years). The child is unaware of gender as a social category and has not learned or developed gender-role stereotypes.

Step II: Hyper-gender-role differentiation (3–7 years). Gender becomes a social category. Rigid stereotyping of activities, dress, social roles, and some personal characteristics such as strength and power emerge. Gender schemas emerge and begin to shape information storage and retrieval as well as preferences for gender-stereotyped activities and toys (Carter & Levy, 1987; Martin & Halverson, 1981). Gender-role conceptualizations are seen as both descriptive and prescriptive and the distinction between gender identity and gender-role identity is not clear. But, because preschoolers do not integrate their cognitive beliefs with their behavior, sex differences in behavior will not be as great as one would expect based on the rigidity and prescriptive nature of their gender-role conceptualizations.

Step III: Gender-role differentiation (7–11 years). Cognitive maturation has laid the groundwork for the differentiation of gender identity from gender-role identity. The child is now capable of separating external manifestations and changes from stable internal constructs such as gender identity. Consequently, the child comes to realize that girls and boys can do many different things without altering their gender and that gender-role norms are flexible social rules (Carter & Patterson, 1982; Carter & Taylor, in press). But the emergence of conventional moral thought and a growing awareness of social roles and potential censure by one's peers leads the child to maintain beliefs in the prescriptive nature of stereotypes (Carter & McCloskey, 1983/1984; Ullian, 1976). For boys, this belief is reinforced not only by others' reactions to feminine gender-stereotyped behavior but also by the cultural value structure. Boys' stereotypic behaviors are both more fun and more prestigious. For girls, however, adherence to the female stereotype is neither as fun nor as prestigious and "inappropriate" gender-role behavior is less likely to be punished. Consequently, conflict is created for girls and the sociocultural environment is supportive of alternative behavioral solutions. Girls should then begin questioning the prescriptive nature of gender roles during this period and may begin to move toward androgyny.

Step IV: Transition phase I (12–14 years). Cognitive maturation has now opened the possibility of considering new social orders and of distinguishing between the descriptive and prescriptive functions of gender-role stereotypes. Major sociocultural and physiological changes are also taking place. The child is expected to become a sexual being and to begin relating to members of the opposite sex. The basis for social approval and popularity shifts from acceptance from same-sex peer groups to acceptance by both-sex peer groups. To the extent that self-esteem becomes tied to this newly emerging social system, an identity crisis will be induced by the need to acquire rapidly the behaviors necessary for acceptance by the other sex. Given the absence of clear models of behavioral alternatives, the lack of sophistication of the peer group, and the perceived link of social acceptance to traditional gender roles, early adolescents may well

"regress" to gender-role conceptualizations they had formed during Step II and III. Thus, despite the cognitive capacity to transcend the prescriptive function of stereotype, sociocultural forces may produce a rigidification of stereotypes and a reemergence of a confusion between gender identity and gender-role identity. This process should be especially evident in adolescents who place great importance on social success with other-sex peers. Since many females perceive their primary role in life to be that of wife and mother, gender-role salience is likely to be high. And we may expect to find some females specifically rejecting those aspects of their behavior that are linked to more traditional male achievement domains.

Step IV: Transition phase II (15–18 years). Some adolescents have established a more stable place in their peer culture and should have worked through some of the conflicts generated in Step III. The need to solidify life plans introduces the potential for a careful examination of who one "is" and a rethinking of one's identity. Since the necessary cognitive structures are available and social roles are still quite flexible, adolescence marks the prime opportunity for gender-role transcendence. If the sociocultural milieu provides the necessary stimuli, adolescents can transcend gender roles as one aspect of the resolution of their identity crisis. While the potential for transcendence remains with the individual throughout life, adult social roles selected on the basis of gender-role differentiation at this period can effectively obstruct this developmental path for extended periods of time. For example, Marini (1985) has shown that heavy dating, marriage, or parenting at this age delays females' post high school education and entry into the labor market.

But what are the appropriate sociocultural stimuli and rewards? Role modeling literature suggests the importance of androgynous role models (Eccles & Hoffman, 1984). Piagetian theory suggests discrepant information that leads to the accommodation of stereotypic schemas (see Newcombe, 1967). Behavioristic theory and attitude change studies suggest the importance of a supportive social environment. Thus, we predict that adolescents who are exposed to androgynous models, who are forced to think about the relevance of gender role for their life decisions, and who live in an "egalitarian" environment are likely to grow toward gender-role transcendence. Adolescents in more traditional environments with limited exposure to "egalitarian" ideas of androgynous role models will probably continue to base their behavior and their judgments of others on the gender-role stereotypes of our society.

Stage V: Identity and gender-role transcendence. The ambivalences and crises of Step IV have been resolved into an integration of masculinity and femininity that transcends traditional gender roles. The individual is characterized by post-conventional, self-principled thought and action. This stage essentially coincides with Stage III in the Rebecca et al. model.

As should be apparent, our model is most similar to the model of Rebecca et al. It differs primarily in the elaboration of early development, in our suggestion of at least two periods of hyper-rigidity of gender-role schemas in self identity,

and in our focus on the identification of the social and individual factors that impinge on development.

SUMMARY

The model of gender role development presented here represents a synthesis of the theories and findings that work around, but not specifically with, our topic. In approaching this model we have integrated aspects from several approaches into a dialectical model of developmental change that draws heavily from existing social development theories. Consistent with several contemporary views of gender roles, we have assumed that gender-role transcendence is a "higher" level of development than gender-role adherence. By adherence we mean something akin to models of gender schemas, in that adherence is defined by the use of gender-role schemas to process information, evaluate the actions of others, and guide one's own preferences, choices, and behaviors. By transcendence we mean movement away from each of these forms of schematic processing. Like Spence and Sawin (1985), we do not mean the absence of gender identity. Nor do we mean ignorance of the cultural norms or the descriptive nature of gender-role stereotypes. Instead, we mean a conscious awareness of the arbitrariness of these norms and stereotypes and a reduction in their salience as guides for self-development and evaluation of others. It seems likely that development will proceed at different speeds for these various components of gender-role schemas and that, although growing awareness of the arbitrariness of gender-role prescriptions may be necessary for the development of a gender-role transcendent schema for oneself, it will not be sufficient. Nor will it be sufficient for the development of gender-role transcendent schemas for evaluating others.

The theories and research we have reviewed regarding adolescent development and gender roles are ambitious and encouraging, but are by no means conclusive. Most of the available empirical work is focused on the early years of development. We have relatively few data about the adolescent period and about the kinds of social structures that either facilitate or retard development toward gender role transcendence. Consequently, few of the hypotheses generated in this chapter can now be evaluated. It is our hope that future research will be directed toward the investigation of gender schemas and gender-role transcendence during adolescence in order to explore the predictions made by our model.

REFERENCES

- Bakan, D. (1969). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Bem, S. (1975). Sex-role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 512–526.
- Bem, S. (1976). Probing the promise of androgyny. In A. Kaplan & P. Bean (Eds.), *Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings towards a psychology of androgyny* (pp. 48–61). Boston: Little, Brown.

- Bem, S. L. (1985). Androgyny and gender schema theory: A conceptual and empirical integration. In T. B. Sonderegger (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1984: Psychology and gender* (pp. 179-226). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Bem, S. L. & Bem, D. J. (1970). Case study of a nonconscious ideology: Training the woman to know her place. In D. J. Bem (Ed.), *Beliefs, attitudes, and human affairs*. Belmont, CA: Brooks-Cole.
- Block, J. H. (1973). Conceptions of sex-roles: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. *American Psychologist*, 28, 512-526.
- Carter, D. B. & Levy, G. D. (In press). Cognitive aspects of early sex-role development: The influence of gender schemas on preschoolers' memories and preferences for sex-typed toys and activities. *Child Development*.
- Carter, D. B. & McCloskey, L. A. (1983/1984). Peers and the maintenance of sex-typed behavior: The development of children's conceptions of cross-gender behavior in their peers. *Social Cognition*, 2, 294-314.
- Carter, D. B. & Patterson, C. J. (1982). Sex-roles as social conventions: The development of children's conceptions of sex-role stereotypes. *Developmental Psychology*, 18, 812-824.
- Carter, D. B. & Taylor, R. D. (In press). The development of children's awareness and understanding of flexibility in sex-role stereotypes: Implications for preferences, attitudes, and behavior. *Sex Roles*.
- Eccles, J. & Hoffman, L. W. (1984). Sex roles, socialization, and occupational behavior. In H. W. Stevenson & A. E. Siegel (Eds.), *Research in child development and social policy* (Vol. 1). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Erikson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Garnets, L. & Pleck, J. (In press). Sex role identity, androgyny, and sex-role transcendence: A sex-role strain analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*.
- Haan, N., Smith, M. B., & Block, J. H. (1968). Moral reasoning of young adults: Political-social behavior, family background, and personality correlates. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 183-201.
- Higgins, E. T. & Parsons, J. E. (1983). Social cognition and the social life of the child: Stages as subcultures. In E. T. Higgins, D. Ruble, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), *Social cognition and social behavior: Developmental issues*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holter, H. (1970). *Sex roles and social structure*. Oslo, Norway: Westholmes Boktrykkeri.
- Huston, A. C. (1983). Sex-typing. In P. H. Mussen & E. M. Hetherington (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 4) (pp. 387-467). New York: Wiley.
- Inkeles, A. (1968). Society, social structure, and child socialization. In J. Clausen (Ed.), *Socialization and society*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization research* (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Kohlberg, L. & Gilligan, C. (1971). The adolescent as philosopher: The discovery of the self in a post-conventional world. *Daedalus*, 100, 1051-1086.
- Loevinger, J. (1966). The meaning and measurement of ego development. *American Psychologist*, 21, 195-206.
- Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development: Conceptions and theories*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marini, M. M. (1985). Determinants of adult role entry. *Social Science Research*, 14, 309-350.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 63-78.
- Martin, C. L. & Halverson, C. F. (1981). A schematic processing model of sex-typing and stereotyping in children. *Child Development*, 52, 1119-1134.
- Matteson, D. R. (1975). *Adolescence today: Sex roles and the search for identity*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Mehrabian, A. (1968). *Analysis of personality theories*. New York: Wiley.
- Newcombe, T. M. (1967). *Persistence and change: Bennington College and its students after 25 years*. New York: Wiley.
- Parsons, T. & Bales, R. (1955). *Family, socialization and interaction process*. New York: Free Press.
- Parsons, J. E. & Bryant, J. (1978). Adolescence: Gateway to androgyny. *Michigan Occasional Paper*, No. VIII.
- Pleck, J. H. (1975). Masculinity-femininity: Current and alternative paradigms. *Sex Roles*, 1, 161-178.
- Rebecca, M. (1978). Sex-role development across the lifespan. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the Orthopsychiatry Society, San Francisco.
- Rebecca, M., Hefner, R., & Oleshansky, B. (1976a). A model of sex-role transcendence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 32, 197-206.
- Rebecca, M., Oleshansky, B., Hefner, R., & Nordin, V. D. (1976b). Polarized sex roles as a model of the process of sex discrimination; Transcending sex roles as a model of the future. Final report of Phase II, Contract #NIE-C-74-0144.
- Riegel, K. F. (1975). From traits and equilibrium toward developmental dialectics. In J. K. Coles & W. J. Arnold (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1974-1975*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Rogers, D. Persistence of personality traits. In D. Rogers (Ed.), *Issues in adolescent psychology* (pp. 46-62). New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts.
- Sears, D. O. (1969). Political behavior. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 5). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Sorenson, R. (1973). *Adolescent sexuality in contemporary America*. New York: World.
- Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conception of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 29-39.
- Spence, J. T. & Sawin, L. L. (1985). Images of masculinity and femininity: A reconceptualization. In V. E. O'Leary, R. K. Unger, & B. S. Wallston (Eds.), *Women, gender, and social psychology* (pp. 35-66). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ullian, D. Z. (1976). The development of conceptions of masculinity and femininity. In B. Lloyd & J. Archer (Eds.), *Exploring sex differences*. New York: Academic Press.

