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3.1 SOCIALIZATION

Socialization has had diverse meanings in the social sciences, partly because a number of disciplines claim it as a central process. In its most common and general usage, the term “socialization” refers to the process of interaction through which an individual acquires the norms, values, beliefs, attitudes, and language characteristic of his or her group.

Anthropologists tend to view socialization primarily as cultural transmission from one generation to the next, sometimes substituting the term “enculturation” for socialization (Herskovits, 1948). Anthropological interest in socialization or enculturation coincide with the emergence of the “culture and personality” orientation of the late 1920s and 1930s, when the works of Mead (1928), Benedict (1934), and Malinowski (1927) focussed on cultural practices affecting child rearing, value transmission, and personality development and helped shape the anthropological approach to socialization.

Contemporary socio-cultural anthropology is guided less by psychoanalytic theory and more by social constructionist theories (such as symbolic interactionism), which view socialization as a collective and interpretive process of reality construction involving the reproduction of culture. This orientation has been shaped largely by the work of Geertz (1973), whose influence is also evident in sociological work on socialization, such as that of Corsaro and Eder (1995).

Within anthropology, there have been two main orientations towards socialization. One views socialization, primarily as learning of social roles. From this perspective, individuals become integrated members of society by learning and internalizing the relevant roles and
statuses of the groups to which they belong (Brim, 1966). This view has been most closely associated with structural-functionalist perspectives.

The other, more prevalent sociological orientation, views socialization mainly as self-concept formation. The development of self and identity in the context of intimate and reciprocal relations is considered the core of socialization.

In Mead’s writings, the self is a reflexive, thoroughly social phenomenon that develops through language or symbolic interaction. Language enables the development of role-taking, by which the individual is able to view himself or herself from the perspective of other person. This becomes the basis of selfhood and the interpretation of self and society. Mead and other symbolic interactionists have argued that self and society are the two sides of the same coin. The basis of their assertion is that the content of self-conception (e.g., identities) reflects the aspects of social process with which the individual is involved through the internalisation of the role identities, values, and meanings. This internalisation in turn reproduces society.

For the contemporary interactionists socialization is not merely the process of learning rules or norms or behaviour patterns; it is a matter of learning these things only to the extent to which they become part of the way people think of themselves. The mark of successful socialization is the transformation of social control into self-control.

Commitment to identities (such as son, mother, professor, honest person) is a source of motivation for individuals to act in accordance with the values and norms implied by those identities (Foote, 1951; Stryker, 1980 and Gecas, 1986).

Particularly important to socialization as identity formation is the process of identification. Initially used by Sigmund Freud, this concept refers to the child’s emotional attachment to the parent and desire to be like the parent; as a consequence, the child internalises and adopts the parent’s values, beliefs, and other characteristics. Among other things, through identification with the parent, the child becomes more receptive
to parental influence. Socialization is that aspect of human development which involves an individual learning of the ascribed roles in society, developing the accepted social values, interaction patterns that are gender specific and approved by the society.

Socialization is a learning process that begins shortly after our birth. Early childhood is the period of the most intense and the most crucial socialization. It is then that we acquire language and learn the fundamentals of our culture. It is also when much of our personality takes shape. However, we continue to be socialized throughout our lives. As we age, we enter new statuses and need to learn the appropriate roles for them. We also have experiences that teach us lessons and potentially lead us to alter our expectations, beliefs and personality. For instance, the experience of being raped is likely to cause a woman to be distrustful of men.

Adams et al. (1997) explains the process of socialization. The cycle of socialization helps us to understand the way in which we are socialized to play certain roles, how we are affected by issues of oppression, and how we help to maintain an oppressive system based upon power (Figure-3.1.1).

Socialization generally refers to the process of social influence through which a person acquires the culture or subculture of his or her group, and in the course of acquiring these cultural elements the individual's self and personality are shaped. Socialization, therefore, addresses two important problems of social life: the problem of societal continuity and the problem of human development. Because of its broad scope and importance, socialization is claimed as a major process by most social science disciplines. Different disciplines, however, have emphasised different aspects of this process. Anthropology tends to view socialization coincides with the emergence of the culture and personality orientation in the late 1920s and 1930s. Psychologists are more likely to emphasise various aspects of individual's development (Gecas, 2001).
The Beginning

First Socialization

Socialized

Taught on a Personal Level by Parents, Relatives, Teachers, People We Love and Trust:

Shapers of Expectations, Norms, Values, Roles, Rules, Models of Ways to be, Sources of Dreams

Born into World with

Mechanics in Place

No Blame, No Consciousness, No Guilt, No Choice

Limited Information

No Information

Misinformation

Biases

Stereotypes

Prejudice

History

Habit

Tradition

Do Nothing

Don't make Waves

Promote Status Quo

Change

Raise Consciousness

Interrupt

Educate

Take a Stand

Question

Reframe

Direction

for change

Cycle of Socialization

Results

Enforcement

Discrimination

Persecution

Privilege

Prejudice

Institutions

Messages from

Institutions

Schools

Churches

Media

Language

Song Lyrics

Culture

Unconscious Levels

Conscious and

Unconscious Levels

Fear

Enforced

Sanctioned

Enforcement

Reward

Punishments

Privileges

Persecution

Discrimination

Empowerment

Result

Reinforced/

Bombarded with

Messages from

Institutions

Culture

Practices

Song Lyrics

Language

Media

Thoughts

Conscious and

Unconscious Levels

People We Love and Trust

People We Love and Trust

Teach a Stand

Educate

Interrupt

Promote Status Quo

Do Nothing

Don't make Waves

Raise Consciousness

Change

Question

Reframe

Direction

for change

Cycle of Socialization

Parental support continues to be important in the socialization of offspring through childhood, adolescence, and beyond. Parental support has been found to be positively related to a child's cognitive development, moral behaviour, conformity to adult standards, self-esteem, academic achievement, and social competence. Conversely, lack of parental support is associated with negative socialization outcomes for children and adolescents: low self-esteem, delinquency, deviance, drug use, and various other problem behaviours (Rollins and Thomas, 1979 and Peterson and Hann, 1999).

Parental control is almost as prominent as support in the socialization literature. "Control" refers to the degree to and the manner in which parents attempt to place constraints on a child's behaviour. Other terms used for this dimension of parenting are punishment, discipline, restrictiveness, permissiveness, protectiveness, supervision, strictness, and monitoring. Parental control is a more complicated variable than is parental support.

Authoritarian or coercive control (control based on force, threat or physical punishment) is associated with negative or unfavourable socialization outcomes, whereas authoritative or inductive control (control based on reason and explanation) has positive outcomes.

Parents are most effective as agent of socialization when they express a high level of support and exercise inductive control. In these conditions, children are most likely to identify with their parents, internalise parental values and expectations, use parents as their models, and become receptive to attempts at parental influence. Conversely, low parental support and reliance on coercive control are associated with unfavourable socialization outcomes.

Other important socialization variables here are extent of parental involvement with the child (e.g., time spent), level of performance expectations, extent to which political or religious beliefs and value
systems are taught to the child by the parent, and various characteristic of parent, such as patience, tolerance, honesty, integrity, competence, and age and sex (of parent and child). Many factors affect the process and outcomes of family socialization.

Much of the socialization that takes place in the family involves learning appropriate role behaviour associated with various family positions. For the child, the most significant of these behaviours involve sex and age roles. Through processes of reinforcement from parents and others, identification with various role models, and parental admonitions and instructions, a child is socialised into the behavioural expectations associated with these roles. Of the two, sex roles have received more of the research attention on role learning in the family (Block, 1983). This result suggests that sex-role socialization is extensive (usually starting at birth with differential treatment of male and female infants), pervasive (various agents and contexts of socialization), and consequential for a wide range of other individuals and social outcomes. A prominent theme in much contemporary research on sex-role socialization is that the differential treatment that emphasizes "masculine" characteristics for boys and "feminine" characteristics for girls is detrimental to the development of both girls and boys and to the relationship between the sexes (Bem, 1974).

Socialization is a reciprocal process, with children influencing parents as well. Over the past few decades, the thinking with regard to socialization processes has shifted from unidirectional to bidirectional and reciprocal models (Corsaro and Eder, 1995 and Gecas, 1981). For example, in considering the association between parental punishment and a child’s deviant behaviour, it can be argued that the child’s behaviour is both a consequence and cause of parental behaviour.

Besides parents and other adult kin, siblings serve as agents of socialization within the family context. As family size increases, more of the socialization of the younger children is taken on by their older
siblings, either by default or because the parents delegate this responsibility to the older children.

An increasingly pervasive agent of socialization in contemporary families is television. Children spend more time watching television than at any other activity except school and sleep (Bronfenbrenner, 1970). The purpose of most television programmes children watch is typically not to socialise or educate but to entertain and sell products. However, a good deal of unintended socialization is likely to occur, from shaping conceptions of reality (e.g., sex roles and ethnic stereotypes) to styles of behaviour and tastes. In general, television is perceived as having a negative influence on children, with the exception of a few educational programmes on public television. Much of the concern has focussed on the extensive violence and sexual themes and situations in television programmes. Bandura et al. (1963) work on modelling has persuasively shown that exposure to aggressive behaviour tends to increase aggression in the viewer. The role of television as an agent of socialization in families seems to be increasing by default as the amount of contact between parents and their children decreases.

Like the family, the school is an institution whose mandate is to socialise children. The school's mission, however, is more narrowly defined than is that of the family and is concerned primarily with the formal instruction and the development of children's cognitive skills. In this sense, the school context is less involved in primary socialization (i.e., the development of basic values, beliefs, motivations, and conceptions of the self) and more involved in secondary socialization (i.e., the development of knowledge and skills). In the course of the socialization experienced in school, things other than skills and knowledge also are learned, such as norms, values, attitudes, and various aspects of a child's personality and self-concept. Much more is typically learned in school than what is explicitly taught.

Many activities associated with school (specifically in the classroom) have implications for a child's self-concept (Hewitt, 1998).
For example, one of the most important activities involves evaluation of the student's performance by the teacher: performance on test, class reports, presentations, assignments, and the like. Success in these activities, based on one's own efforts, is good for self-esteem and builds confidence in one's abilities. However, failure is not, and public failure is even worse. School provides numerous opportunities for public failure as well as public success. One of the consequences of performance evaluations may be categorization or "labelling" of students, by teachers as well as others, as "smart," "dumb," "slow learner," "underachiever," and so on. Negative as well as positive labels affect the way in which others respond to a person and, through their responses, reinforce and shape that person in the labelled direction. When the teacher was led to believe that a student would be a "slow learner," that student was more likely to do poorly in class. Labelling and expectancy effects occur in most socialization contexts and have important consequences for self-concept development.

Convington and Beery (1976) propose that two fundamentally different motivation patterns emerge in schools as a result of these pressures: One is oriented towards striving for success, and the other toward avoiding failure. Failure-avoiding strategies (such as non-participation, withdrawal, procrastination, and putting off work assignments until too late) are attempts to disassociate one's performance from one's ability and worth. Failure then can be attributed to lack of effort or to external circumstances (less damaging attributions for the self), not to lack of ability (a more damaging attribution). This is a form of role distancing, the separation of the self from the behaviour required for a role occupant; it is also an obstacle to school achievement.

Socialization of children and adolescents is the peer group. In terms of structure and function, the peer group is a very different context from family and school. There are several important features of the peer group as a context of socialization. The basic relationship
within peer groups is not hierarchical; rather, it is the friendship bond, based on equality, mutual tolerance, and concern. Third, the peer group is an arena for the exercise of independence from adult control. As such, it is often the context for the development of values, norms and behaviour in opposition to those of adults.

An important socialization consequence of intensive association with the same-sex peers and involvement in sex-typed activities is that this strongly reinforces identification and belongingness with the members of the same sex and contributes to the development of stereotypical attitudes towards members of the opposite sex. Not only sex-role identity but also much of sexual socialization during childhood occurs in the context of peer rather than parent-child associations, since parents are much less interested in discussing sexual matters with their children than are the children’s peers (Fine, 1987 and Corsaro and Eder, 1990). Peers provide an alternative reference group for children as well as an alternative source of self-esteem and identity. For these reasons, attachment to peers may be even stronger than attachment to family, especially for adolescents.

The socialization experienced by adults generally falls in the category of secondary socialization, building on the socialization experiences of childhood. Much of this role-specific (Brim, 1968), that is learning the knowledge and skills required for the performance of specific adult roles, such as occupation, marriage and parenthood. As individuals become committed to the roles they play, they come to identify themselves and think of themselves in terms of these role-identities (Stryker, 1980).

Many other contexts have socializing consequences for adults: family, political, and religious organizations, recreational settings and voluntary associations. The socialization that takes place in these contexts can be considered “developmental” (Wheeler, 1966) because it builds on previous socialization and is a continuation and expansion of past socialization experiences.
In traditional, relatively stable societies (which are increasingly rare), socialization is relatively routine and unproblematic. By contrast, in modern societies characterised by rapid social and cultural change, the socialization of children and adults is increasingly problematic and more likely to be contentious but also more interesting.

3.2 GIRL CHILD SOCIALIZATION AND GENDER ROLES

She’s made of sunshine, sugar and spice
She’ll be pert and pretty and awfully nice
Some day she’s bound to change her name
Now choose the one that will stay the same
The name that polls the winning vote
The famous name that makes up quotes............
May be the name you name your boy.
(quoted in Walum, 1977, pp. 38-9)

That rhyme comes from an American book on how to choose a name for a new baby. The assumptions about boys and girls are embodied in it. The first piece of labelling which affects the newborn baby is the attribution of gender. As Walum (1977) puts it: From before the cradle to beyond the grave, a person is supposed to be inextricably and forever male or female. A distribution of traits of both sexes within one individual does not appear natural. From the moment one is born, the process of socialization begins as a person is taught the rules, relationships, roles and expectations and entitlements of the society into which she or he is born. As scholars have repeatedly noted, the choice of the name, the colour of clothing, nursery walls, bed linen, room décor, and toys all set the mode for girlhood or boyhood.

The social learning process that indoctrinates people (notably young people) into understanding the various aspects of their culture includes the process of gender socialization. Gender socialization encompasses the all-inclusive process of learning society’s gender roles
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and their advantages and limitations. In most societies, especially in Indian society, there is a clear categorisation of what it means to be male or female. This categorization process and the agents of socialization that transfers knowledge about gender role influence how individuals define themselves and others in terms gender and sex roles.

Gender roles— the expected or preferred ways for people of each sex to behave—are rigidly denied in many societies. Men have traditionally been expected to be strong, aggressive, even domineering; the cliché that “boys don’t cry” typifies one aspect of the male role. Women have been expected to be nurturing, sensitive, emotional, and relatively passive. Children are taught these values, both consciously and unconsciously, from very early age.

Agents of gender socialization include parent, siblings, peers, schools, society, formalised religion and a variety of other institutions. For very young children, parents and family (including grandparents and other extended family members) play the central role in shaping gender socialization. They determine how the family interacts with the baby (the process is often unconscious) as well as the types of toys and clothes the baby is given.

Schools and families continue to influence gender socialization throughout adolescence. During adolescence, however, peer influence becomes the strongest agent of gender socialization as teens bond together in small social groups to facilitate their transition into adult hood and into the larger society. The socialization effects of the mass media also become powerful in the teen years. The institution of education has been implicated by the sociologists in the process of gender socialization and the stereotyping of the gender.

Personality and the physical development is inextricably linked to the processes of socialization. Nancy Chodorow, a specialist in cross-cultural and psychoanalytic perspectives, has examined development in the light of the social and psychological oppression that can be
perpetuated in the individual during personality development. Personality development is influenced heavily by gender socialization and the cultural valuation of the genders in society; research by Chodorow and others has examined how development is influenced by the societal devaluation of women. Some researchers believe that very early patterns of influence strongly affect personality development and social roles, arguing that parental expectations about the gender of their yet-to-be-born child begin the gender socialization process (Magill, 1995).

Parents have expectations for their offspring based on their own acceptance of cultural stereotypes about the differences between females and males. Using these cultural definitions of differences, parents perceive and reinforce gender role differentiation in their sons and daughters. These complex parental expectations are active from the moment the child is born. The sex-stereotyped expectations influence the parents' behaviour toward their children. Toys are the visible tools of early socialization, preparing children for adult roles. The typical toys offered to little girls are soft and unmechanical; boys are given mechanical toys, such as cars and tool kits to repair them. The closest thing to tools that girls receive is sewing kits. Dolls are the primary toys offered to girls, and some researchers believe that through the play activity of talking to and caring for dolls, girls train themselves to be ideal recipients of gender-role socialization.

Psychologists generally agree that by age of 3, children have an “irreversible conception of what gender is” (Kohlberg, 1966). There is also agreement that gender is not a biologically but culturally determined identity. As noted by Aries (1962): “Boys become ‘children’ while the girls remain ‘little women’. Girlhood becomes a preparation and information training ground for motherhood. But boyhood is not necessarily a preface of fatherhood.

Gender role socialization teaches girls, and insulates from boys, the expression of fear. Through many ways of gender role socialization,
females learn to define themselves and subsequently to behave, think and act in accordance not simply with their actual tendencies, but with cultural stereotypes of feminine behaviour (Neerja Kuckreja Solonia, 1994).

In general, even feminist ideas about gender roles (especially role-taking) appear deterministic; Socialization becomes a process by which little girls and little boys become stereotypically feminine and masculine. Parental and societal behavioural expectations, and patterns fostered, reinforce a person’s gender identity. If a girl plays with dolls and a boy with guns and toy trucks, or if a girl is meek and the boy aggressive, they are considered as behaving in a manner appropriate to their gender.

Socialization of girls is based on three basic concepts. First, girls are inferior to boys in every sphere of life. They are weak physically (less muscle power), mentally (less wisdom), and spiritually (they talk ill of others thus women can never enter heaven). Second, girls are responsible for ensuring the continuity of cultural norms by conforming to the traditional culture and by socializing the young accordingly. Third, girls must safeguard the ‘izzat’ of the family.

From very early years girls are talked to and cuddled more, while boys are tossed around more vigorously. Girls are seen as fragile, boys are not. From their earliest hours, boys and girls are brought up in different ways, to reinforce different behaviours, and sanction ‘wrong’ activities.

Considerable importance is attached to the way a girl carries herself, the way she sits, stands and talks, and interacts with others. A girl should walk with soft steps, so soft that they are barely audible to others. Taking long strides denotes masculinity. Girls are often rebuked for jumping, running, rushing to a place and hopping. These movements are considered a part of masculine behaviour, unbecoming of a female. A girl has to be careful about her posture, she should keep
her knees close together while sitting, standing or sleeping is ‘decent’, and indicates a sense of shame and modesty.

Girls are encouraged to speak softly, and to avoid abrasive ‘male’-language. A girl must demonstrate her capacity for self-restraint: talking and laughing loudly is disapproved of; a girl should not be augmentative. Smiling without purpose, and glancing ‘furtively’, looking through the corners of one’s eyes do not become a ‘well-bred’ girl. Shyness and modesty are approved of and considered as ‘natural’ feminine qualities.

Independence, aggression, fearlessness, leadership tenacity, anger, stoicism, and triumph over defeat are the psychological bricks and mortar of male gender roles, geared for powerful, controlling adult positions. This socialization creates a tongue-and-groove fit with female gender roles. Female socialization is in sharp contrast to the male socialization. Girls enter the “pink world” at the moment of birth (Jessie Bernard, 1981). From the outset, female infants are handled more gently than males, without any substantial evidence of greater fragility. Little girls are more likely to be protected from physical harm, and parents are more apt to worry about the physical well-being of daughters, even as young as 9 months old (Pedersen and Robson, 1969). This concern leads to greater restrictions on the physical activity of girls. Little girls are kept closer to home than their brothers, a pattern, anthropologists have observed in preliterate as well as postindustrial societies (Whiting, 1978). This pattern of keeping little girls nearer home is also associated with assigning them household and childcare tasks at relatively early ages.

In most societies, boys spend boyhood without having to take on adult roles. They spend their time either alone, or with peer groups-and remain more or less unconnected with either the adult world of work and activity, or the familial world. Girls, after the age of five or so begin to help their mothers or other female relatives. This leads to different gender characteristics. Socialization of boys tends to be oriented toward
achievement and self-reliance, that of girls towards nurturance and responsibility. Girls are pressured to be involved with, and connected to, others; boys to bypass, deny or ignore this involvement and connection. One obvious consequence of this socialization is that females in most societies are defined relationally (as someone’s wife, mother, daughter, and daughter-in-law) (Chodorow, 1986).

Despite household work, girls are also assigned child care responsibilities, as part of the tasks they watch their mothers perform. Girls learn to wait on fathers and brothers, a lesson they will carry over into adult relationships with men. Learning helplessness and dependence rather than self-assertion and self-reliance becomes a primary task of female socialization. This crippling dependence on men is transferred into adult life, where women are expected to depend on men in the home, the community, and at the nation’s helm to see to their best interests. Timidity and fearfulness are other attributes females are socialized to include in their repertoire of gender characteristics. The injunctions about physical segregation and control of contact with males make certain demands on a girl outside her home: with downcast eyes, silent and unobtrusive movements, and her body almost shrinking, a girl is expected to create a separate space for herself in places full of strangers.

Type of clothes the girls should wear is also a part of gender socialization. The delicate clothes in which small girls customarily have been created further limitations on their physical activities. In earlier historical periods, upper-class females required a maid’s help to lace their petticoats and fasten their back-closing dresses. These delicate and complicated clothes were meant to be handled carefully and to be kept clean, providing further restraints on females’ physical activity and independence.

The recent trend toward dressing little girls in overalls or pants rather than dresses inevitably influences girls physical activity. Graduating into jeans rather than skirts has already enabled teenage
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Girls to shed certain physical limitations tied solely to restrictive clothing. Clothes that allow females to dress themselves and to move easily ultimately influence their self-confidence and independence. But the initial social resistance to unisex clothes and hairstyles might well be interpreted as reluctance to allow female to share in more unrestricted, and therefore particularly powerful, styles and symbols (Lipman-Blumen, 1984).

Unlike boys, little girls rarely play in large groups or teams (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974). Typically they play in small two-or-three persons groups, a pattern carried over into the teenage years. Not surprisingly, competition to win at games is less evident among girls. Little girls are taught that overt competition in general, much less against friends, is unfeminine. In the female world, friendship and relationships are more important than winning. Girls learn to select valued friends as playmates, even if the friend is less competent at the game than a non-friend. One anthropological study of third grade children observed little girls deliberately allowing their friends to win the race in the name of friendship (Best, 1983). This stands in direct contrast to the male pattern in which boys are socialized to compete overtly, even against friends, to play to win, and to tolerate unlinked teammates for the sake of the game. With friendship and relationships so highly valued in female socialization, it is not surprising that female achievement is cast within the context of relationships. Rather than competing to win, females are far more apt to contribute to other people's success or take pleasure vicariously from the success of others.

According to most cultural stereotypes, females are more emotional than males. Few would dispute that females are socialized to express their emotions, or atleast not suppress them. Researchers find little initial difference in emotional expression between preschool girls and boys (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974). What small difference exists seems to favour male children as more emotional—more likely to cry, more prone to angry outbursts (Feldman, 1974; Marvin, 1971). But this
early expression of emotionality is soon constrained, with boys being socialized to suppress emotions that do not express strength and power.

Withdrawal of love is major disciplinary tool for girls, while physical punishment is more often used with boys. Withdrawing of love trains the female child to depend on others’ goodwill and affection. Physical punishment socializes young boys to a life of autonomy and self-reliance, unfettered by strong needs for the approval and affection of others. The love-and-affection-oriented upbringing of girls seems appropriately linked to the maternal role girls have been trained to expect and seek in adulthood.

Nurturance, which Webster defines as affectionate care and attention, is another quality highly valued in females. Nurturance is the key ingredient in the traditional roles assigned to ‘females’— mother, wife, teacher etc. Here too, research on very young children fails to demonstrate any marked tendency on the part of girls to outdistance their male age-mates in nurturance. A six-culture study conducted during 1950s that observed children in naturalistic settings concluded that among children aged 3 to 6 no differences in nurturance were observable. There was slight evidence that at 7 to 11 years old girls were somewhat more likely to be supportive or offer help to others. These data suggest that in-born nurturance differences between the genders are not evident, and what slight differences do occur among children appear only among somewhat older children, well into gender-linked socialization (Whiting and Edwards, 1973).

If women learn through socialization that emotional support, affection, and tenderness are important components of the female gender role, they also discern that anger, at least interpersonal anger, is not acceptable part of the female emotional vocabulary. Only anger at social injustices to others has been allowed to women, an emotional loophole that has enabled them to move beyond homebound roles into political movements.
Gender role socialization, managed primarily by adults raised under different social conditions, is inevitably geared to roles of a previous era. The result is cultural lag, a disparity between the expectations created by outdated socialization processes and the realities of an ever changing society. This disparity generates tensions that permeate all other roles. When social change is slow, these tensions remain within bounds. In times of rapid social change, however, general societal tensions as well as those between socialization and actual reality perpetuate, even exacerbate, the power struggle between women and men.

Demographic trends—including marriage, divorce, fertility and occupational patterns—provide a context for socialization within which boys and girls, later men and women, learn and relearn throughout life what is expected of them as members of distinct gender groups. Socialization to gender role and the power dynamic they embody occurs through these and other social mechanisms and processes. For example, control myths based on ancient images of masculinity and feminity, are echoed in religion, media, and the arts. These prescribed gender images become part of the individual’s self concept.

3.3 THE ROLE THEORY

“All the world’s a stage,
And all the men and women merely players:
They have their exits and their entrances;
And one man in his time plays many parts,
His acts being seven ages. At first the infant,
Mewling and puking in the nurse’s arms.
And Then............” (W. Shakespeare, As you like it, Act II, Scene 7).

It is perhaps difficult to believe that these oftquoted lines of Shakespeare would have any bearing whatever on the modern field of behavioural science called “role theory”. Aside from the poetry, however,
there are noteworthy parallels between Shakespeare's characterisation of men and role theory. Both express a particular perspective of human behaviour, which for Shakespeare was that social life was similar to acting on the stage of a theatre, with all its scenes, masks, and airs, and both employ a special language, the terms of which for Shakespeare were those of drama and the theatre.

When actors portray a character in a play, their performance is determined by the script, the director's instructions, the performances of fellow actors, and reactions of the audience as well as by the acting talents of the players. Apart from differences between actors in the interpretation of their parts, the performance of each actor is programmed by all of these external factors; consequently, there are significant similarities in the performances of actors taking the same part, no matter who the actors are.

This analogy is also used into real life by taking some of the terms of role theory. Individuals in society occupy positions, and their role performance in these positions is determined by social norms, demands, and rules; by the role performances of others in their respective positions; by those who observe and react to the performance; and by the individual's particular capabilities and personality. The social "script" may be as constraining as that of a play, but it frequently allows more options; the "director" is often present in real life as a supervisor, parent, teacher, or coach; the "audience" in life consists of all those who observe the position member's behaviour; the position member's "performance" in life, as in the play, is attributable to his familiarity with the "part", his personality and personal history in general, and more significantly, to the "script" which others define in so many ways. In essence, the role perspective assumes, as does the theatre that performance results from the social prescriptions and behaviour of others, and that individual variations in performance to the extent that they do occur, are expressed within the framework created by these factors.
The behaviour of the individual is examined in terms of how it is shaped by the demands and rules of others, by their sanctions for his conforming and non-conforming behaviour, and by the individual's own understanding and conceptions of what his behaviour should be. Determining factors such as these are studies in the contexts of families, informal and work groups, school groups, communities, and societies. Natural developmental phases of this behaviour are charted from infancy to old age; the fit between individual and social mould is studied; and personal factors which influence the individual's behaviour in the face of these determining factors are also examined. This perspective does not deny the facts of individual differences, but it does highlight the social determinants that may have entered into creating such differences, and it does focus the role analyst's attention upon the conditions under which the social determinants will be more rather than less influential.

The term “role” appeared in the 1934 edition of Moreno's “Who shall survive”. “Role” originally a French word which penetrated into English is survive derived from the Latin *rotula* (the little wheel, or round log, the diminutive of *rota*-wheel). Only towards the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, with the emergence of the modern stage, the parts of the theatrical characters are read from “roles”, paper fascicles. Whence each scenic “part” becomes a role (Moreno, 1960).

George Herbert Mead's 'Mind, Self and Society', published in 1934, examined the problems of interaction, the self, and socialization, Mead employed the concept of “role-taking”, along with such related ideas as the “generalized other,” the “self”, the "I" and “me”, and “audience”.

Moreno’s (1960) concept of “role-playing may be considered as an experimental procedure, a method of learning to perform roles more adequately.” He opposed this notion to Mead's idea of taking the role of the other: “In contrast with role-playing, role-taking is an attitude
already frozen in the behaviour of the person. Role-playing is an act, a spontaneous playing; role taking is a finished product, a role conserve”.

**Role expectations**

Role expectations may be viewed as actions or qualities expected of the occupant of a position. If viewed as actions, role expectations are codified as in a job description: The occupant is expected, for instance, to call the roll, open the windows, and secure the doors. If viewed as qualities, role expectations are codified in adjectival terms; for example, the occupant is expected to be warm, friendly, outgoing sincere and cautious.

In addition, the occupant of a position not only enacts role behaviour that is congruent with the expectations held by others in the macrocosmic social system but also performs acts that make good his occupancy of concurrent positions in microcosmic personal role systems. Whereas the macrosystem points to the kinds of role behaviours appropriate to regularly occurring situations, miniature systems develop where the role expectations must be expressed in terms separate from the more obvious task expectations of the macrosystem. These may be denoted as idiosyncratic preferences, nonconsensual expectations, and subtle or disguised expectations (Sarbin, 1972).

Role expectations are the entire set of responses or behaviour anticipated and desired in relation to a certain role. By this definition, role expectations include the actor's expectations of himself as well as the expectations of others.

**Role enactment**

Sarbin (1972) further states, in the first place, the behaviour that serves as the dependent, or outcome, variable is seen as role enactment. That is, interest is focussed on what the occupant of a given position does and says, such behaviours being noted by observers. The effectiveness, convincingness, validity, or propriety of such role enactments varies between persons and situations. To uncover the
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antecedents of this variation, social scientists have introduced additional theoretical conceptions and observational procedures. Among the variables that have been demonstrated to be antecedent to variation in effectiveness or propriety of role enactment are

1) validity of role expectations held by the actor,
2) accuracy of the actor in locating the other(s) (and reciprocally the self) in the proper role system,
3) sensitivity to situationally generated role demands,
4) available general and specific skills,
5) congruence of self and role, and
6) reinforcement properties of the audience.

Role demands

Role demands are the expectation of others with reference to a person playing a role in a situation. The actor may or may not, once aware of the role demands, wish or be able to fulfill them (Sharma, 1992). In other words, once a person correctly locates the position of the other on the basis of cues emitted by the other interactant, the possible choice of role behaviours is reduced from near-infinity to a small number. Further constraints on the choice of role behaviors are introduced when certain additional features of the situation are taken into account. These may be called role demands, that is, demands for a specific role enactment.

Silently operating to guide the actor in his choice of roles, these demands stem from cultural norms. Among such demands one may list norms for modesty, communication, control of aggression, cooperation, face-saving, public commitment, and prevention of embarrassment to others (Sarbin, 1972).

Role perception

It is axiomatic that in order to survive as a member of a society, a person must be able to locate himself accurately in the role structure.
The simplest way to accomplish this is by seeking and finding answers to the question “Who am I?” Since roles are structured in reciprocal fashion, the answers can also be achieved through locating the position of the other by implicitly asking the question are usually phrased in terms of role categories, such as man, teacher, friend, officer, secretary, and clown. In order to establish the position of the other, the actor must pay attention to the behaviors emitted by that other, scanning for cues that have reliability and validity. Physique and figure, hairstyle, facial adornment, and dress, among other things, are cues to which the actor may attend in order to locate the other, and reciprocally the self, in social space (Sarbin, 1972).

**Role persistence**

Once stabilised, the role structure tends to persist, regardless of changes in the actors. This postulate takes two specific forms. First, when an actor leaves the group and is replaced by another, there is a tendency to allocate to the new member the role played by the one who leaves. Second, if one actor changes roles, there is a tendency for another actor to make a compensatory change of roles in order to maintain the original role structure. The latter principle has been referred to as role appropriating by Perry et al. (1956), who noted that in some families, when the parent became disorganized and assumed a childlike role of dependence in a disaster situation, a child suddenly blossomed into responsibility and helped to supply family leadership.

**Role allocation**

There is a tendency for a given individual to be identified with a given role, and a complementary tendency for an individual to adopt a given role, for the duration of the interaction. The postulate of role allocation, in combination with the meaningfulness postulate, suggests that an actor’s behaviour is without clear meaning until he settles on a particular role in interaction. In combination with the postulate of legitimate expectation, role allocation suggests that an individual whose
behavior cannot be fitted into an identifiable role will be regarded as violating the terms of interaction.

A role allocation has taken place when relevant alters interact with ego on the basis of the same role as he is playing. Ego's act of attempting to determine the role that alter will play has been dubbed "altercasting" by Weinstein and Deutschberger (1963). The alter's use of a relatively unambiguous response to confer the right to play the chosen role is sometimes designated as validation.

The bases for the role allocation can be inferred from the postulate of evaluation in conjunction with the postulate of role complementarity. Since roles are evaluated, there is likely to be competition for the preferred roles, and the principles of any competitive situation will be at work. Because of complementarity of roles, it is essential that an individual be able to play the role with sufficient adequacy; demonstrated adequacy or inadequacy therefore affects the willingness of others to allocate to him a particular role (Turner, 1972).

**Role behaviour**

Role behaviour is a behaviour that is socially expected in a particular role, or behaviour that is performed as part of a role.

**Role model**

Role model is an individual whose behaviour in a particular role provides a pattern or model upon which another individual bases his behaviour in performing the same role. The role model provides a standard used by the other person in determining the appropriate attitudes and actions of an occupant of the role. A role model need not be personally known to the individual, neither living, nor necessarily real, and may include public figures, and legendary heroes (Sharma, 1992).

**Role playing**

The term “role-playing” appeared in the 1934 edition of Moreno's who shall survive? Moreno's interest in changing behaviour is
represented well in his conception of role playing. In his terms “Role playing may be considered as an experimental procedure, a method of learning to perform roles more adequately”.

Role playing means acting in a manner one considers proper for his role. In role playing individual conforms to the social norms that define the appropriate behaviour for a given role. It is a technique used in sociodrama and psychodrama in which a person enacts a part in an improvised dramatization of a life situation.

**Role performance**

The term “role performance” generally refers to the performances of a particular category of persons, where the common features of the performances are left undesignated or assume meaning by virtue of the context in which the expression is employed. It refers to the way a person actually plays his role in a situation.

**Role-taking**

The concept of role-taking is introduced by Mead (1934). Role taking in its most general form is a process of looking at or anticipating another’s behaviour by viewing it in the context of a role imputed to that other. The actor takes the role of another in carrying out some behaviour of his own; role taking is an adjunct to the determination or application of one’s own role in a given situation. The role of the other may remain an object to the actor, so that he understands and interprets it without allowing its point of view to become his own, or the actor may allow the inferred attitudes of the other to become his own and to direct his behaviour.

**Role-set**

A particular social status involves, not a single associated role, but an array of associated roles. Merton (1957) defined role set as “complement of role relationships which persons have by virtue of occupying a particular social status.” For example, the single status of medical student entails not only the role of a student in relation to his
teachers, but also an array of other roles relating the occupant of that status to other students, nurses, physicians, social workers, medical technicians, etc.

**Role distance**

Role distance is defined as a "pointed separateness between individual and putative role" (Goffman, 1961). Role distance depends upon a separation between self and role, but may be means whereby an identity with the seriousness of that role is maintained. It can be a way of demonstrating supreme confidence in the performance of tasks involved in a particular role. It is the subjective detachment displayed by a social actor while plying a role e.g. a waiter who may indicate to a customer that he is not only a waiter.

**Role embracement**

Role embracement, or the "admittedly expressed attachment to the role" (Goffman, 1961), varies according to one's social status and the role being enacted. He uses a merry-go-round as one illustration. Until the age of five, Goffman reports, the child wholeheartedly embraces his/her role as a rider of a merry-go-round. Goffman points out that the role playing of the adult differs from that of the adolescent, and that both adolescent and adult differ from a four year old in the degree to which each embraces the role. Role distance and role embracement appear related to the person's status, including age, sex, education, and other related variables.

**Role conflict**

In certain situations an individual may find himself exposed to conflicting expectations; some people expect him to behave in one way, others in another, and these expectations are incompatible. It is the incompatibility between two or more roles that an individual is expected to perform in a given situation. The performance of one role interferes with or is antagonistic to the other. The state of conflict may last only a
short time and the conflicting demands may be met without much
difficulty or it may be a persistent problem facing someone all of his life.

3.3.1 CONCEPT OF STATUS AND ROLE IN ANTHROPOLOGY

Maine (1861) was one of the first to use this notion of status and
to distinguish between societies or social relations where one’s position
in society (i.e. one’s status) is determined at birth (“ascribed”) and those
in which one’s position may depend upon one’s actions during one’s
lifetime (“achieved”). The division of the world’s societies into those two
fundamentally different types was followed later by Tonnies and even
Durkheim.

During the first three decades of the last century, the notions of
status and role were not thoroughly examined in social anthropology
and were rarely used in precise ways. Nevertheless, these concepts were
implicit in the discussions of anthropologists concerned with social
relationship and social structure. For example, Radcliffe-Brown (1952)
conceived of social structure as a set of actually existing social
relationships of which the basic unit was the dyadic relationship, i.e.,
the relationship between any two people. Each individual in the dyad, in
this structural framework, had a set of rights and duties with respect to
the other person. Thus, social structure was seen as a network of social
persons bound together by normative specified rights and duties.

It was from this position that Linton, an eminent anthropologist a
student of Boas, proposed a classic distinction between status (position)
and role. Linton (1936) and Mead (1934) found the notion of role and to
a lesser extent, that of status-often called position – useful in their
analyses of western society. To Linton, status is a ‘collection of rights
and duties’ and role is the ‘dynamic aspect of a status; to put rights and
duties into effect is to perform a role’. The concept expanded to include
role, role expectations—the expectations a social person vis-à-vis the
other person in the relationship–role perception—how one sees one’s
role—and role performance—how, normatively, the person carried out his
rights and duties. Infact, contemporary sociologist have developed a whole set of working propositions, called role theory. Role theory is one sociological method of examining the nature of the social system. Merton further refined the notion of role by introduction the idea of the role-set, which is refinement of Linton’s ideas. Merton proposed that each social status (vis-à-vis another social person) is associated not with a single role but, rather, a whole array of roles, and that this set of roles is a basic feature of social structure.

Nadel, a student of Malinowski, much influenced by the structural ideas of Radcliffe-Brown, tried to develop of a whole logical theory of society in his book, ‘Social structure’ (1957), published posthumously. Examining critically the notions of social structure used by various different anthropologists, he attempted to build a new model of the nature of society using role, that is, expected ways of acting towards another social person, as basic unit. In an important analysis of this concept, he objects to Linton’s definition of status and role, on the grounds that it is pointless to have different names for a role of behaviour and its application. According to Nadel, a role is a category of persons distinguished by a normative set of behavioural attributes. He also pointed out that roles mark the distribution of activities and of socially recognised characteristics among members of a society.

Mitchell (1966) defines social roles as the “expected behaviour associated with a social position”. Developing formal notions from this basis he examined the nature of structure, pattern, and network and went on to differentiate among different kinds of roles in a society, particularly those that are necessary, and those that are incidental. Although the book was probably not as refined as it would have been had Nadel seen it through to publication himself, it has had a lasting influence on social theorist.

The Chicago School of sociologist, influenced by Merton, Redfield, and Robert Park, further developed the notion of social life as a drama involving the idea that people may be seen as “actors” playing “roles”.
Goffman (1959) has been a leader among these writers and the resulting branch of sociology – anthropology has come to be known as “interaction theory”. Interaction theory concentrates upon the examination of social life in terms of “encounters” between social persons in particular situations. Abandoning the more static anthropological concepts of people playing normative, culturally defined roles, interaction theorists have shown how individuals modify their behaviour in terms of their perceptions of situations, their self-perception, and their perceptions of how the other social persons expect them to act. Thus, interaction theory resembles, in many ways, a detailed study of “face”, and the mechanisms by which a social person chooses what role to play in each situation. These detailed studies have been performed, mainly, in institutions of Western society, such as hospitals, mental institutions, small group encounters, power relationship, and so on. Berreman (1962) used this kind of approach to advantage in his analysis of a field situation in which he described the “faces” or roles put on by the anthropologist and by various informants in Himalayan India.

Goodenough, a student of Murdock, attempted to refine (“Rethinking Status and Role”, 1965) the concepts of status and role in anthropology, illustrating his contentions from his well-known Truck material. He was able to show that dyadic roles are not entirely different from each other, but form a continuum; the differences are certain culturally diagnostic expected behaviour. Thus, kin roles e.g. can be scaled according to the presence or absence of these particular features. In order to do this, he differentiated between status as a bundle of rights and duties, and the social “positions”, social identities as he calls them, associated with each status and bundle. Consequently, as a general role he makes the useful distinction between rights, duties, privileges, powers, liabilities and immunities and identity relationship. Each person has a number of social identities, vis-a-vis other people and a social identity is “an aspect of self that makes a difference is how
one's rights and duties distribute to specific others. While agreement is not complete on how to use the concepts of status and role, and their various derivatives, in social anthropology, the variety of approaches now available gives us some powerful tools for our analysis of social systems and social behaviour.

Role is a relational term. One plays a role, vis-à-vis another person's role which is attached to a counterposition. The relational aspects of the role concept centres on the notion of role-taking. The expectations that the role partner in the counter position has of ego's role are usually referred to as ego's role, obligations or duties, and the expectations that ego has of his role partner are ego's rights. The expectations between the focal positions of ego and another counter position are said to constitute a 'role sector'.

There is distinction between role and role behaviour. The expected role behaviour is not necessarily identical with the ideal role behaviour. Ideal role can be differentiated from expected role but the two seem often to be used synonymously.

Linton's insistence upon a close relationship between role and position has been followed by most modern writers on role; the implication that positions and the attending roles were elements of societies suggested new possibilities for analysing social structure; and the idea that an individual's behaviour could be construed as role performance implied that role was one linkage between individual behaviour and social structure.

3.3.2 FUNCTIONALIST ROLE THEORY

Functionalist thought arose from the contributions of Talcott Parsons and was at one time, the dominant orientation in American sociology. Functionalist theory was concerned with the problem of explaining social order. Stable but differentiated behaviours were thought to persist within social systems because they accomplished functions and because not the static entities that functionalist thought
portrayed, and that human conduct often responds to power and conflicts of interest in ways that were ignored by functionalists. As a result of these attacks, interest in functionalist role theory has declined, although it is still possible to find writers who advocate (Bates and Harvey 1975) or denounce (Connell 1979) role theory as if it were merely a gloss for functionalism.

3.3.3 ROLE-CONFLICT AND ORGANIZATIONAL ANALYSIS

Interest in organizational role theory began with the works of Neal Gross, Robert Kahn, and their associates, which questioned the assumption that consensual norms were required for social stability. Instead, these writers suggested that formal organizations were often characterised by role conflict (i.e., opposing norms that were held for actors by powerful others), that such conflicts posed problems for both the actors and the organisations in which they appeared, and that strategies for coping with or “resolving” role conflict could be studied.

In addition, the concept of role conflict has proven attractive to scholars who wanted to conceptualise or study problems that are faced by disempowered persons, particularly married women who must cope with the opposing demands of the workplace, home maintenance, and support for their husbands (Stryker and Macke 1978; Lopata 1980; Skinner 1980). Unfortunately (for the argument), evidence suggests that role conflicts are not always shunned by disempowered persons (Sales et al. 1980) and that “resolving” those conflicts does not necessarily lead to empowerment.

3.3.4 THE STRUCTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Another use of role concepts has appeared among structuralists and network theorists. This third perspective reflects the early contributions of anthropologists such as S.F. Nadel and Michael Banton, sociologists such as Marion Levy, and social psychologists ranging from Dorwin Cartwright and Frank Harary to Oscar Oeser. As a rule, structuralists concern themselves with the logical implications of
ways for organising social systems (conceived as social positions and roles) and eschew any discussion of norms or other expectation concepts.

To date, much of the work in structural role theory has been expressed in formal, mathematical terms (Burt 1982; Winship and Mandel 1983). This means that it has had greater appeal for scholars who are mathematically trained. It also constitutes one form of network analysis (although other network perspectives have appeared that do not use role concepts).

3.3.5 ROLE THEORY AMONG SYMBOLIC INTERACTIONISTS

Interest in role theory has also appeared among symbolic interactionists who were influenced not only by George Herbert Mead but also by Everett Hughes, Irving Goffman, and other influential figures. In general, symbolic interactionists think of a role as a line of action that is pursued by the individual within a given context. Roles are affected by various forces, including pre-existing norms applying to the social position of the actor, beliefs and attitudes that the actor holds, the actor's conception and portrayal of self, and the "definition of the situation" that evolves as the actor and others interact. Roles need not have common elements, but they are likely to become quite similar among actors who face common problems in similar circumstances.

Unfortunately, some persons within this perspective have also been guilty of tunnel vision and have produced reviews in which role theory is portrayed largely as an extension of symbolic interactionist thought (Heiss 1981; Stryker and Statham 1985). In addition, symbolic interactionism has attracted its share of criticism among other things, for its tendencies to use fuzzy definitions, recite cant and ignore structural constraints that affect behaviours and some of these criticisms have tended to rub off on role theory.
3.3.6 COGNITIVE PERSPECTIVES IN ROLE THEORY

Empirical research in role theory has been carried out by cognitive social psychologists representing several traditions. Some of these work has focussed on the accomplished functions and because actors in those systems shared expectations for behaviours. Such consensual expectations (or “roles”) constituted norms for conduct, and actor conformity to norms was induced either because others in the system imposed sanctions on the actor or because the actor internalised them. In addition, those in the system were thought to be aware of the norms they held and could be counted on to teach them to (i.e. to socialise) neophytes as the latter entered the system.

Critics have pointed out that persisting behaviour may or may not be functional for social systems, that norms for conduct are often in conflict, that actor conformity need not be generated by norms alone but can also reflect other modes of thought (such as beliefs or preferences), that norms might or might not be supported by explicit sanctions, that norms internalised by the actor may be at odds with those supported by external forces, and that processes of socialization are problematic. Above all, critics have noted that social systems are role playing, some of it has concerned the impact of group norms, some of it has studied the effects of anticipatory role expectations, and some of it has examined role-taking.

In addition, cognitive social psychologists have studied conformity to many forms of expectations, including instrumental norms, moral norms, norms attributed to others, self-fulfilling prophesies, beliefs about the self (such as those induced by identity projection or labelling), beliefs about others, and preferences or “attitudes”. These studies suggest that roles are often generated by two or more modes of expectational thought, and several models have also appeared from cognitive theorists reflecting this insight (Bank et al. 1985).
Unfortunately, much of this effort ignores expectations for social positions and concentrates, instead, on expectations for individual actors, cognitive role theory also tends to ignore the implications of its findings for structural analysis, and thus appears to be atheoretical from an anthropological perspective. However, Biddle (1979) has authored a broad vision for role theory that uses information from cognitive research to build models for social system analysis.

### 3.3.7 RECENT TRENDS IN ROLE THEORY

The term “role” continues to appear in most textbooks for basic courses in anthropology, sociology and social psychology, it normally does not appear by itself as a major concept. In contrast, extensive discussions of roles and related concepts may be found in texts for various types of advanced courses for these fields.

Keyton (1999) focusses a major chapter on “group member roles”, “group norms,” and associated materials. As a rule, portrayals of role theory in such sources is straightforward: “roles” are deemed to refer to specific patterns of behaviour that are associated with individuals or recognized identities; “norms” are shared expectations for conduct that may apply to all persons in the group or only to certain identities (such as “leaders”); and related concepts such as “socialization” and “role conflict” appear frequently.

Many authors continue to employ role concepts for discussing social relations within a specific institution or for portraying the lives of those who share an occupational identity. For example, Biddle (1997) provides an extensive overview of recent research on the role of school teacher. Again, much of this applied work makes clear use of concepts from role theory, With the “role” term normally used to refer to differentiated behaviours, whereas notions about behaviours that are thought to be appropriate for roles are normally termed “norms” or “role expectations.”
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Some authors wrote about the differences between the conduct, problems or outlooks of men and women have used role theory as a vehicle for interpreting their findings. For example, a recent advocate uses role theory to interpret evidence about gender differences in behaviour. (Alice Eagly, 1987, 1995). Eagly asserts that such differences appear as a result of structural forces in societies- hence may differ among countries- but are sustained and reproduced because men and women develop role appropriate expectations for those behaviours. Psychologists prefer to believe that gender differences in conduct are hard wired and culturally universal, and have arisen from the mechanisms of Darwinian selection (Biddle, 2000).

Despite these differences, role theorists tend to share a basic vocabulary, an interest in the fact that human behaviour is contextually differentiated and is associated with the social position of the actor, and the assumption that behaviour is generated (in part) by expectations that are held by the actor and others. This means that much of role theory presumes a thoughtful, phenomenally aware participant, and role researchers tend to adopt methods that call for the observing of roles and for asking respondents to report about their own or others expectations. Moreover, it also means that role theory may be contrasted with alternative theoretical positions that give stronger emphasis to unconscious motives or behaviour-inducing forces of which the actor may be unaware (such as mechanisms that are not obvious but that serve to maintain structured inequalities of power, wealth, or status).