

A large, stylized teal silhouette of a tree with a thick trunk and a full, rounded canopy, serving as a background for the text.

Women Growing Older

PSYCHOLOGICAL
PERSPECTIVES

BARBARA F. TURNER
LILLIAN E. TROLL
EDITORS

Women Growing Older

P S Y C H O L O G I C A L
P E R S P E C T I V E S

B A R B A R A F. T U R N E R
L I L L I A N E. T R O L L
E D I T O R S



SAGE Publications
International Educational and Professional Publisher
Thousand Oaks London New Delhi

Copyright © 1994 by Sage Publications, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information address:



SAGE Publications, Inc.
2455 Teller Road
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications Ltd.
6 Bonhill Street
London EC2A 4PU
United Kingdom

SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
M-32 Market
Greater Kailash I
New Delhi 110 048 India

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Women growing older: psychological perspectives / edited by Barbara F. Turner, Lillian E. Troll.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-8039-3986-8.—ISBN 0-8039-3987-6 (pbk.)

1. Women—Psychology. 2. Middle aged women—Psychology. 3. Aged women—Psychology. I. Turner, Barbara F. II. Troll, Lillian E.

HQ1206.W8746 1994

305.4—dc20

94-35574

94 95 96 97 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2

Sage Production Editor: Astrid Virding

Contents

1. Introduction	
<i>Barbara F. Turner</i>	1
2. Women's Goal Orientations Across the Life Cycle: Findings From the Terman Study of the Gifted	
<i>Carole K. Holahan</i>	35
3. The Social Clock Project in Middle Age	
<i>Ravenna Helson and Laurel McCabe</i>	68
4. Social Cognition and Gender Stereotypes for Women Varying in Age and Race	
<i>Barbara F. Turner and Castellano B. Turner</i>	94
5. Women's Creativity and Images of Gender	
<i>Gisela Labouvie-Vief</i>	140
6. Family Connectedness of Old Women: Attachments in Later Life	
<i>Lillian E. Troll</i>	169
7. The Relevance of Psychodynamic Theories for Understanding Gender Among Older Women	
<i>Margaret Hellie Huyck</i>	202
8. A Life-Span View of Women's Social Relations	
<i>Toni C. Antonucci</i>	239
Index	270
About the Contributors	279

1

Introduction

Barbara F. Turner

Our purpose in producing this book is to relate current research on older women to recent theoretical and conceptual developments in the psychology of adult development and aging. Our ultimate goal in looking at the intersection of these fields is to stimulate the development of theory where it has been notably scarce. We are not the first gerontologists to remark on this paucity of gerontological theory (e.g., Birren & Bengtson, 1988; Marshall, 1986), which can in part be attributed to a prevailing social-problem focus. In pursuit of our goal, we asked the authors who contributed the chapters to develop or apply psychological concepts and models to empirical data, typically from their own research.

The decision to focus on older *women* instead of to focus more broadly on gender differences is partly strategic, to accommodate to space limitations. It is also because we are older women ourselves and particularly interested in this subject. We hope we can help turn the study of adult development and aging away from its prevailing definition of an older person as an urban heterosexual White non-Latino man. **Because women form a substantial majority of the North American population over 50 and increasingly more of a majority with each succeeding age decade, it is absurd to refer to us as a “minority.”**

AUTHOR'S NOTE: The author is indebted to her co-editor, Lillian E. Troll, for extensive editing and revision of this chapter. The chapter also has benefited from the remarks of an anonymous reviewer.

Our focus on older women also is meant to draw attention to the tremendous variation among them. But there are times throughout this volume when a broader focus on female-male differences and similarities is unavoidable. This is so because, historically, psychological theory and research on gender have *emphasized* the delineation of gender differences, as described a little later in this chapter. In many perspectives and approaches, as noted, gender comparisons are explicitly featured. Even in research focused wholly on older women, comparisons with men are often implicit.

Our other decision, to limit the focus to the *psychology* of older women, runs counter to the prevailing gerontological policy of multidisciplinary collaboration. Books on older women typically include an array of topics that reflect the research and viewpoints of several disciplines and professions. There are usually chapters on social roles—usually family roles but occasionally also work roles. There are also chapters on health and disease and biopsychosocial processes like menopause, osteoporosis, cardiovascular disease, and sexuality. Most of all, there are chapters on social problems like poverty, mental illness, and discrimination as well as on ethnic, social class, and cross-cultural variations. Not only are these books multidisciplinary, they also tend to be unintegrated. There is little effort to pull the pieces together to form a whole. Pioneering exemplars include the volumes edited by Troll, Israel, and Israel (1978) and Markson (1983). Occasionally in such books there is a chapter on personality (e.g., in Rossi, 1985) or moral development (e.g., in Giele, 1982). By and large, though, most of the issues of concern to present-day psychologists tend to be slighted and psychological theory is given short shrift. By specifically addressing the concerns of psychologists, therefore, we feel that we are filling a gap.

At a time when gerontologists are calling for more, not less, interdisciplinary collaboration (e.g., Birren & Bengtson, 1988; Schaie & Schooler, 1989), it may seem that we are artificially erecting disciplinary fences. But this is not our intent. Indeed, this volume displays the extent to which research and theory in the psychology of aging have been suffused with concepts and methods from other disciplines.

In psychology, the role of gender in aging covers a broad range of topics (Huyck, 1990; Turner, 1982). Turner's review of sex-related differences in aging, for example, was organized into three main sections: mortality and morbidity; psychology as a natural science, including learning, memory, and intelligence; and psychology as a social

science. While the first two sections are of enormous import in the psychology of aging, the concentration in this book is on social science issues. The reader is directed to Huyck (1990) and Turner (1982) for summaries of the first two issues. For reviews of gender differences in mental health, see Turner and Troll (1982) and Turner (1987).

In summary, this introductory chapter reviews conceptual developments in the psychology of gender and applies them to conceptions of aging. Starting with a historical review of theories of gender, we relate shifts in such theories to prevailing social and historical circumstances, consistent with the historical embeddedness of scientific thought. We then turn to a consideration of new research questions on older women that would be suggested by these new conceptions of gender, as well as by current conceptions of aging. Finally, we place the other chapters in the volume within these conceptual frameworks.

Current writing on phenomena associated with femaleness differentiates between *sex* and *gender*. We will observe the convention of using *sex* to refer to genital, chromosomal, reproductive, or denotative status, and *gender* to the social, cultural, interactive, and psychological aspects ascribed differentially to women and men.

Feminism, Gender, and Epistemology

Feminist philosophy, which has shaped research and theory in the psychology of gender during the last few decades (Cheal, 1991; Riger, 1992), argues for social, economic, and political equality between women and men. Feminist psychologists and sociologists—especially feminist family sociologists—both start from this agenda. Deaux (1984), who is a social psychologist, and Ferree and Hess (1987), who are feminist sociologists, provide overlapping accounts of a movement since the 1960s through three stages of theory and research on gender. Juxtaposition of the two accounts, which complement each other, highlights several major themes of this volume.

Consistent with a major focus of this book, Deaux (1984) focuses on *psychological* research. Ferree and Hess (1987), in contrast, focus more broadly on both psychological and sociological research. But, consistent with a second major theme of this volume, Ferree and Hess attend more than Deaux to the theoretical underpinnings of the three approaches to psychological research on gender. The juxtaposition of the two accounts illustrates a third theme: How research in the psychology

of gender, like that in the psychology of aging, has been suffused with concepts from another discipline.

Both accounts describe three stages: An initial focus on sex differences; then an emphasis on "sex roles" (Ferree & Hess, 1987), exemplified in psychology by research and theory on androgyny (Deaux, 1984). More recently, according to Deaux, there has been a focus on sex as a social category (i.e., on gender stereotypes), a focus that suggests the importance of future research on the social interactions and processes that influence gender. In Ferree and Hess's complementary account, the most recent conceptual stage centers on the social construction of gender.

Deaux's (1984) review of the first perspective, on sex differences, focuses first on Maccoby and Jacklin's (1974) classic survey of research on sex as a subject variable. Subsequent research, she concludes, indicates that sex differences are often qualified by situational characteristics. According to Ferree and Hess (1987), research within this perspective often maintained that these differences were biologically based, "essential" properties of individuals that determined differences in behavior. Thus Bakan (1966) proposed that women are inherently predisposed toward "communion" and relatedness and men toward "agency" and egoism. Rossi (1977, 1984) proposed a biosocial theory that held that sex differences are at least in part biological. Ferree and Hess warned that while these viewpoints themselves might be unbiased, they are often interpreted as indicating a deficiency in women and a superiority in men and used to justify male dominance and female subordination. Some feminist psychologists (e.g., Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990c) have gone even further than Ferree and Hess and charged that a focus on gender differences altogether—rather than similarities—serves to perpetuate male dominance. They argue that any research on sex differences places women at a disadvantage because such differences are inevitably used against women. Further, they argue, psychology is biased against women because its self-definition as the study of *individual differences* de-emphasizes basic human similarities. Even the formal design of experiments to reject the null hypothesis that no difference exists between the experimental and control groups accentuates this bias (Riger, 1992; Unger, 1979). A focus on sex differences also draws attention away from the existence of tremendous variation among women.

In Ferree and Hess's (1987) account, the sex-role socialization model that predominated during the 1960s and 1970s moved away from this

strong emphasis on biologically based differences by combining varying amounts of biological determinism (nature) with a strong emphasis on social determinism (nurture). According to this perspective, sex roles were internalized early in life by a process of social learning or socialization and then enacted in adulthood in different social settings. In psychology, this perspective is represented by psychodynamic and object-relations models (e.g., Chodorow, 1978; Dinnerstein, 1976) that focus on mother-infant interactions as establishing the characteristic orientations of each gender—orientations continually reinforced by later cultural prescriptions. Chodorow (1978), for example, argues that women's emphasis on relatedness derives in part from infantile experiences of similarity and continuity with their mothers. In contrast, men's emphasis on difference and individuation is partly a consequence of infantile experiences of difference and separation from their mothers.

But, in psychology, the most popular derivation of the sex-role socialization model during the 1970s was theory and research on masculinity, femininity, and, especially, androgyny (Deaux, 1984). *Androgyny* was defined as having high levels of both masculine and feminine characteristics; the construct's derivation from the sex-role socialization model is indicated by the name of the scale Bem (1974) devised to measure it, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Deaux (1984) describes several reasons why the psychological construct of androgyny fell into disfavor during the 1980s (see Turner & Turner, this volume).

Although most sex-role socialization models stressed early-life socialization, not all did. A study of age norms by Neugarten, Moore, and Lowe (1968), for example, suggested that socialization also could take place after childhood. Angres (1975) and Hagestad (1984) described reverse socialization in which parents were influenced by their children in forming new definitions of appropriate sex-role behavior. Brim (1966) applied symbolic interactionism to adult socialization. He did not, however, address sex-role socialization. Ahammer (1973) used principles of social learning theory to describe how sex roles might change throughout adulthood as a consequence of learning in adulthood, not in childhood. Despite the interest of adult life-span psychologists in Ahammer's ideas, few followed her lead. Possibly the tenets of behaviorism, from which social learning theory derives, were unappealing at the time.

The concept of "sex role" soon became an omnibus term for female-male differences in behaviors, such as role enactments, as well as differences in internal dispositions, such as personality, values, attitudes, and other

characteristics (Angrist, 1969). Theoretical and empirical confusion was the result (Turner, 1982). One problem with the concept of sex roles was the assumption that they were internally consistent, unitary, and continuous throughout life (Ferree, 1990; Ferree & Hess, 1987). Research showing that behavior has multiple determinants indicated that it was a mistake to assume a close correspondence between stereotypic sex-related personality characteristics and particular social behaviors or other personality characteristics (Constantinople, 1973; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Personality traits, interpersonal behavior, and occupational choice were neither unitary nor internally consistent, and the link between childhood traits and behaviors, such as playing with dolls, and adult occupational and other role behavior was fragile (cf. Deaux & Kite, 1987). In sociology, the concept of sex roles received its coup de grâce in Lopata and Thorne's (1978) penetrating and influential critique. Arguing that a social role implies specific behavioral prescriptions toward specified others, they pointed to the incongruity of an abstract sex role that, organized around personality traits directing behavior across the life span in many settings, existed without specific behavioral content. It is as absurd to speak of sex roles, they suggested, as it is to talk of race or class roles: Social structural rather than individual determinants, of course, predominate in analyses of race and class.

In Deaux's (1984) account, the third approach in psychological research on sex and gender examines sex as a social category. Summarizing this research, she wrote: "Gender stereotypes are pervasive" (Deaux, 1984, p. 113), and influence judgments and expectations for behavior.

Current Gender Perspectives

The transition, during the 1980s, from a sex-role to a gender perspective is a transition from a "difference" to a "dominance" model (Ferree, 1990). To be sure, a number of models now coexist and vie for influence. Some are biologically based, like those of Bakan (1966) and Rossi (1977, 1984). Others derive from object relations (e.g., Chodorow, 1978). ("Objects" are people who are important to the self. The self is formed through object relations; thoughts and feelings about the self and significant others are seen as critical in mediating interpersonal functioning.) Still other models derive from social roles (Eagly, 1987), proposing that sex differences are determined by the different social roles ascribed to women and men.

But the essence of what is, perhaps, the most influential current gender perspective in social and academic psychology is that gender relations, like race and class relations, are *power* relations. Ferree (1990) calls this perspective “gender theory.” Moreover, gender is seen as a product of interpersonal interaction, as Deaux (1984) argued (also see Deaux & Major, 1987); that is, gender is socially constructed. Thus, gender is viewed as a *process*, not a phenomenon (Unger, 1990)—a verb, something one does, not a noun, something one has or is. This focus on process (doing) rather than structure (having) seems to us to be part of a general shift in many areas of psychology (e.g., personality psychology and social cognition) from research on structure to research on process (Cantor, 1990; Larsen, 1989; Turner & Turner, this volume). Ferree (1990) concludes,

the feminist critique of a unified and internalized “sex role” has matured into an alternative theoretical standpoint that defines gender as a lifelong process of situated behavior that both reflects and reproduces a structure of differentiation and control in which men have material and ideological advantages. . . . Gender is, with race and class, a hierarchical structure of opportunity and oppression as well as an affective structure of identity and cohesion. (p. 870)

Consistent with this model, Miller (1986) and Hare-Mustin and Marecek (1986) argue that the relatedness of women reflects subjugation rather than gender. That is, it behooves any subjugated group to be attuned and responsive to those who have power over them. In the power model, furthermore, *context* (social, historical, and political) is a crucial determinant of gender differences. Such a focus on context is, of course, consistent with long-standing principles of the life-span or life-course perspective in gerontology.

The secular changes in definitions of sex and gender that we have described are readily assimilable to the everyday practice of theory and research in psychology. Far more disorienting to psychologists, trained and steeped as we are in standard versions of “normal,” positivist social science, are feminist challenges to the epistemological foundations of the scientific method in social science itself (e.g., Harding, 1986b; Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990b; Riger, 1992).

Psychologists, like other social scientists studying women, “sex differences,” or gender, have been deeply affected by the epistemological debates unleashed by feminist criticisms of theory and research on

women. Thus Harding (1986b) describes three epistemological positions on the study of women: Feminist empiricism, feminist (i.e., woman-centered) standpoint, and poststructuralism (also see Riger, 1992). Each stance has articulate adherents among psychologists.

Feminist empiricists comprise the great majority of psychologists studying women. They use traditional (usually quantitative) scientific methods, attempting to correct gender bias in theory and research by strict adherence to the norms of "neutral" science (Harding, 1986b; Epstein, 1988; Riger, 1992). Although these biases may reveal the cultural embeddedness of researchers and of the scientific method itself, feminist empiricists view them as correctable errors in a scientific system regarded as essentially value-neutral and objective.

In contrast, feminist standpoint epistemologies argue that male-centered biases in psychology can best be redressed by studying society from women's point of view. Many, though by no means all, phenomenological approaches fall here (Morgan, 1983), and qualitative methods are typically used. The argument is that subjugated groups have perspectives on society that are not reflected in the dominant mode of thought. Foucault (1980) called these subjugated knowledges. Subjugated knowledges are hidden because the dominant group tends to have more education, controls academia and its production of knowledge, and owns the mass media through which its viewpoints are disseminated. Power confers the ability to grant credibility to some viewpoints and marginalize others. Therefore, proponents argue that studying women's perspectives can provide a more unbiased and complete understanding of all of society. Of course, women cannot be expected to have a unified perspective. Race and class, the other bedrock foundations of social stratification, no doubt interact with gender to produce distinctive subgroup differences (e.g., Ferree & Hess, 1987). Furthermore, even subjugated individuals may subscribe to the dominant group's belief systems (Riger, 1992).

The third epistemological position is poststructuralism. Feminist postmodernist psychology draws on poststructuralism and postmodern philosophy, both of which emerged around the same time (Sands & Nuccio, 1992). These fields are hard to define and differentiate because themes overlap and are contradictory even within a field. In the analytic method of structuralism, social life is explained by structures and phenomena beneath the surface; examples of such theorists are Freud and Piaget. But while structuralists regard meaning that is generated within language as fixed, *post*structuralists view meaning as multiple,

open to interpretation, and unstable (Weedon, 1987). They interpret meaning in relation to the contexts in which language appears; discourses and people are situated, not neutral. Grand theories and universal truths are disparaged. Theorists associated with poststructuralism are Foucault (1980) and Derrida (1978). Postmodern philosophers also devalue a search for universal laws and theories, emphasizing situated meanings that are socially constructed. They object to binary categories and view categories such as gender, race, and social class as too reductive (Fraser & Nicholson, 1990).

As Neugarten (1985) pointed out, many students of social behavior in all fields are moving toward a postmodernist stance. The interest of postmodernists and poststructuralists in constructionism (also called social construction) reflects a disavowal of the positivist tradition of science and an explicit denial that "the truth" exists "outside" in the world, awaiting our discovery. Postmodernists believe that facts and reality are not *discovered*, they are *invented* (Watzlawick, 1984). Feminist postmodernists disavow the search for gender differences entirely, on the grounds that knowing the truth about gender is impossible (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990c). It is impossible because similar research findings permit multiple interpretations, and so many definitions of difference—magnitude, variability, overlap—struggle for priority. Researchers may choose to emphasize the size of mean differences, or within-group variability, or the overlap of group distributions to support the argument that sex differences do or do not exist (Eagly, 1987).

In postmodernism, there are no enduring, absolute, or universal truths; no stable, autonomous knower; no logic, rationality, or reason independent of a social system endorsing those mental processes; and no objective language to describe reality (Harding, 1986b; Morawski, 1990). Constructionism asserts that power enables the dominant group to define what counts as knowledge. Because knowledge is expressed through language, control over language and the authority to legitimate "truth" are important resources held by those in power (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990c). Language is never gender-neutral; it is elaborately gendered, and language necessarily structures and channels our thought. Foucault (1980), for example, views knowledge as a set of fictive accounts or "discourses," endorsed by experts, that establish and rationalize the power hierarchy. Most people are then likely to accept one of the prevailing social discourses, though some will resist. A central postmodernist message is that every social theory contains a political agenda.

Within postmodernism, the criterion for choosing between competing views is their utility (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990a), not their accuracy, which is viewed as undeterminable. Who benefits? Because traditional science furthers male dominance, "power, not truth, determines which version of reality will prevail" (Riger, 1992, p. 736). Postmodernists suggest that Western epistemologies seem enamored with classic dualisms—fact versus value, nature versus nurture, masculine versus feminine, reason versus emotion, autonomy versus relatedness—and they assert that language structures all but compel dichotomous thinking and the search for difference. It follows, then, that difference itself is a dubious concept.

Thus theory and research in sociology and social psychology, on the one hand, and postmodernist psychology on the other, have converged to define gender as a social construction. The construal of gender as a product of *contemporary* interpersonal interaction rather than childhood interaction is comfortable for social psychologists, who study social interaction. Theory and research on gender in adulthood in social and academic psychology has moved away from psychodynamic and developmental theories. Eagly (1987), for example, who studies "sex differences," argues that progress in the study of sex differences in adulthood was hindered by the popularity of theoretical approaches based on childhood socialization (such as Chodorow, 1978) with only a distal influence on adulthood. She notes, "To be sure, sex differences have interesting developmental histories that are worthy of study in their own right. Yet, understanding development does not necessarily enlighten us about the factors that maintain a sex difference among adults" (Eagly, 1987, p. 7).

Historical Analysis

Why have these shifts in theories about gender, from sex difference to sex-role socialization and androgyny to sex as a social category and power relations, occurred? One argument is that such shifts reflect the evolution of knowledge in a field in which inadequate approaches are replaced by more useful ones. For example, Bem's (1974) theory of psychological androgyny did involve methodological, conceptual, and metatheoretical problems (see Turner & Turner, this volume) that hastened the loss of interest in this approach. Usually, however, older perspectives in a field are not refuted or even laid aside. Instead, new approaches reflect "fundamental shifts of interest away from certain

issues and problems . . . to new or different ones that require different theories, approaches, and perspectives" (Duckitt, 1992, p. 1183). Duckitt argues that *historical events and circumstances* are powerful prompters of interest in new research topics and new conceptions about the nature of the topic. Historical events and circumstances, then, can be viewed as history-graded influences (Baltes, 1987) on theorists and researchers.

What events and circumstances have influenced shifts in theories of gender? Cheal (1991) argues that feminist family sociologists' critiques of families as oppressive to women peaked during periods of disruptive social change. One such period was the Great Depression (Mowrer, 1932). The second period, during the 1960s, was marked by the flood of women into the labor force, which coincided with and helped to stimulate the resurgence of feminism. The social scientists among the swelling numbers of female workers were almost necessarily interested in issues of equity for women and men (see, e.g., Berscheid, 1992, on the discrimination she experienced at the University of Minnesota in the mid-1960s). One effect was a turn away from biologically based theories of gender, on the grounds that biological differences were especially likely to be used against women.

Between 1970 and 1990, the economic downturn increased the gap in income and well-being between the top and bottom quintiles of the American population (Collins & Coltrane, 1991). The rising divorce rate was partly responsible for the increasing numbers of women workers in this period, but there were other causes. Well-paid manufacturing jobs that paid a "family wage" to male breadwinners dwindled in number (Wilkie, 1991). Collins and Coltrane (1991) argue that the only way for most families to achieve upper-middle class status today is to have two middle-class incomes. Thus it is economic necessity across classes that has spurred the influx of American women into the labor force. Traditionally, married mothers of infants were least likely to be employed for pay. By 1985, however, 50% of such women were in the labor force (Hayghe, 1986); and by 1990, it was 54% (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1991).

As women flowed into academia, including into social psychology (Berscheid, 1992) and other fields that studied gender, it is not surprising that expert discourses on gender themselves shifted. Discourses on the family often focus on women's place. For example, after World War II popular psychological writing warned about the negative consequences of "maternal deprivation," drawing upon psychoanalytic research to caution mothers to stay at home with their children (Cheal,

1991). Recent British textbooks employing psychoanalytic perspectives (e.g., Rayner, 1986; Skynner & Cleese, 1983) similarly warn new mothers against working outside the home while their children are less than 3 years old. The use (and misuse) of psychoanalytic models in expert discourses on women's place has no doubt contributed to many feminists' rejection of psychodynamic models of gender in adult development.

Social psychologists' almost restrictive use of college students as subjects also may have led researchers away from developmental theories, which derived from thinking about a wide age spectrum. A primary task of youth is individuation and separation from parents, and restricting research to youth blurs the long-term linkages between them and their parents (Rossi & Rossi, 1990) or family members in general.

Beginning in the mid-1970s, according to Eagly (1987), a majority of research psychologists agreed that most "sex differences" were nonexistent. They also agreed that even well-documented sex differences were typically small in magnitude and of little practical importance. As this consensus evolved, it was augmented by the antiwoman backlash of the Reagan-Bush era (Faludi, 1992), which accentuated psychologists' concern about theory or research on sex differences that could be used to disadvantage women (Eagly, 1987; Riger, 1992). Thus research psychologists were perplexed by widespread evidence that most Americans believed that women were different from men (cf. Ashmore, Del Boca, & Wohlers, 1986). Since so few reliable sex differences appeared in the psychological research literature, how was it, psychologists wondered, that gender stereotypes persisted among the general public? Eagly (1987) concludes that the disjunction between research findings and public beliefs originated in the methodological biases of "the narrow focus of experimental research" (p. 2) and the unsystematic narrative methods of summarizing research used at the time. Sex differences in research turned out to be much larger when the technology of meta-analysis to summarize research became available (Eagly, 1987). In some naturalistic settings, sex differences are larger than in controlled settings. Thus psychologists who concluded that sex differences were small or nonexistent were misled by the classic period or historical effect of the state of psychological knowledge on their topic at the time.

This analysis suggests that one determinant of recent shifts in conceptions about gender is that historical events and circumstances make certain questions about sex and gender especially salient for social scientists. The different approaches adopted at different periods repre-

sent attempts to answer very different questions about the nature of gender. We do not mean, of course, that the zeitgeist of an era is the only or even the most important causal influence on the evolution of knowledge in this or any other area of study. But it is well to recognize that psychological science is as open to contextual influences as the topics we study (cf. Cheal, 1991; Riger, 1992).

What Questions for Research on Older Women Are Prompted by Conceptions of Gender as Power Relations?

At the present time, as noted, many conceptions and theories of gender coexist. Several are represented in the following chapters, and will be mentioned later. Different theories, of course, lead to different research questions. Let us consider the feminist view that **gender relations are power relations** (Riger, 1992), perhaps the single most influential one today (but one that is not otherwise emphasized in this volume). The emerging influence of this viewpoint in psychology (see Riger, 1992) makes it important to emphasize in this chapter. What implications does this conception have for gendered interactions in later life (see also McGee & Wells, 1982)?

Troll and Parron (1981) pointed out that several disparate theories, particularly that of Gutmann (1987), converge to predict a diminution or even a reversal of gender-typed characteristics in old age. Theories typically focus on the social roles that happen to be viewed as critical for the functioning of societies in structural-functional theory—**production and reproduction**. This is so even for theories from very different traditions, reflecting, perhaps, the continuing “subterranean influence” of Parsonian structural-functionalism (cf. Cheal, 1991). **The end of active parenting and retirement are thought to diminish gendered characteristics and behavior because they remove the contexts for gender-role enactment** (Gutmann, 1987).

If gender typing is a power attribute, social behavior that is viewed as less important or less relevant to societal maintenance would be seen as feminine. Social behavior in old age would be seen as less important and thus as less masculine. Thus, early reports on retirement depicted men as moving into the woman’s sphere, the home, and early reports on **grandparenting saw grandfathers as functioning essentially the same as grandmothers** (cf. Troll, Miller, & Atchley, 1979). Neither of these hypotheses were later confirmed (Troll et al., 1979).