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ABSTRACT

Social positions and social relationships are important in structuring self-concept. The self is often viewed as composed of identities related to the social positions an individual occupies. These identities are generally conceptualized as being organized hierarchically based on the individual's relative commitment to each. I contribute to this work by developing an Identity Management Model in which I propose three strategies (compartmentalization, amalgamation, and reprioritization) individuals use to manage completion among identities.

In this model, I identify characteristics of (a) the identities, (b) the social environment and (c) the individual's social network that are likely to influence which strategy is used in a particular situation. I then formulate hypotheses regarding the effect of specific characteristics. For example, I hypothesize that (1) the greater the density of an individual's social network the less likely he or she is to compartmentalize master identities; (2) the amalgamation of identities is more likely for those identities that are broad in scope and potentially relevant in a wide range of social settings; and (3) the amalgamation of competing identities is more likely when the individual has access to reference groups or role models who have amalgamated similar identities.

I tested some of the propositions using data collected from 269 women sociologists using a mailed questionnaire. I found support for the proposition that individuals have multiple identities to which they are highly committed. I also found
that the number and value of relationships linked to an amalgamated identity could be used to predict involvement in behaviors related to the amalgamated identities.

However, the relationship between commitment and behavior was not equally strong for all types of identities. Commitment appears to be strongly related to behaviors associated with identities that are both voluntary in nature and flexibly defined. Of the identities I examined, (academic, woman, mother, and feminist), commitment and behavior were most strongly related for the identity of feminist. This difference between more and less voluntary identities may provide an important key for understanding why previous tests of Identity Theory have had only weak to moderate success in predicting behavior.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the work of James (1890) and Mead (1934), social scientists have viewed the self as inherently social and multidimensional in nature. Specifically, the self is viewed as consisting of many components that stem from the formal social statuses occupied by an individual (cf., Stryker 1968, 1980, 1983, 1987b; Stryker and Statham 1985) and the less formally recognized social categories and groups to which he or she belongs (cf., Callero 1985; Rosenberg 1979; Stets 1995). Identities represent the internalized meanings individuals attribute to themselves as occupants of these positions (Burke 1980; Burke and Reitzes 1981, 1991; Burke and Tully 1977; Serpe and Stryker 1987, Stets 1995; Stryker 1968, 1980, 1983, 1987b, 1991, 1994; Stryker and Statham 1985; Wells and Stryker 1989).

It has been argued that people may have as many part to their self as they have others, or groups of others with whom they interact. Not surprisingly, in complex modern societies, individuals have numerous identities that must be organized into a coherent self-structure.

Our understanding of how identities are organized derives substantially from identity and role identity theories. According to these perspectives, identities are hierarchically arranged on the basis of their relative importance to the individual (McCall and Simmons 1966/1978; Stryker 1968). This relative importance is variously conceptualized as salience (Stryker 1968) or as prominence or psychological
centrality (McCall and Simmons 1966/1978; Rosenberg 1979). It can more generally be thought of as commitment or an individual’s sense of having an emotional obligation to or stake in a particular identity. Commitment structures the social experience of individuals by linking them to various role partners, activities, and organizations (Burke and Reitzes 1991).

While these lines of work have added much to our understanding of self-content and structure, the focus on a hierarchical arrangement of identities has resulted in a tendency to consider identities as essentially isolated from one another. As a result, little attention has been given to the ways that various identities held by an individual interact and in some cases compete with one another. I address this important issue by focusing on the potential conflict or competition between those identities that are crucial to individual self-definition. These identities are likely to influence the other identities held by the individual and his or her behavior. They are also likely to serve as a filter through which the individual views the social world.

I begin by synthesizing and elaborating existing work (reviewed in Chapter 2) to provide a foundation for understanding how individuals manage the competition between similarly valued identities. In the Identity Management Model, presented in Chapter 3, I propose three strategies (compartmentalization, amalgamation, and prioritization) that individuals may use to manage such competition or conflict. I also identify three sets of characteristics that influence which of these strategies is likely to
be used. These are (a) characteristics of the identities, (b) characteristics of the social environment and (c) characteristics of the individual’s social network.

To begin to test the Identity Management Model, I focus on two types of identities that are likely to be linked to very high levels of commitment – gender and occupation (particularly among professionals). As discussed in Chapter 4, gender and work identities have the potential to compete or conflict with one another. Previous studies have shown that individuals in non-traditional gendered occupations are particularly likely to experience conflict between these identities.

Academia has traditionally been populated by males and is viewed as having a masculine culture. For this reason it provided a useful venue for addressing the questions presented in this dissertation. Therefore, I collected data via a questionnaire mailed to all women sociology faculty members of graduate degree granting departments of Research I or II universities. The questionnaire requested information about the various identities, social relationships, and activities of the women. This survey yielded data from 269 women sociologists employed full-time as regular faculty members in 101 different departments.

I utilized these data to test some propositions set forth in the Identity Management Model. The specific propositions to be tested, the research hypotheses derived from these propositions, and the operationalizations of concepts are presented in Chapter 6 and the results of my analyses are presented in Chapter 7.
In Chapter 8, I conclude by discussing refinements to the Identity Management Model as well as directions for further tests of the model. In particular, I use this discussion to call attention to the fact that the relationships among social structure, commitment to a given identity, and behavioral choices may differ based on the degree to which that identity is flexibly defined and voluntary in nature.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, I briefly review two lines of theory and research (role theory and symbolic interactionism) that provide important foundations for contemporary identity theory. Following this review, I discuss identity theory as developed by Stryker and colleagues and Burke and colleagues (Burke 1980; Burke and Reitzes 1981, 1991; Burke and Tully 1977; Serpe and Stryker 1987, Stets 1995; Stryker 1968, 1980, 1983, 1987b, 1991, 1994; Stryker and Statham 1985; Wells and Stryker 1989). By synthesizing and elaborating these lines of work and by drawing from the work of additional researchers, I then formulate the initial definitions, assumptions and propositions for the Identity Management Model developed in Chapter 3.

Role Theory

According to role theorists, all individuals occupy positions or statuses relative to others within the organizational structure of society (Linton 1936). The various social positions held by an individual are important in structuring the content of specific interactions and the self-concept of individuals. Social positions are associated with cultural norms or expectations known as roles.

These roles suggest the behavioral rights and obligations an occupant of a given position has in relation to others with whom they interact (Bredemeier and Stephenson, 1962; Callero 1986; Linton 1936, 1945). Through role expectations, social positions structure the content of social interaction by providing a script for
behavior and interactions. According to Callero (1986), roles are related to behavior either directly as a response to role expectations or indirectly as a result of the internalization of roles (cf., Banton 1965; Linton 1936; Merton 1957; Newcomb 1950; Parsons 1951). Individuals are under a great deal of both internal and external pressure to conform to role expectations. This pressure comes both from other participants in a given interaction and from various others who are not present. The others who are not present may be specific interaction partners of the individual or they may represent symbolic others (cf., Baldwin and Homes (1987) for a discussion of private audiences). The concept of symbolic others may refer to general classifications of others with whom the individual identifies or seeks to identify (e.g., ideal types or reference groups), individuals who have played an important part in the life of the individual but are no longer in his or her social network (e.g., deceased parents or spouses), or specific others with whom the individual hopes to interact in the future.

In response to the pressure to conform, individuals attempt to play their parts as close to the script provided by role expectations as possible (Stryker and Statham 1985). Behavior that deviates from these scripts is considered undesirable and the actors are likely to attempt to correct any deviations as quickly and completely as possible.

Social positions not only guide interaction but also serve as key elements in the self-definition of the individual. Park (1955) illustrates how social positions are linked
to self-concept using a role theory perspective. He contends that the self-concept of individuals depends on "their vocations, and in general the role they seek to play in communities and social groups in which they live, as well as upon the recognition and status which society accords them in these roles" (1955, pp. 285-286).

Individuals occupy many social positions during their lives and at any given point they occupy a number of positions, or a status set (Merton 1968). The various social positions an individual holds differ in compatibility with each other and with the individual's self-concept. Some social positions and associated roles fit more smoothly into her or his overall set of thoughts and feelings than do others. Typically the more compatible a particular role is with the overall self-concept of a person the better he or she is likely to perform that role in the face of conflicting demands.

Individuals are at times likely to experience difficulty in meeting the obligations of their many roles. One type of difficulty created by multiple social positions is inter-role conflict which occurs when two or more of a person's roles are incompatible. In other words, when the requirements of a particular role are in opposition to the requirements of one or more other roles. This may occur because the various roles demand differing loyalties. Alternatively, roles may be incompatible simply because they are defined as such by a given culture. For example, many major religions define being homosexual and being a member of the clergy as mutually exclusive. Similarly, openly claiming a gay or lesbian identity makes the role of military officer impossible in the United States.
A second type of difficulty created by multiple social positions is role strain. This occurs when an individual cannot fill all the expectations associated with his or her total role set due to insufficient resources such as time and/or energy. This view of time and energy as scarce commodities is a central theme in the work of Goode (1960), Slater (1963) and L. Coser (1974).

Goode (1960) argues that role strain is an unavoidable fact of social life. He views the role obligations of modern individuals as over-demanding. As a result of this is inevitable and overwhelming role strain, the individual is faced with the constant problem of how to allocate time and energy to reduce role strain. Slater (1963) also portrays role demands as over-demanding and suggests that individuals must make constant compromises in order to manage this role strain.

Given the multiplicity of statuses held by any individual and the differing demands created by the role sets of any given social position, it might seem that most individuals would remain in a state of constant conflict and strain. Considerable work has examined the impact of this multiplicity of social positions on the individual (cf., R. Coser 1975; L. Coser 1974; Goode 1960; Marks 1977; Merton 1957; Newcomb 1950; Sarbin and Allen 1968; Thoits 1983). Recent research suggests that multiple roles are not overly problematic. A number of studies have shown that under many conditions the more roles an individual has the better the person will be able to function in society (Marks 1977; Thoits, 1983).
One broad mechanism that aids in reducing role conflict and strain is the tendency for conflicting roles to be performed at differing times and in differing contexts. That is to say that various roles are performed sequentially, with different interaction partners, or within various foci of activity. However, in some situations this type of compartmentalization and sequential role enactment is not possible. In this case, individuals must choose actions that fulfill some roles while simultaneously leaving unfilled the expectations associated with other social positions. The question for the individual becomes which roles are fulfilled and which are not. The course of action an individual follows in such situations is in large part a result of how his or her various positions and roles fit together and how they fit into his or her self-concept.

A second mechanism also reduces the consequences of conflict among roles. This mechanism is based on the differential importance of the various roles to the individual. Roles differ not only in compatibility with an individual's self-concept and with one another but also in their relative importance for the individual's definition of self. Some positions and their related roles are so key to the individual that they are central to the development and maintenance of his or her self-concept (Lopata 1980; Rosenberg 1979; Turner 1968, 1976, 1978). The roles that are viewed by the individual as very important for self-definition are more likely to receive priority when role strain or conflict occurs.

To summarize, for role theorists, society offers various social positions and roles to its members. The specific social positions available or assigned to an
individual provide that person with scripts for further behavior and interactions. These social positions and their related roles are important for structuring an individual’s self-concept with some roles being more important than others for self-definition. Further, the more important a role is to the person’s self-concept the more likely that role is to receive preference when conflict occurs.

However, role theory has failed to predict behavior as fully as expected (Stryker and Statham 1985). In addition, this perspective fails to take into account the possibility that role behavior may be negotiated within interaction as much as it is determined by preexisting structures such as social positions (Cicourel 1973). Finally, role theory seems to be limited in its ability to describe behavior based on social positions that are not widely understood and for which role expectations are ambiguous.

Symbolic Interactionism

Symbolic interactionism places greater emphasis on the process of negotiation through social interaction and therefore overcomes some of the weaknesses associated with role theory. Symbolic interaction differs from traditional role theory by emphasizing the active construction process in which identity components and self-concepts develop on the basis of personal experiences as well as societal norms. For symbolic interactionists the self reflects society and both self and society emerge out of social interaction (Gecas and Burke 1995). This perspective emphasizes
meaning, its maintenance in communication and social interaction, and its relevance for the concepts of self and identity.

Just as social positions and statuses are important in structuring self-concept based on a role theory perspective, they are also important within the symbolic interactionist interpretation. For symbolic interactionists, the concept of social position is used broadly to refer to any socially recognized category of actors. This includes not only specific statuses (e.g., doctor, parent, employee) but also general social categories (e.g., philanthropist, scholar, eccentric). It is from this perspective that I have developed my own conceptualization of social positions. Specifically, I define social positions as any socially recognized category of actors including both specific statuses and more general social categories.

In contrast to role theorists, who view roles as primary in structuring behavior and interactions, symbolic interactionists see positions and their related expectations as providing only general expectations about the behavior of the individual and his or her interaction partners. Some symbolic interactionists use the term role1 to refer to "those expectations mobilized by an identity through verbal and nonverbal

---

1 It should be noted that not all symbolic interactionists use the term "role." According to Stryker and Statham (1985), a minority refuses to use the term on the grounds that it implies the existence of fixed patterns of behavioral expectations that exist prior to the beginning of interaction. This belief is in contrast with the basic symbolic interactionist view that meaning emerges from interaction. Still others imply the term but do not actually use it. However, most symbolic interactionists do recognize the existence of social positions and related behavioral expectations and use the term role to refer to these concepts.
communication in a specified social situation" (Stone and Faberman 1970, p. 208). In this framework, roles are not the causes of behavior but are merely devices for organizing and structuring social situations (Callero 1986; Hewitt 1979). Further, roles are not assumed to represent fixed or universally defined parts of social structure that exist independent of specific actors (Blumer 1969).

Whether social positions are viewed from a role theory or a symbolic interactionist perspective, they are important in structuring patterns of interaction because social structures serve to bring some people together while keeping others apart. The structure of society is such that individuals are likely to interact most with others who occupy similar or complementary social positions and who share similar meanings and definitions of the world (cf. Bell 1981; Feld 1982; Lazarsfeld and Merton 1954; Marsden 1987, 1988; Merton 1968).

For example, the social world is structured in such a way that most individuals who occupy the position of "university English Professor" are unlikely to have many opportunities to interact with occupants of the position of "coal miner." The activities of each of the two individuals generally occur in different places from one another. The activities in which individuals are engaged can be thought of as foci of activity.

A focus of activity is defined by Feld (1981, p. 1016) as "a social, psychological, legal, or physical entity around which joint activities are organized." A particular focus of activity can also operate to bring together individuals who would not otherwise interact. For example, in a small town the college professor and the coal
miner might be members of the same religious organization and thus interact with one another. It is through these differing realms of activity that social positions serve to organize patterns of social interaction.

The concepts of positions and roles are given more direct emphasis by the Iowa school of symbolic interactionism than by some other variants of symbolic interactionism. This line of work has been developed through the work of Kuhn and his students. Like Blumer (1969), Kuhn (1964) took the stance that social structure is created, maintained and changed through social interaction. However, he also notes that once created social structure acts to constrain further interactions. For Kuhn and his followers, social structure is seen as a network of positions and associated roles. This network gives the self a stability that transcends a particular social interaction and makes reliable measurement of the self possible.

This web of social positions and interactions with others is important in the maintenance, as well as in the formation, of self-images. Self-images require validation through the responses of others with whom the individual interacts. This validation occurs through two mechanisms: (1) the provision of role-validating responses (2) the existence of appropriate counter role responses (Stryker and Statham 1985).

When validation persistently fails to occur, the long-term consequence can have one of two forms. First, the individual may alter his or her self-image by removing that position and its associated role from his or her definition of self (e.g.,
resigning one's job, breaking up with a lover, ending participation in a particular social group). Second, the individual may alter their interaction networks by reducing or ending contact with others who fail to validate important components of his or her self-definition and increasing contact with others who will validate important self-definitions (Robinson and Smith-Lovin 1992; Stryker and Statham 1985).

Just as role theory has been criticized for failing to take into account the impact of negotiation in social interaction (Cicourel 1973), symbolic interaction has been criticized for not giving sufficient attention to the impact of social structure on social interaction (Stryker and Statham 1985). A typical criticism is that this framework fails to adequately address the question of how social structure influences self-processes and behavioral choices. Criticisms such as these have prompted the development of theories that integrate role/reference group theory and symbolic interactionism. Two such theories are role identity theory (McCall and Simmons 1966/1978) and identity theory (Stryker 1968).

Identity Theory

Identity theory and role identity are particularly relevant for understanding the structure and content of the self and behavioral choices. Identity theory focuses on the ways that social structure serves to bring us together with some people while keeping us away from others and how this differentiation in social relationships influences our commitment to various identities and ultimately our social behavior.
The development of these frameworks can be traced from the work of Mead, to the work of Kuhn and McPartland (1954) and the Iowa school of symbolic interactionism, to development of role-identity theory by McCall and Simmons (1966/1978) and identity theory by Stryker (e.g., 1968, 1977, 1980), to the more recent work by Burke (e.g., 1980).

Stryker’s version of structural symbolic interactionism begins with the key interactionist principle that the relationship between self and society is reciprocal. Specifically, Stryker argued that "social structure and social person mutually constrain one another (indeed, symbolic interactionism insists that they presuppose one another and do not exist except in relation to one another)” (Stryker 1983, p. 187). Stryker’s work moves beyond the traditional symbolic interactionist stance by taking the explicit view that social interaction is itself shaped by social structures.

Within identity theory the structure of the self is a reflection of the multifaceted and highly differentiated society in which we live. Specifically, the self can be viewed as being made up of many components that stem from both the specific formal social statuses occupied by the individual (cf., Stryker 1968, 1980, 1983, 1987b; Stryker and Statham 1985) and the less formally recognized social categories and groups to which he or she belongs (cf., Callero 1985; Rosenberg 1979; Stets 1995). The meanings individuals attribute to themselves as occupants of these positions constitute identities or role identities (Burke 1980; Callero 1985; McCall and
Our understanding of the organization of identities within the structure of the self has been advanced by identity and role identity theories. Theorists such as Stryker argue that identities are organized hierarchically on the basis of their relative importance to the individual (Stryker 1968). This relative importance is often conceptualized as salience (cf., Callero 1985; Serpe and Stryker 1987; Stryker 1968, 1980, 1983, 1987b, 1991; Stryker and Statham 1985; Wells and Stryker 1989) or as prominence or psychological centrality (McCall and Simmons 1966/1978; Rosenberg 1979).

Commitment provides a mechanism by which the identities linked to specific social positions can influence behavior. For Stryker and colleagues this link is expressed as the belief that social structure (i.e., the social positions held by an individual) influences commitment to an identity (defined as the cost to the individual in terms of relationships foregone if she or he was no longer to have a given identity) which influences the salience of that identity (defined as the readiness to act out an identity as a consequence of the identity’s properties as a cognitive structure or schema), which ultimately influences individual behavior (Stryker 1994).

In other words, individuals are likely to act in ways that support identities to which they are more committed. For example, role-identity salience has been found to be associated with self reports of church attendance and other religious activities.
(Santee and Jackson 1979; Stryker and Serpe 1982). Athletic role identity salience has been found to predict level of participation in sports activities (Santee and Jackson 1979). Studies using actual, rather than reported, behavioral measures have also found an association between altruistic identity salience and behaviors such as blood donation (Callero 1985).

Like McCall an Simmons (1966/1978) and Stryker (1968), I also believe that an individual’s behavior is influenced by the relative position of identities within the hierarchy. Further, I believe that the position within that hierarchy is determined by the individual’s relative commitment to each identity. However, I define commitment as the sense of having an emotional obligation to or stake in a particular identity. In other words, I define commitment as the degree to which an individual feels compelled to maintain a given identity. I believe that commitment is based on the individual’s desire to protect both his or her social relationships and a sense of authenticity that in large part stems from the internalization of the individual’s past and desired future relationships.

Commitment is important because it ties the individual to various role partners, activities, and organizations (Burke and Reitzes 1991). In addition, commitment serves to structure the self by prioritizing identities and allowing the individual to make behavioral choices that support his or her most valued identities. In most cases, the various identities held by an individual are linked to behavioral expectations. In
order to maintain and protect a given identity the individual may need to act in specific ways.

A danger of focusing on the hierarchical arrangement of identities is a tendency to consider the identities as essentially separate and isolated from one another. This can be problematic because a single setting may lead to the activation of more than one identity. By thinking of the arrangement of identities in a more flexible manner than the traditional hierarchy, we can more easily attend to the crucial but under-examined issue of how identities interact with one another and, in particular, how they compete or conflict with one another. Specifically, a more flexible view allows research to focus on the ways individuals may manage competing or conflicting identities in an effort to verify the view they hold of themselves while simultaneously fulfilling potentially contradictory demands and expectations from outside forces.

An alternative approach to understanding the relative importance of identities is to distinguish those identities that are most important to the individual’s self from others. Individuals are likely to have one or more identities that are core aspects of how they view themselves and to which they are very highly committed. These identities are likely to be defining elements of an individual’s view of self and social world. One way to think of such identities is provided by Stets and Burke (1996). They distinguish between those identities linked to specific settings and those identities that cut across situations. They use the term "situated identity" to refer to the former and "master identity" to refer to the latter.
I also use the term "master identity" to refer to highly valued and crosscutting identities which are likely to be relevant in nearly all settings. However, my definition is somewhat broader than that provided by Stets and Burke (1996). Specifically, I define master identities as identities that are linked to extremely high levels of commitment and that serve as a crucial element for self-definition, a major force in the organization of the individual’s social life, and as a lense through which she or he views the social world. These master identities are also likely to reflect societies organization around dimensions such as race, gender, or class.

As discussed above, higher levels of commitment increase the likelihood that an identity will be activated in any relevant situation. Extremely high levels of commitment to an identity may also lead to the enactment of that identity when it is not directly relevant. As a result, master identities should have a very strong influence on behavioral outcomes. In short, master identities are likely to play an important part in determining which activities we perform and with whom we perform those activities.

While having multiple statuses and thus multiple identities is not inherently problematic. However, the nature of master identities may lead to problems and challenges for individuals who have two or more master identities that are in competition or conflict with one another.

Our understanding of master identities and the unique challenges they may present can be informed by considering the work of Ralph Turner. Although he does
not use the term “master identity,” Turner’s (1978) work on role-person merger supports the existence of such identities. He notes that the consequences of role-person merger include the following: (1) Roles merged with person are likely to be activated and played out in situations where they do not apply. (2) The individual is likely to resist abandonment of merged roles even when it is advantageous to do so. (3) The individual is likely to acquire attitudes and behaviors appropriate to a merged role. In other words, individuals have a very strong desire to protect and maintain these identities. In addition, these identities are likely to be activated frequently and in a wide range of settings.

For these reasons, conflict or competition between master identities may be particularly problematic and individual’s faced with such conflict may require special management strategies for resolving conflicts. In the next chapter, I present a framework for understanding strategies individuals may use to manage conflict or competition between identities.

More specifically, I propose an Identity Management Model that describes the ways in which individuals manage competition or conflict among identities to which they are highly committed such as master identities. I have presented the initial definitions, assumptions, and propositions of this model below. These statements have been developed by elaborating and synthesizing the work discussed in this chapter and they provide the foundation for the Identity Management Model described in the next chapter.
| Definition: | An individual’s **self-definition** is the understanding he or she has of himself or herself as a physical, social, and spiritual or moral being. |
| Definition: | **Identities** are the meanings an individual applies to himself or herself as an occupant of a specific social position. |
| Definition: | **Social position** refers to any socially recognized category of actors including both specific statuses and more general social categories. |
| Assumption #1: | The relationship between the self and society is reciprocal. |
| Assumption #2: | The self is composed of the multiple identities held by an individual. |
| Assumption #3: | Identities are related to the various social positions an individual occupies, has occupied, or hopes to occupy and the various social categories in which he or she claims membership. |
| Assumption #4: | The various identities held by an individual vary in their compatibility with one another and with the individual’s overall self-concept. |
| Assumption #5: | Some identities are central or core to the individual’s sense of self than others. |
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Commitment is the degree to which an individual feels compelled to maintain a particular identity.

Commitment is the result of an individual's efforts to protect numerous and valued social relationships and his or her sense of authenticity.

The higher an individual's level of commitment to a given identity the more likely the identity will be enacted in a given situation or across situations.

The higher the individual's level of commitment to a given identity the higher the likelihood that the individual will express a desire to spend more time engaged in that activity than he or she currently spends.

An individual will seek interactions that confirm highly valued or strongly held identities and her or his overall self-concept.

Foci of activity are social, psychological, legal, or physical entities around which joint activities are organized.

Foci of activities serve to bring those with similar or compatible identities together.

Master identities are identities that are linked to extremely high levels of commitment and that are likely to serve as defining elements in the self-definition, a major force in the organization.
Assumption #9: Identities linked to either very numerous or extremely highly valued relationships are more likely to serve as master identities than are other identities.

Proposition #3: The more extremely (positively or negatively) society evaluates and values an identity the more likely it is to become a master identity.

Proposition #4: The more successful at executing a given identity an individual feels the more likely the identity is to become a master identity.

Proposition #5: The greater an individual’s investment of time, effort, and sacrifice in obtaining a given identity the more likely the identity is to become a master identity.

Proposition #6: Master identities are likely to be activated and played out even in situations where that particular identity does not apply.

Proposition #7: The individual is likely to resist abandonment of master identities even when it is to his or her advantage to do so.

Proposition #8: The individual is likely to acquire attitudes and behaviors appropriate to the master identity.
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Proposition #9: The individual is more likely to acquire attitudes and behaviors appropriate to the identities to which he or she is highly committed than to other identities.

Proposition #10: The higher the individual's level of commitment to a given identity, the higher the probability that a person will actively create and seek out opportunities to enact that identity.

Proposition #11: The higher the individual’s level of commitment to a given identity the more likely it is to impact the adoption and maintenance of future identities.
CHAPTER 3

IDENTITY MANAGEMENT MODEL

As I noted in the previous chapter, identity theory relies on a well-defined hierarchy to understand the relationships among identities within the structure of the self. One danger of relying on such an understanding of self-structure is a tendency to consider the various identities held by an individual as separate and isolated from one another and to overlook the possibility of competition or conflict among those identities.

Identity theorists generally argue that observable behavior reflects the identities to which an individual is most committed. That is to say, identities linked to the highest levels of commitment are the most likely to be activated in a given situation or across situations (Stryker 1968). However, this argument is less useful in predicting behavior in situations where conflicting behavioral expectations are associated with identities linked to similar levels of commitment. Stryker does note that “two or more identities may exist at the same location in a hierarchical order,” (Stryker 1994; footnote 1 on p. 17). However, neither the impact of this statement on individual behavior nor its importance in advancing identity theory has been adequately examined. I address this issue by proposing a model for understanding competition and conflict among identities, and specifically among master identities.

I begin with a general discussion of the ways individuals manage conflicting identity-based expectations in general; specifically I discuss compartmentalization and
re prioritization. I then address why these strategies are not likely to be effective for managing conflict involving master identities. Finally I propose a mechanism, amalgamation, that may be used to manage conflict between master identities.

Compartmentalization

As noted in the previous chapter, two broad mechanisms minimize conflict between roles and by extension between identities. The first of these is the tendency for conflicting identities to be enacted at differing times and in differing contexts. Various roles held by an individual may be played out sequentially, with different interaction partners, or within various foci of activity. Thus, in many cases, it is unlikely that identities associated with competing roles will be activated in a single setting. In addition to the natural tendency for competing identities to be played out in separate parts of the social world, individuals may actively structure their time and interaction partners in efforts to further isolate incompatible identities. In short, the identities may be compartmentalized either naturally or intentionally. As an example of extreme compartmentalization, consider gay or lesbian individuals who are in the closest.

Definition: Compartmentalization is the separation of competing identities into different parts of the social environments.

In some situations, the compartmentalization and sequential enactment of competing identities is either not possible or is not desired by the individual. In these cases, individuals must choose actions that are consistent with one identity but not
another. This choice is sometimes easily made and of relatively little consequence.

As discussed above, identity theory suggests that when competing identities are characterized by substantially different levels of commitment, the individual’s behavior is likely to reflect the identity to which he or she is most committed. In addition, infrequent conflict between identities is not particularly problematic since it is unlikely to threaten either the individual’s sense of self or social relationships. Thus, in the case of infrequent conflict, the individual may simply suffer the costs incurred by fulfilling the expectations associated with one identity rather than another. The identity given precedence may be rotated so that over time the obligations of each identity are performed at some minimal standard.

Reprioritization

In some cases conflict between similarly valued identities is persistent and/or frequent. This may become problematic because individuals require validation of the identities they hold. This validation is, in large part, supplied by the responses of others with whom the individual interacts and thus require the performance of behaviors appropriate to specific identities. Validation of an identity occurs through two mechanisms: (1) the provision of role-validating responses from others and (2) the existence of appropriate counter role responses from others (Stryker and Statham 1985). Persistent conflict between identities may lead to the lack of validation for one or more identities. When validation persistently fails to occur, the long-term outcome can take one of two forms. First, the individual may alter his or her self-image by
removing that identity from his or her definition of self or reducing the prominence of the non-validated identity within his or her self-concept. Second, the individual may alter his or interaction network by reducing or ending contact with associates who fail to validate important components of his or her self-definition and increasing contact with others who will validate important self-definitions (Stryker and Statham 1985). Either or both of these strategies will in turn reduce the individual's level of commitment to that identity and ultimately result in a reprioritization of the identity in question.

An identity is more likely to be devalued or reprioritized if any of the following are true: (a) the rewards obtained by holding that identity can be replaced by similar rewards linked to other identities; (b) the social context supporting that identity has become less important or relevant to the individual; (c) that identity receives little support from current interaction partners and there is little hope that the level of support will increase; (d) the conflict associated with that identity is due to incompatibility with other identities rather than a scarcity of resources.

Definition: Reprioritization is the reduction of commitment to an identity.

Proposition #12: The likelihood that an individual's commitment to a given identity will decrease is higher if the rewards obtained by holding that identity can be replaced with similar rewards linked to another identity.
Proposition #13: The likelihood that an individual’s commitment level to a given identity will be reduced increases if the social context that previously supported that identity is devalued by the individual.

Proposition #14: The likelihood that an individual’s commitment level to a given identity will be reduced increases if there is no hope that current or future networks will offer any support for that identity.

Proposition #15: The likelihood that an individual’s commitment level to a given identity will be reduced increases if it is defined by important others as highly incompatible with other master identities and when that view cannot be changed.

Proposition #16: The likelihood that an individual’s commitment level to a given identity will be reduced increases if the individual adopts a new master identity that is inconsistent with that identity.

Compartmentalization and reprioritization are important tools for managing multiple and even competing identities (even those linked to similar levels of commitment). Strategies such as these help to explain why multiple identities are not inherently problematic. However, the management of multiple master identities presents special challenges for individuals and for theories that address the relationship between self-concept and behavior.
The nature of master identities is likely to limit the value of both compartmentalization and reprioritization and to create conflict that is problematic for a number of reasons. Several of these reasons are suggested by Turner's (1978) work. Recall that role-person merger is likely to result in identities that are seen as crucial to an individual's sense of self. The tendency for individuals to enact master identities when they do not apply suggests that both natural and intentional compartmentalization of master identities are likely to be of limited use in managing conflicting expectations. In addition, the tendency to resist abandonment of master identities when it would be advantageous to do so suggests that reprioritization will be of limited value. In short, individuals are likely to be unable or unwilling to engage in the isolation of any master identity necessary for either compartmentalization or reprioritization.

**Amalgamation**

In cases where individuals are unable or unwilling to compartmentalize or reprioritize competing master identities, they may attempt to redefine the meaning of the identities to make them more compatible. One approach to redefinition is the amalgamation or merger of the two identities into a new related but distinctive identity that is associated with a unique set of expectations. The new expectations can then be used by the individual for self-evaluation. In addition, this new identity provides a means for soliciting validation from interaction partners.
This idea is related to a process identified by Averett and Heise (1987) in the affect control theory literature. These researchers suggest that role identities may be modified by a supplementary status (as well as by other factors) to define a particularized identity for individuals within a given interaction. Averett and Heise also suggest that these modifications may result in different expectations for and interpretations of the interaction. I argue that over the course of repeated interactions a similar modification may occur for competing identities held by the individual. In the next chapter, I discuss two social positions and identities that may modified in this way—gender and occupation.

For females in traditionally male careers and males in traditionally female position, gender and occupational identities may operate in competition or opposition to one another. In addition, each of these identities may be redefined in light of the inconsistencies. This may lead to a situation where it means something very different to be a male nurse than to be a nurse or to be a female attorney than an attorney.

Definition: Amalgamation or merger is the redefinition of competing identities in a way that creates a distinctive new identity.

Assumption #10: As a strategy for managing competing identities amalgamation is most likely when at least one of the identities in question is a master identity.
Assumption #11: The amalgamation of identities leads to a new set of behavioral expectations on the part of the individual amalgamating the identities.

As a reaction to having competing identities, amalgamation it is the opposite of compartmentalization. When individuals are either unable or unwilling to separate competing identities, they may attempt to blend them together on a relatively permanent basis.

Assumption #12: Compartmentalization and amalgamation represent the end points of a single continuum.

The questions then become (1) under what conditions is compartmentalization least likely and amalgamation most likely and (2) what are the consequences of amalgamation. To address these issues, I draw from a variety of sources to identify three sets of factors that are likely to influence the likelihood of amalgamation (and thus decrease the likelihood of compartmentalization). These factors are: (1) characteristics of the individual’s social network; (2) characteristics of the identities; and (3) characteristics of the social environment.

Network Characteristics

Individuals have numerous others with whom they interact on an ongoing basis. The combination of casual acquaintances and intimates represent the individual’s personal social network. Several characteristics of the social network influence the likelihood of the compartmentalization of competing identities. First, the
likelihood of compartmentalization is related to the size of the individual’s social network. For individuals to compartmentalize their social worlds, they must have sufficient numbers of interaction partners with whom they can enact competing identities. Very small networks are likely to constrain compartmentalization because the number of interaction partners with whom an individual may perform various identities is limited. In other words, small networks may increase the likelihood of amalgamation.

Assumption #13: Compartmentalization requires enough interaction partners to allow the individual to perform competing identities with different associates.

Proposition #17: The smaller the size of an individual’s social network the greater the likelihood that amalgamation will be used as an identity management strategy.

Within the individual’s social network, communication patterns influence the likelihood of compartmentalization versus amalgamation. The isolation of competing identities requires either a social network with low overall density or a network in which there is little interaction among associates linked to the identities in competition. Compartmentalization requires control over information about competing identities. In a dense network, information is more freely exchanged between interaction partners and is potentially available to most or all associates. In this situation, the individual has greater difficulty isolating information about and
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performances of competing identities. This may in turn make the amalgamation of identities more likely.

Assumption #14: Compartmentalization requires the ability to control information about competing identities.

Proposition #18: The more visible each of the competing identities the more likely amalgamation is to be used as a tool for managing competing identities.

Assumption #15: The greater the density within a social network the more widely available information is likely to be to all members of the social network.

Proposition #19: The higher the level of network density the greater the likelihood that amalgamation will be used as a means of managing competing identities.

Some types of relatively large networks that are characterized by overall low density may nonetheless create difficulties for compartmentalization. Often networks are made up of dense clusters of associates who share a common foci of activity. In some cases one or more associates of the individual may serve as links or bridges between various clusters. The likelihood of compartmentalization is maximized if the individual has no associates who provide bridging tie between the foci associated with a competing identity and other clusters of the network. Communication patterns also explain this proposition. Associates who provide bridging ties between the foci
associated with a competing identity and any other network members compromise an individual’s ability to control information and isolate identity performances.

Definition: Bridging ties are those relationships that connect otherwise separate clusters of associates.

Proposition #20: Greater numbers of bridging ties between network clusters increase the likelihood of amalgamation.

A second type of large network also inhibits compartmentalization. Social networks containing a disproportionate number of associates with a similar relationship to the individual, (e.g., the patients of a physician or the students of a faculty member) provide limited opportunities for enacting different “selves.” Consequently, networks composed of associates who represent a limited number of counter identities reduce the likelihood of compartmentalization.

Assumption #16: Identities are linked to counter identities.

Assumption #17: The interaction of a specific identity requires associates who possess a relevant counter identity.

Proposition #16: Amalgamation is more likely in a less differentiated network.

Characteristics of the Identities

Characteristics of identities themselves also affect the likelihood of amalgamation. First, the meanings each identity has for the individual, and for the larger culture, influence the likelihood of amalgamation. Identities that are broadly
defined and potentially relevant across many situations or settings are more likely to be amalgamated than more specific and narrowly defined identities.

Assumption #18: Amalgamation of identities requires freedom to redefine the competing identities.

Proposition #21: Identities characterized by broad based and flexible expectations are more likely to be amalgamated than narrowly defined identities.

Proposition #22: Amalgamation is less likely when each of the conflicting identities to which the individual is highly committed is associated with clearly defined settings and venues for interaction than when one or more of the competing identities are relevant across a broad range of settings.

The nature of the competition between identities also influences likelihood of amalgamation. Identities may compete by: (a) collectively claiming more resources than the individual has available; (b) demanding incompatible allegiances, actions, or values; or (c) being defined as mutually exclusive by society. Some types of conflict are more easily mitigated by amalgamation than others.

For master identities, amalgamation may be more likely when one or more of the identities in question is valued intensely (either positively or negatively) by society, particularly when the identity is associated with a social position that is easily known by interaction partners. In other words, identities that are associated with
unusual or deviant social positions may create special problems for identity management. For example, a lesbian might have considerable difficulty managing the identities of fundamentalist Christian and homosexual even when the portions of her social network are completely isolated simply because of the frequent expressions of beliefs from her church-going friends about the immorality of homosexuality.

Proposition #23: The more extremely society views an identity the more likely it is that amalgamation will be used as a means of managing identity competition when that identity is a master identity for the individual.

Characteristics of the Social Environment

The final set of factors influencing the likelihood of amalgamation relates to characteristics of the social environment. For example, individuals who have access to interaction partners or role models who have amalgamated similar identities are more likely to use this strategy than are individuals without such resources.

Proposition #24: Amalgamation is more likely when the individual has access to reference groups and role-models who have merged similar identities.

The relative support or hostility of the immediate social environment may also influence the likelihood of compartmentalization versus amalgamation. However, arguments could be made for both a positive and a negative effect of environmental supportiveness/hostility on the likelihood of identity amalgamation. On one hand, a
hostile environment could make the individual more defensive regarding the
threatened identity and thus increase the relevance of that identity in a given situation
or across situations. Alternatively, the hostility could lead the individual to take
extreme measures to hide (or compartmentalize) the threatened identity.

Taken together the propositions presented in this and the previous chapter
represent the Identity Management Model. To summarize, this model proposes three
strategies that individuals may use to manage competing identities -- prioritization,
compartmentalization, and amalgamation. The model also identifies characteristics of
social networks, the social identities, and the social environment that should influence
the likelihood of amalgamation/compartmentalization. In the next chapter, I discuss
two types of identities that are likely to serve as master identities and to be
amalgamated when they are in conflict.
CHAPTER 4

GENDER AND OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITIES

In this chapter, I discuss two identities that serve as master identities for many individuals—occupation (particularly in the case of professions) and gender. These types of identities are likely to be influential in structuring both self-concepts and social worlds. Thus they can be viewed as "primitive categories" that are always, at some level, activated in social life (Deaux and Major 1987; Messick and Mackie 1989). I also discuss evidence suggesting that these identities compete or conflict with one another for at least some individuals.

Gender Identities

Gender identities are the meanings one has for his- or herself as a male or female (Burke and Tully 1977; Burke 1989; Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good 1988; Katz 1986; Stets 1995). Gender identities reflect biological sex, cultural expectations, cognitive comparisons to the ideal type for men and women, and individual life experiences (Boudreau 1986). While it is possible to have a gender identity that varies from the conventional beliefs about what is feminine or masculine, as noted by Boudreau (1986), the tendency for so many men and woman to turn out the way that society says they should is evidence for a shared understanding of sex role definitions and expected gender identities.

All females occupy a similar social position; however, they are likely to vary in the degree to which they actively adopt an identity as a woman and in their
commitment to that identity and thus in the extent to which they engage in behaviors related to the identity of woman. Having a woman identity means more than just labeling oneself as female. As noted by Henderson-King and Stewart (1994), the relationship between gender and group consciousness is not straightforward. For a female to develop a distinct and prominent identity as "woman" two things are necessary. First, she must view herself as a member of "the community of women." Second, she must take an evaluative stance toward the community of women as opposed to counter groups (Henderson-King and Stewart 1994).

Further, Stone (1962) argues that to have a specific identity is not only to be socially situated and to be assigned to a specific group but also to have a specific "perspective." This perspective consists of assumptions, definitions, attitudes, and values that are used as frames of reference for organizing or informing thoughts and actions toward self and others.

If having an identity as "woman" entails belonging to a community of women and having specific assumptions, definitions and perspectives related to that identity, then it is important to understand the likely content of these meanings and the boundaries of such a community. Traditionally, the identity of woman was closely linked to the concept of femininity and to traditional family roles. Being a woman meant being nurturing, passive, and dependent and holding the roles of wife and mother. Josselson (1996) notes that until the 1960's a woman's identity was defined by her husband and her position as "Mrs. Somebody."
In recent history, the meaning of a woman identity has become less clear. Women are now free to define themselves in a variety of ways and arguments can be in support of alternative definitions of womanhood. For some, the identity of woman continues to be experienced and expressed through family identities such as mother, daughter, or wife. However, increases in the number of women delaying marriage and/or child-rearing and the increase in childlessness means that a growing proportion of women must find alternative expressions of the woman identity. One option adopted by some women is the enactment of the woman identity through a feminist identity.

Women who do not claim an identity of either mother and/or wife or feminist may be faced with a dilemma of how to express and perform the identity of woman. The interaction partners of a woman in this position are also faced with a challenge in terms of validating this identity when there is a lack of clarity regarding appropriate identity-based behaviors.

Occupational Identities

Occupations and particular professions may also function as master identities. Reskin (1992, p. 2253) notes that in "modern society, work is a defining force in people's lives." According to Reskin, work shapes identity, provides a placement in the stratification system (which further shapes identity), and affects both physical and emotional well-being. In other words, occupations may serve as identities by providing a unique set of assumptions, definitions, attitudes, and values that serve as
frames of reference for organizing or informing thoughts and actions toward self and others.

For many people gender and occupational identities are likely to occupy similarly prominent positions in the self-structure hierarchy. The question then arises as to the compatibility between the two identities. The compatibility of occupational and gendered identities is important both in terms of how they work independently from, and in relationship to, one another.

**Gender and Occupational Identities**

Much of the occupational world is gendered due to occupational segregation and the nature of occupational cultures. In completing the 1990 census, one-third of all employed women indicated that they were employed in one of only 10 of the 503 detailed occupational categories. In contrast, men are more evenly distributed among the occupational categories; the top ten occupations for men accounting for only one-quarter of male workers (Reskin and Padavic 1994). According to Reskin and Padavic (1994), these figures actually underestimate the amount of sex segregation within the workplace. If it were possible to look at job level rather than occupational level segregation, the picture would be even more extreme. Within many occupational categories men and women are employed in very different jobs.

Traditionally female lines of work have included secretarial and clerical, retail sales, elementary school teaching, and nursing. Furthermore, these occupations are often viewed as extensions of the traditionally female roles of caretaking and
nurturing. According to Ollenburger and Moore (1992), women comprise about 50% of professionals; however, they are constrained to a small range of professions. Many of the professions occupied by women are referred to as the semiprofessions (e.g., nursing, teaching, social work, and library work). These jobs tend to have less autonomy and lower pay than the "true" professions.

While men are not concentrated within as few occupations, there are a number of occupations that are predominately occupied by men and are associated with a culture based on traditionally male values and traits. Male-dominated and male-oriented occupations include law, medicine, engineering, architecture, academics, and science.

In recent years sex segregation has decreased; however, the decrease has been due primarily to women moving into male-dominated occupations rather than men moving into female-dominated occupations (Reskin and Roos 199). For women in occupations that have traditionally been defined as feminine or men in occupations that have traditionally be defined as masculine, gender identity and occupational identity may present few contradictions. While these individuals may experience role strain and role conflict, they are not particularly likely to experience persistent tension between these two important dimensions of self-concept. In short, they are able to view their gender and occupational identities as compatible or even as two parts of a unified whole.
In contrast, individuals who occupy occupational positions that have not traditionally been held by members of their sex may find that their occupational identity and their gender identity are both of great importance to them but are also at odds with one another. As stated above, women are more likely to occupy male-dominated occupations than vice versa and so women would seem to be at greater risk of experiencing such tension.

Broadhead (1980) suggests that individuals in this situation may need to resort to articulating their identities using a problematic calculus. Such attempts are at best partial, tentative, and continuously shifting. The articulation of multiple identities is potentially problematic because many situations are likely to simultaneously call for the presentation of multiple identities. The failure to properly articulate the various relevant identities may create several kinds of interactional difficulties. This is particularly problematic within formal organizations that are likely to call for the presentation of only specific identities at the exclusion of all other identities.

When an individual presents an identity that does not conform to the expectations associated with the situation, he or she may disrupt the interactions. This may create doubts about his or her loyalties and commitments, capabilities, and proficiency. For example, several authors of work on professional women have noted that women are viewed as lacking commitment and dedication and that those around them operate under the assumption that they will sooner or later forsake career for
family (cf., Pattatucci 1998). This leads to a tendency for them to be seen as poor risks in terms of things like promotions and training.

Thus, one consequence of occupying a position within a male-dominated occupation is that women may find that they are constantly held to two competing standards for behavior and self-presentation. As women they may be expected to be nurturing, affective, particularistic, and empathetic. At the same time, the expectations associated with their profession may include being affectively neutral, universal in nature, competitive, assertive or even aggressive, and highly rational—traits that have traditionally been defined as masculine. In other words, it may be impossible for them to simultaneously carry out behavior that affirms both a womanly and a professional identity.

Broadhead (1980) notes that one of the primary challenges facing female medical students is finding a way to successfully articulate the identities of both woman and medical student/physician. He reports that while women have, as a group, shown that they can be successful medical students they often have trouble simultaneously successfully fulfilling the behavioral expectations that affirm their identity of woman to themselves and to others. Women in male-dominated professions often refer to the neutering dimension of their experience or make comments about “being turned into a man.”

Considerable research suggests that the discrepancy between gendered stereotypes and occupational stereotypes is particularly pronounced in the field of law.
(c.f., Chester 1985; Harrington and Rifkin 1989; Jack and Jack 1988; Kanter 1978; Liefland 1986; Menkel-Meadow 1985, 1989; Pierce 1995, 1996; Spencer 1987; Spencer and Podmore 1987). In particular, trial lawyers have been depicted as “Rambo Litigators” that are hypermasculine and aggressive (Pierce 1996).

Women within law often find themselves in a double bind in terms of behavioral expectations. On the one hand, to be successful attorneys they must adopt attributes and values that have traditionally been defined as “masculine”; however, to the extent that they make such modifications in self-presentation and perhaps even self-conceptualization, they are perceived as “unfeminine” and even “unnatural” and as failing to successfully portray the role of “woman.”

Law is certainly not the only profession where the identities of woman and professional are seen as mutually exclusive or at least highly incompatible. In a discussion concerning the experience of women in science, Angela Pattatucci (1998) mentions that she repeatedly observed female scientists being branded as “undirected” and “nonproductive” as soon as they announced plans to wed or become a mother. However, it was acceptable and unproblematic for men to be fathers and husbands.

This double standard surrounding marriage is found in a number of professions that are highly competitive and male-dominated. Winter (1983) reported that the primary difference between successful male and female professionals is family status. Highly successful women tend to be single or divorced with no children and highly
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successful men tend to be married and have children. In many male-dominated fields, particularly those in science and engineering, marriage and family are seen as a career-enhancing move for men but a career-ending move for women (Pattatucci 1998). It is important to note that the primary obstacle in managing both a family and a career may not be the juggling of time and responsibilities but rather the negotiation of the stereotypical views of colleagues (Vorvick 1998).

Of the careers that have traditionally been defined as male, we might hope that academics, with its basis in merit and the advancement of knowledge, might provide an arena in which the identities of woman and professional could be defined in a compatible way. The titles of several articles and books on women academics suggest otherwise; examples include: *Faculty Women in the American University: Up the Down Staircase* (1977) *Women the Other Academics* (1983), *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World* (Lie and O'Leary 1990), and *Lifting a Ton of Feathers* (Caplan 1993). While conflict between the identities of woman and professional is certainly not as extreme within higher education as within law, academia has, nevertheless, been described as a "chilly climate" for women at all levels including faculty. Several academic writers have commented either directly or indirectly on the tension between being female and being an academic. For example, Miller (1986) speaks of the feelings she has while facing a class during the first meeting of the term and comments on "the contradictions within myself that I have traced to the dichotomous nature of being both teacher and woman" (p. 111).
Further, sex segregation in higher education continues to be considerable. In 1992, women made up 32.5 percent of full-time, instructional faculty and staff (National Center for Educational Statistics 1996). However, women are not distributed equally through the academic universe. Women comprised only 23 percent of the faculty at public research universities and 29.9 percent at private research universities. In contrast, 44.6 percent of the faculty at public two year colleges was female. At one elite university, Cornell, it has been estimated that it will be the year 3000 before women are as equally distributed among the faculty as they are among the students at that institution (Farley 1990).

In addition, women academics are more likely to be found at lower levels and occupying part-time and untenured positions within the university than are men. In several specialties women make-up more than half of the part-time faculty while men comprise the majority of full-time faculty. These specialties include agriculture and home economics, communication, education other than teacher education, health sciences other than nursing, and sociology (National Center for Educational Statistics 1996).

As of twenty years ago, women represented less than 3 percent of all top-level college and university administrators (Simpson 1976). Those women who did administer were clustered at two- and four-year colleges. This number has increased during the past 20 years; in 1995, 6 percent of all administrators at two and four-year institutions were women. The percentage ranges by type of institution from 14 percent
at public four-year institutions to 27 percent at independent 2-year institutions (The American Council on Education 1998).

Finally, within academics, sex segregation also occurs by educational specialty. Women academics are most likely to be found in the following specialties: teacher education, nursing, English and literature, and foreign language (National Center for Educational Statistics 1996).

Not only are men and women distributed differently within academics they also differ in their likelihood of holding tenure. In 1994-95 among full-time faculty at public 4-year institutions 73 percent of men and 47 percent of women had tenure (National Center for Educational Statistics 1996). This number has changed little since 1980-81 when the figures were 71 percent of men and 48 percent of women (National Center for Educational Statistics 1996).

Thus, women within academics as well as other “male” occupations may be a particular disadvantage in terms of claiming the identity of woman. The demands of professional life may delay or exclude the adoption of some expressions of the woman identity—namely being wife and/or mother. The culture of these climates may also make it difficult or problematic to behave in ways that are traditionally feminine and they may be hostile toward an open identity as a feminist. In the next chapter, I discuss a study that was conducted to examine the management of gender and academic identities among women sociologists.
CHAPTER 5
DATA

In this chapter, I describe the instrument I used to collect data for this dissertation. I also describe the population and sample from which data were collected. I describe the hypotheses to be tested using this data in the next chapter.

The Instrument

The purpose of my survey was to gather information about selected identities, social relationships, personal and professional activities, and attitudes. Therefore, I designed a questionnaire to collect information about the identities of academic and woman as well as the related identities of mother and feminist. I also requested information about social relationships and activities related to these identities. The questionnaire included both open- and closed-ended items. In addition respondents were encouraged to offer additional comments and a number did so.

The key concepts I measured were (1) commitment to the identities of woman, academic, female-academic, mother, and feminist; (2) network structure and content; (3) general social environmental climate; (4) behaviors and involvement in activities linked to the identities of interest; (5) the meanings of the social positions and identities of academic, feminist, mother, woman and female academic; (6) the meanings the individuals have of themselves; and (7) general demographic

---

2 The complete text of the questionnaire is located in Appendix A.
information. In Chapter 6, I discuss the specific operationalization and measurement of these items.

Female faculty members and graduate students in the Department of Sociology at Louisiana State University pretested the initial survey. While this represented a limited pretest, it was useful in identifying the need to shorten the instrument and to clarify some items.

The Population

During September of 1998, questionnaires were mailed to all women listed as faculty members in graduate degree granting sociology departments at Research I or II universities with the exception of Louisiana State University. I focused on this set of faculty members for several reasons. First, by limiting my sample to Research I and II universities, I believed I would find faculty members who have the most fully integrated academic roles. As Wright (1992) notes, full academic role integration requires teaching, research, and service.

Second, the experiences of women within academia are likely to vary considerably by discipline. Some disciplines have higher proportions of women and/or cultures that are more hospitable to women than do others. Therefore, I chose to limit my population to members of a single discipline – sociology.

Sociology was well-suited for several reasons, including my familiarity with the culture of the discipline. As a discipline, sociology is interesting for two additional reasons. First, in terms of percentage of full-time faculty members who are
women, sociology ranks somewhere in the middle of academic disciplines with 24.6 percent. Women are much better represented than they are in fields such as engineering or the physical sciences—fields in which 5.9 and 11.3 percent of full-time instruction faculty are female (National Center for Educational Statistics 1996). However, the representation of women is not nearly as great as in the humanities or education—fields where 40.9 and 50.1 percent of faculty are women (National Center for Educational Statistics 1996).

Second, due to the discipline's attention to issues such as stratification and social interaction, I expected the climate within sociology to be warmer than the climate of academia in general. However, as suggested by several recent autobiographical accounts of female sociologists being an academic sociologist and a woman is remains problematic for some (e.g., Deegan 1991; Goetting and Fenstermaker 1995; Orlans and Wallace 1994; Scott and Porter 1983). This work, however, provides little systematic attention to the ways in which individuals manage the tensions between the identities of woman and academic.

Restricting my study to this set of women has three advantages. First, in these departments the role of academic is likely to be defined as engaging in a combination of research, teaching and training future sociologists and professional service. Second, previous research suggests that top level institutions tend to be the most hostile environments for women and as a result the women in such universities are most likely to experience conflict between the identities of woman and academic. Third, research
institutions offer academics the most autonomy. Thus, these women may have the
greatest latitude in finding ways to manage the conflict between the identities of
woman and academic.

The Sample

Institutions were identified as Research I or II using the 1995 edition of the
Almanac of Higher Education. Institutions offering a Master's or Doctoral Degree in
sociology were identified using the 1998 American Sociological Association Guide to
Graduate Departments. This directory also provided the names of individual faculty
members. The survey, included in Appendix A, was mailed individually to each of the
women in departments that met the stated criteria.

I used a modified Total Design Method (TDM), invented and elaborated by
Dillman (1978), to maximize response rates. While it would have been desirable to
follow all of Dillman's suggestions, several compromises were necessary.

Specifically, I took following steps to maximize response rates: (1) I included
cover letters that explained the project that were personalized and individually
addressed to each of the respondents. (2) I printed the questionnaire in a small booklet
format that did not exceed twelve-pages in length. (3) I monitored the return rate by
logging returned questionnaires with the date they were returned and kept a running
total of completed surveys. (4) I included pre-addressed return envelopes for use by
respondents. (5) I sent a reminder postcard to all respondents approximately three
weeks after the initial mailing. (6) I provided contact information in the form of a
weeks after the initial mailing. (6) I provided contact information in the form of a phone number, E-mail address, and postal address and answered all queries from potential respondents promptly. (7) In mid-October, I mailed a second survey went to all respondents from whom I had not yet received a completed survey.

I originally sent the survey to all 842 women listed as affiliated with the departments meeting the scope conditions. Further, investigation revealed that 364 of the individuals were ineligible for various reasons (e.g., they were not academic sociologists, they were male, they were part-time or adjunct faculty, they were no longer at that university). These individuals were excluded from additional follow-ups.

By February 1999, I had received a total of 396 completed surveys; however, 127 of these were from individuals who were excluded because they did not meet the scope conditions (i.e., they not academic sociologists, they were not full-time regular faculty members, they were no longer at that university, they had moved into administrative positions, etcetera). Using Dillman's (1978, p. 50) formula, the 269 valid returned surveys represent a 56.3 percent response rate.

My response rate compares favorably with that in other studies using mailed questionnaires. For example, a recent survey of elementary and secondary general education teachers resulted in a 52 percent response rate. These researchers encouraged response with the incentive of a prize-drawing for which respondents were eligible if they completed the survey (Bursuck, Polloway, Plante, Epstein, Jayanthi, McConeghy 1996). Response rates were also near 50 percent in studies of American
Psychological Association members (Hammel, Olkin, and Taube 1996), women staff members at a British university (Field and Bramwell 1998) and economists (Davis 1997).

While a response rate of 56.3 compares favorably with other recent mail surveys, it does not insure the absence of a response bias. Information published in the American Sociological Association Guide to Graduate Departments allowed me to make some inquires into possible response biases. Using this source I was able to determine whether those who responded to the survey differed from those who did not in terms of length of time since they received their Ph.D., professorial rank, and areas of interest.

As shown by Table 5.1, full-professors were slightly over represented among responders and associate professors were slightly under represented. However, the chi-square based measure of association revealed that the relationship between rank and response was not statistically significant (Phi=.055).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Within Rank Who Responded</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of when the individuals received their doctorate degree, there was a slight difference between when responders and non-responders finished graduate
studies. As a group those who responded to the survey finished their graduate work slightly more recently than those who did not. The median year of completion for responders was 1985 and for non-responders it was 1983.

Table 5.2 presents the response rate by cohort based on year of Ph.D. completion. Response rates were lowest for those individuals who completed their Ph.D. between 1971-1975 (41.7%) and highest for those who had completed their Ph.D. since 1996 (67.4%).

Table 5.2 Percent of Women Sociologists Who Completed Survey By Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Percent of Individuals in This Cohort Who Completed the Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to 1970</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1975</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-1980</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1985</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-1990</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1995</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 or later</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, in terms of areas of research interest, the percent responding ranged from 50 percent for those identifying social psychology as an interest to 68 percent for those identifying crime, law, or deviance as an area of interest based on information in the 1998 Guide to Graduate Departments.

Table 5.3 shows the percent of responders and non-responders within various areas of interest. The comments offered on the survey, by e-mail, and by letter suggest possible explanations for the low response rate among those identifying social psychology and qualitative methods as interests. Some non-respondents indicated that they were electing not to complete the survey because they felt that the could not give
unbiased responses based on their perception of what they believed my interests to be.

Given the social psychological focus of this study, this belief may have been higher among social psychologists than other subgroups. Other individuals indicated that they were choosing not to participate in the study because they question the validity of any survey based research.

with an interest in crime, law, or deviance, demography, or qualitative methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Interest</th>
<th>Percent Within Area Who Responded</th>
<th>N*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime, Law or Deviance</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratification</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics and Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Methods</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The sum of respondents within areas does not equal the total N due to the fact that many respondents indicated more than one of these areas.

To summarize, the individuals who completed the survey slightly under represent associate professors and over represent full professors. Individuals in three cohorts (based on year Ph.D. completed), prior to 1970, 1971-1975 and 1986-1990 are also under represented, as are social psychologists and those with an interest in
qualitative methods. The two cohorts finishing since 1991 and the cohort who finished between 1981 and 1985 are slightly over represented as are those

The Respondents

The data used in my analyses are from a total of 269 respondents. In the following section, I have presented information regarding the personal and professional demographic profiles of this sample.

Personal Demographics. Table 5.4 presents various demographic characteristics for the respondents. The women ranged in age from 29 years of age to 72 years of age; both the median and the mean age were 46. The women identified their race in an open-ended question. Eighty-eight percent of the 269 respondents indicated that they were white or Caucasian. Finally, the majority of the women were married (58 percent) or living with a long-term partner (12.5 percent). Slightly more than half of the women were mothers (55.6 percent).

Professional Demographics. The respondents who met the scope conditions were employed by 101 different universities. Table 5.5 presents the professional demographic characteristics of the respondents. As shown in this table the respondents were distributed fairly equally among the academic ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor. They received their doctorate degrees between 1953 and 1998.
Table 5.4 Personal Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 years of age or younger</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40 years of age</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45 years of age</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50 years of age</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55 years of age</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60 years of age</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 years of age or older</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with a long-term partner</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motherhood Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with child of any age</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with a child under the age of 6 years</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with a child between 6 and 12 years of age</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with a child between 13 and 17 years of age</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with a child between 18 and 23 years of age</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents with a child over the age of 23</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of women with children of any age is smaller than the total of women with children of specific ages due to the fact that some women had more than one child.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Doctorate Degree Was Received</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968 or earlier</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969 to 1971</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 to 1974</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975 to 1977</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978 to 1980</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981 to 1983</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 to 1986</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987 to 1989</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1992</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 to 1995</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 or later</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Figure 5.1, respondents reported spending between 9 and 100 hours on teaching, research and other academic activities. The mean was 50.6 and both the median and modal number of hours were 50 hours per week.

![Histogram of hours spent on academic activities](image)

**Figure 5.1 Distribution of Average Number of Hours Spent on Academic Activities Per Week**

Table 5.6 shows the summary statistics for the distribution of hours for teaching, research and other academic activities individually. Approximately 38 percent of respondents reported spending roughly equal amounts of time (within five hours per week) on teaching and research. Twenty-nine percent spent considerably more time on teaching; seven respondents reported spending more than 30 additional hours on teaching than on research. The final 33 percent spent more time on research. Again, the discrepancy was sometimes extreme; ten respondents reported spending more than 30 additional hours on research than on teaching.
Respondents also indicated whether they would like to spend more, less, or about the same amount of time on each of these activities. As shown in Table 5.7, for teaching and other academic activities a substantial percentage of the respondents reported being satisfied with the number hours they currently spend on those activities and many wished to spend less time on these activities. In contrast, nearly three-fourths of the respondents expressed a desire to spend additional time on research activities.

Table 5.6 Summary Statistics for Average Number of Hours Per Week Spent in Teaching, Research and Other Academic Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Other Academic Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>4-60</td>
<td>1-80</td>
<td>0-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 Desired Amount of Time the Respondent Would Like to Spend on Teaching, Research and Other Academic Activities Relative to What They Now Spend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Amount of Time Relative to What is Now Spent</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Other Academic Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Much Less</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Less</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Same</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat More</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much More</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, most of the women who responded are between 30 and 65 and white. More than half are married with at least one child (including adult children). Eighty-percent of the respondents reported spending more than 40 hours per week on
academic activities and more than 50 percent report spending more than 50 hours per week on academics.
CHAPTER 6
OPERATIONALIZATION, HYPOTHESES, AND MEASUREMENT

In this chapter, I present a discussion of the concepts of amalgamation and commitment. I conceptualize these as latent constructs and discuss their indicators, construction, and underlying logic. I then review the propositions developed in preceding chapters and identify those propositions to be tested. Finally, I derive specific research hypotheses and describe the operationalization and measurement of the concepts used to test these hypotheses. These propositions can be divided into four groups: (1) propositions describing the relationship between commitment and behavior; (2) propositions describing factors that influence commitment; (3) propositions describing identity management strategies; and (4) propositions describing the consequences of identity amalgamation.

Commitment

As discussed earlier, commitment refers to the degree to which an individual feels compelled to maintain a particular identity. I conceptualize it as being the result of an individual's efforts to protect numerous and valued social relationships and a sense of self-authenticity. Stryker and Serpe (1982) have identified two components of commitment: (1) the number of relationships tied to a given identity (extensivity) and (2) the importance of the relationships tied to a given identity (intensivity).

I collected data on the intensivity and extensivity of relationship linked to the identities of academic, feminist, mother, and woman using a modified version of
Stryker and Serpe's (1982) measures. I present the items used to collect information regarding the academic identity below. Identical questions assessed each of the remaining identities.

To measure extensivity, individuals identified approximately what percentage (0-20%, 21-40%, 41-60%, 61-80%, 81-100%) of their relationships were based on their being academics. To measure intensivity, individuals were asked to think about all of their personal relationships and to answer the question: "How important are the relationships based on your being an academic?" Response categories were: "critically important," "very important," "somewhat important," "not very important," "not important at all," or "does not apply."

Researchers such as Callero (1985) have suggested that psychological centrality or prominence may also important in determining the individual's commitment to a given identity. In the present study, I measured prominence, using two items adapted from Callero's (1985) identity prominence scale. Again, only the items for the academic identity are below; the questions for the identities of woman, mother, and feminist were identical with the exception of the substitution in identity term.

(1) Being an academic is an important part of who I am.

(2) Being an academic is something I rarely even think about.

Respondents rated these items on a four-point scale of "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree." I reverse-coded the second item so that
higher values indicated higher levels of commitment. Scores on these two items are summed to produce prominence score for each identity.

Using AMOS (the structural equation modeling program associated with SPSS), I conducted a confirmatory factor analysis of these measures for each of the identities being investigated. In each case, the models were scaled on the value of relationships (intensivity) variable. The model was constructed with the assumption that the errors did not covary.

I then used this information to create a scaled commitment variable for each identity. This score was then converted to a Z-score to allow comparisons to be made among the identities. Figures 6.1-6.4 show the measurement models.

I expected that the identities of both woman and academic would be linked to high levels of commitment. As discussed above, there are three indicators of commitment to a given identity; they are relationship extensivity, relationship intensivity and prominence. As shown in Table 6.1, two of the three indicators of commitment, intensivity and prominence, demonstrate that both woman and academic identities were highly important to the respondents. The pattern for the third indicator, extensivity is less clear. Overall, it does appear that the identities of woman and academic are likely to serve as master identities for a substantial number of the respondents.
Figure 6.1 Measurement Model For Academic Commitment

Figure 6.2 Measurement Model For Woman Commitment
Figure 6.3 Measurement Model For Feminist Commitment

Figure 6.4 Measurement Model For Mother Commitment
Table 6.1 Levels of Commitment to Academic and Woman Identities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Identity</th>
<th>Woman Identity</th>
<th>Feminist Identity</th>
<th>Mother Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extensivity of Relationships</td>
<td>n=253</td>
<td>n=243</td>
<td>n=247</td>
<td>n=208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (0-40%)</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate 41-60%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (61-100%)</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensivity of Relationships</td>
<td>n=233</td>
<td>n=223</td>
<td>n=226</td>
<td>n=173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (Very Unimportant/Unimportant)</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (Slightly Unimportant/ Slightly Important)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (Important/Extremely Important)</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prominence</td>
<td>n=259</td>
<td>n=261</td>
<td>n=253</td>
<td>n=154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (2 -3)</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (4-6)</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (7-8)</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also collected information about two other identities that might be held by the respondents, mother and feminist. In terms of the extensivity and intensivity of relationships, neither of these identities appeared to be linked to particularly high levels of commitment. However, in terms of prominence the identity of mother showed the highest levels of all four of these identities.

Relationships between identities of woman and academic. In Chapter 3, I argued that it is possible for two or more identities to be linked to similarly high levels of commitment. To examine this possibility, I computed a difference score that indicate the difference in commitment to the identities of academic and woman.
Positive values indicate that the individual had a higher score for academic commitment than for woman commitment. A negative score indicated that the respondent had a higher score for commitment to the woman identity than the academic identity. A score of zero means that the commitment score was equal for these to identities. An examination of the difference in commitment scores for the identities of woman and academic reveals that for more than 92 percent of the respondents, the two identities are similarly valued. That is the difference in commitment scores was between -1 and 1. The distribution of difference scores is shown in Figure 6.1.

![Figure 6.1 Difference in Commitment Scores for Academic and Woman Identities](image-url)
I also argued that these two identities may conflict or compete with one another. Respondents indicated the extent to which being a female had influenced their academic experiences and decisions. Fifty percent of the respondents indicated that being female had a great deal of impact; an additional 39 percent said it had some effect. Interestingly, respondents were more likely to indicate that being female had a greater impact than being either a mother or a feminist.

While most of the respondents reported that being a female has influenced their academic experiences and decisions, these responses do indicate whether that effect has been positive or negative. However, I have indirect information about this from responses to questions regarding what it is like to be woman academics in their departments.

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents indicated female faculty members would receive less attention when speaking at faculty meetings than would males. Thirty-nine percent did not feel that faculty members would be as comfortable with a female chairperson as they would be with a male chairperson. Fifty-one percent felt that male faculty members had more influence in departmental politics than female faculty. Finally, only 46 percent felt that the working environment for female faculty members in their department was about the same as for their male counterparts. Interestingly, more than 80 percent of the women felt that women in their own department were treated better than women in the discipline of sociology in general and than in their universities as a whole.
Taken together, these findings would seem to suggest that the influence of being a female in academics is not positive for most women. Thus it appears that the question of “How do individuals manage competing master identities?” is relevant for the respondents in this study. In the next chapter, I examine this question by testing the various propositions identified in Chapter 5.

Identity Management Strategies

As discussed in Chapter Three, individuals can manage potentially competing identities in three ways. First, they can prioritize one identity thus allowing them to manage competing expectations by giving preference to the identity that is linked to greater commitment. When prioritization is not possible the individual may attempt to either compartmentalize or amalgamate the two competing identities.

Prioritization. Individuals may manage competing identities by enacting behaviors associated with the identity to which they are substantially more committed. In the present study, prioritization was measured as a difference in the level of commitment between the identities of woman and academic. Specifically, the commitment score for the identity of woman was subtracted from the commitment score for the identity of academic.

I conceptualized a difference score of less than -1 as indicating a prioritization of the woman identity and a commitment score of +1 as indicating the prioritization of the academic identity. These cutoffs were chosen based on an examination of the distribution of the difference in commitment scores (presented above in Figure 6.1).
Again, using this operationalization of prioritization, 7 percent of the respondents appear to prioritize either the identity of woman or that of academic.

**Amalgamation**

Individuals who do not prioritize either of the two identities but who experience conflict between identities must manage that competition through either compartmentalization or amalgamation, which are on opposite ends of a continuum. Amalgamation is not directly measured in this study. However, I argue that amalgamation should result in the adoption of a new identity that combines each of the competing identities into a new distinctive but related identity. Therefore, I used the salience of the “female academic” identity as the measure of amalgamation. As in the case of the simple identities of woman and academic, respondents indicated the intensivity of relationships based on being a female academic and the extensivity of those relationships. The measures used are the same as those described in the commitment section above. Higher levels of intensivity and extensivity based on being a female academic are presumed to indicate higher levels of amalgamation.

Using these latent constructs, I tested various propositions set forth in Chapters 3 and 4. In the remainder of this chapter, I present the propositions to be tested along with the specific research hypotheses based on those propositions. As concepts within the hypotheses are introduction for the first time, the operationalization and measurement of variables for that construct are discussed. The propositions are numbered as they appear in earlier chapters and those propositions not tested in my
dissertation are omitted from the summation. Hypotheses are numbered consecutively as they appear below.

**Relationship Between Commitment and Behavior**

**Proposition #1:** The higher an individual's level of commitment to a given identity the higher the likelihood the identity will be enacted in a given situation or across situations.

**Hypothesis 1:** The higher an individual's level of commitment to the identity of academic the more hours she will spend on academic activities.

**Sub-Hypothesis 1a:** The more highly committed an individual is to the identity of academic the more hours she is likely to spend in all academic activities combined.

**Sub-Hypothesis 1b:** The more highly committed an individual is to the identity of academic the more hours she is likely to spend in all teaching activities.

**Sub-Hypothesis 1c:** The more highly committed an individual is to the identity of academic the more hours she is likely to spend in research activities.

**Sub-Hypothesis 1d:** The more highly committed an individual is to the identity of academic the more hours she is likely to spend in academic activities other than teaching or research.
Hypothesis 2: The more committed an individual is to the identity of woman the more hours she will spend on woman centered activities.

Hypothesis 3: The more committed an individual is to the identity of feminist the more hours she will spend on feminist activities.

Proposition #2: The higher an individual’s level of commitment to a given identity the higher the likelihood that an individual will desire to spend more time engaged in that activity than he or she currently spends.

Hypothesis 4: The higher an individual’s level of commitment to her academic identity the more likely she is to say that she would like to spend more time on academic activities relative to what she now spends.

Sub-hypothesis 4a: The higher an individual’s level of commitment to her academic identity the more likely she is to say that she would like to spend more time on teaching activities relative to what she now spends.

Sub-hypothesis 4b: The higher an individual’s level of commitment to her academic identity the more likely she is to say that she would like to spend more time on research activities relative to what she now spends.
Sub-hypothesis 4c: The higher an individual’s level of commitment to her academic identity the more likely she is to say that she would like to spend more time on academic activities other than teaching or research relative to what she now spends.

Hypothesis 5: The higher an individual’s level of commitment to her identity as woman the more likely she is to say that she would like to spend more time on woman-centered activities relative to what she now spends.

Hypothesis 6: The higher an individual’s level of commitment to her feminist identity the more likely she is to say that she would like to spend more time on feminist activities relative to what she now spends.

Hypothesis 7: The higher an individual’s level of commitment to her identity as a mother the more likely she is to say that she would like to spend more time in the role of mother relative to what she now spends.

Respondents reported the average number of hours per week they spent in each of the following: teaching activities, research activities, academic activities other than teaching or research, feminist activities, housework, activities related to motherhood, woman-centered activities, and activities specific to female academics. In addition, they indicated how much time they would like to spend in each of these types of
activities relative to what they currently spent. The response options were “Much More,” “Somewhat More,” “The Same As Now,” “Somewhat Less,” and “Much Less.”

Factors that Affect Commitment to an Identity and Consequences of Extremely High Levels of Commitment

Proposition #4: The more successful at performing a given identity the individual feels, the more likely the identity is to become a master identity.

If achieving tenure and promotion to full professor increase feelings of success as an academic, then we might expect that those with tenure would have higher levels of commitment to the identity of academic than those without tenure. Further, those with the rank of full professor should be most committed to this identity. Based on this logic I developed the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 8: Respondents who have tenure will have higher levels of commitment to the identity of academic than respondents without tenure.

Hypothesis 9: Full professor will have higher levels of commitment to the identity of academic than either assistant or associate professors.

Respondents indicated whether they had tenure by checking either Yes or No. Respondents indicated their rank by checking the appropriate response from the
following: full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or other (in this case they were asked to specify rank).

Proposition #6: Master identities are likely to be performed even in situations where that particular role does not apply.

Hypothesis 10: The more highly committed a respondent is to the identity of woman the more importance she is likely to place on a candidate’s gender in hiring decisions.

Hypothesis 11: The more highly committed a respondent is to the identity of woman the more importance she is likely to place on a candidate’s gender in promotion decisions.

Hypothesis 12: The more highly committed a respondent is to the identity of woman the more importance she is likely to place on a candidate’s gender in decisions about which students to mentor.

**Importance of gender in making professional decisions.** For each of the decisions above, respondents indicated whether gender was extremely important, important, slightly important, slightly unimportant, unimportant, or extremely important.

**Factors Influencing the Strategy Used to Manage Competing Identities**

Proposition #17: The smaller the size of an individual’s social network the greater the likelihood that amalgamation will be used as an identity management strategy.
Hypothesis 13: Network size will be negatively related to indicators of amalgamation for those individuals who have similar levels of commitment to the woman and academic identities.

In order to make it feasible to collect network data in a self-administered survey, I chose to focus on a specific portion of the network and to collect general aggregate data rather than information about specific associates and relationships. Network size was measured by asking the respondents to indicate how many individuals they either (a) consider close personal friends or (b) talk to about important decisions.

Proposition #14: The higher the level of network density the greater the likelihood that amalgamation will be used as a means of managing competing identities.

Hypothesis 14: Network density will be positively related to indicators of amalgamation for those individuals who have similar levels of commitment to the woman and academic identities.

Network density was computed by dividing network size by the number of people in the respondent’s network who know one another.

Consequences of Identity Amalgamation

The amalgamation of two master identities should result in the adoption of a new, related but distinctive, identity that is linked to very high levels of commitment. Once this identity is established by the individual then it should function in the same
way as any other master identity. Therefore, I have formulated the following hypotheses based on propositions presented above.

**Proposition 1:** The higher an individual's level of commitment to a given identity the more likely the identity will be enacted in a given situation or across situations.

**Hypothesis 15:** The more highly committed a respondent is to the identity of female academic, the greater her level of participation in women's studies is likely to be.

*Commitment to the identity of female academic* is measured using a combination of relationship intensivitity and extensivity to this identity. The measurement for this variable was discussed in greater detail in the "Commitment" section of this chapter.

*Level of participation in women's studies* was computed by totaling the number of positive responses the respondents gave to the following questions: “Are you involved with Women's Studies at your university? Do you regularly attend general meetings and programs held by the unit? Do you serve on committees for this unit? Have you ever served on the executive board for the unit? Have you ever taught classes for this unit?"

In this chapter, I discussed the hypotheses and operationalizations linked to (1) the description of the relationship between commitment and behavior; (2) the description of factors that influence commitment; (3) the description of identity.
management strategies; and (4) the description of the consequences of identity amalgamation. In the next chapter, I present the results of the tests of these hypotheses using data collected as described in Chapter 5. In presenting these results, I answer the following questions: (1) Is an individual’s level of commitment to a given identity related to behavior? (2) What factors influence an individual’s commitment to a given identity? (3) What factors influence the way in which an individual will manage competition between identities that are linked to similarly high levels of commitment? (4) Does the amalgamation of two identities result in a new identity that can be used to predict behavior?
CHAPTER 7
RESULTS

In this chapter I present analyses related to four questions. First, is an individual's level of commitment to related to behavior? Second, what factors influence commitment to an identity? Third, what determines the mechanism by which an individual will manage competition between identities with similarly high levels of commitment? Fourth, does the amalgamation of two identities result in a distinctive new identity that can be used to predict behavior?

Does commitment level influence behavioral outcomes?

Based on the idea that individuals are more likely to engage in behaviors related to identities to which they are highly committed, I formulated four specific hypotheses concerning the academic identity. First, I predicted that level of commitment to the academic identity would be positively related the number of hours spent on all academic activities (Hypothesis 1a). Second, I predicted that level of commitment would be positively related to number of hours spent in teaching activities (Hypothesis 1b). Third, I predicted that level of commitment to the academic identity would be related to hours spent on research activities (Hypothesis 1c). Fourth, I predicted that level of commitment to the academic identity would be related to the number of hours spent on all other academic activities (Hypothesis 1b).

Initial bivariate tests of these hypotheses, shown in Table 7.1, did not support these hypotheses. This is not entirely surprising given the multitude of constraints and
demands placed on the individual and her management of time. For example, respondents had varying levels of responsibilities to children and partners. These responsibilities could have constrained the time available for academic activities. In addition, time spent on academic activities is likely to be influenced by the respondent's academic rank and whether she was pre- or post-tenure. In Table 7.2, I examine the relationship between commitment and time on various academic activities taking these time constraints into account.

Table 7.1 Correlations for Various Academic Behaviors and Commitment to an Academic Identity (n=219)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment to Academic Identity</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Hours in Teaching Activities</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>0.48**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hours in Research Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.19**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hours in Other Academic Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Total Hours in Academic Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01 level

Overall, the models presented in Table 7.2, were not useful in predicting how people spend their time; the maximum $R^2$ was 0.107 for the model having number of hours spent in academic activities other than teaching or research as the dependent variable. Again, the hypotheses that higher levels of commitment to an academic identity would be linked to greater number of hours spent in teaching activities (Hypothesis 1b), research (Hypothesis 1c), other types of academic activities
(Hypothesis 1c) or all academic activities combined (Hypothesis 1a) were not supported.

Table 7.2 Regression of Hours Spent on Various Academic Activities on Having a Partner, Having Children of Various Ages, Academic Rank and Commitment to an Academic Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Hours Teaching b</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Hours Research b</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Hours Other Academic b</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>Total Academic Activities b</th>
<th>se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-2.09*</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Child</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Age Child</td>
<td>-2.97‡</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-5.41*</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Age Child</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Age Child</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76*</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Child</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>3.48**</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>-4.84**</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.35*</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>4.57***</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-4.63*</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Academic Identity</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .100** n=216  R² = .074 ‡ n=216  R² = .107** n=216  R² = .099** n=216

‡p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, one-tailed tests are presented for predicted relationships
There are several possible explanations for the lack of support. First, while I attempted to control on some of the most obvious constraints the respondents were likely to face in terms of time management, it is unlikely that I controlled for all such demands. Some support for the effect of time constraints was evident which suggests the need to examine this issue more closely. For the total number of hours spent on all types of academic activities, having elementary age children decreased the amount of time spent on such activities as did being a full professor. A similar pattern emerged for the number of hours spent in teaching activities; although the relationship between having a child between 6 and 12 years of age is only marginally significant (p < .10).

Second, to a large extent individuals may have limited discretion in the number of hours they spend on activities related to being an academic. First, as full-time academics it is expected that these women will work "full-time" hours. The fulfillment of this expectation can be seen by the fact that only 20 percent of the sample reported spending less than 40 hours per week on academic activities. In addition, my focus on research universities may have limited the number of individuals who would either spend or report spending a limited time on such activities. Recall that the mean number of hours spent on all academic activities was nearly 51 hours per week. It may be that respondents who are unwilling to devote this level of time to the identity of academic may have chosen a less stringent venue in which to enact this identity\(^3\). On the other hand, it is also true that time is a finite

\(^3\) In order to study the potential conflict between identities of similarly high value it was necessary to focus on a sample where variation on commitment to
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resource and the maximum number of hours an individual may devote to activities related to a given identity is thus limited. Less than 15 percent of the respondents reported spending more than 60 hours per week on academic activities. The combination of expectations regarding both the minimum number of hours and the availability of a maximum number of hours truncates the dependent variable “total academic hours” at both ends of the continuum.

The idea that constraints may limit the number of hours available for academic activities is further supported by the fact that while 30 percent of all respondents had children under the age of 13 only 15 percent of those who reported spending more than 60 hours on academic activities had a child of this age. In particular, having children between 6 and 12 seems to place limits on available time, the correlation between having children of this age and hours spent on academic activities was -.209 (p<.001).

Consideration of demands on time may also help to explain a pattern that has been previously noted in empirical tests of identity theory. Some studies have shown that commitment to an identity is better at predicting how the individual would prefer to spend her or his time than how they actually spend it (e.g., Keeton 1996). For this reason, I conducted a similar analysis using the respondents’ statements about the amount of time she would prefer to spend on the various academic activities (teaching, research, and other activities) relative to what she now spends as the dependent

---

the academic identity was censored (Heckman 1976). This allowed me to maximize the likelihood of finding individuals whose gender and occupational identities were in competition.
variable. Again, I hypothesized that commitment would be positively related to
desired time spent on teaching (Hypothesis 4a), research (Hypothesis 4b), and other
academic activities (Hypothesis 4c).

Initial tests of these hypotheses appear in Table 7.3. Again, at the bivariate
level I did not find support for the hypothesized relationship between commitment to
the academic identity and desired behaviors related to that identity.

Table 7.3 Correlations for Commitment to Academic Identity and Desired Time Spent
in Various Academic Activities Relative to Time Now Spent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Amount of Time Spent on Teaching Activities</th>
<th>Desired Amount of Time Spent on Research Activities</th>
<th>Desired Amount of Time Spent on Other Academic Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Academic Identity (n=212)</td>
<td>0.021 (n=212)</td>
<td>0.029 (n=209)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 7.4, I present the tests of these variables controlling for constraints on
time and for the number of hours the respondent now spends on the activity in
question. Again, the overall predictive value of these models is low. For teaching and
research, the most important factor is the amount of time the respondent currently
spends on those activities. In both cases, the greater the amount of time the
respondent now spends on that activity the more likely she is to express a desire to
spend less time on that activity. This result may be a function of either an
over-reporting of the time spent on activities of which the respondent is not fond, or a
desire to do less of these things than they actually do, or a combination of both of
these factors.
Table 7.4 Regression of Desired Amount of Time Spent on Various Academic Activities Relative to Time Now Spent on Time Constraints (Having Children of Various Ages and a Partner), Academic Rank, Hours Now Spent on Those Activities and Academic Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Desired Amount of Time Teaching Relative to Now</th>
<th>Desired Amount of Research Time Relative to Now</th>
<th>Desired Amount of Time on Other Academic Activities Relative to Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>( b )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.25†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Child</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Age Child</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Age Child</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Age Child</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Child</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.34†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent on Teaching</td>
<td>-0.16⋆</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent on Research</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-1.39⋆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent on Other Academic Activities</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Academic Identity</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( R^2 = .065 \quad \text{\( n=212 \)} \quad R^2 = .095⋆ \quad \text{\( n=212 \)} \quad R^2 = .088⋆ \quad \text{\( n=209 \)}

†\( p<.10 \), ⋆\( p<.05 \), ⋆⋆\( p<.01 \), ⋆⋆⋆\( p<.001 \)
For academic activities other than teaching or research, the most important predictors were having a rank other than assistant professor and being the mother of a preschool child. Both being an associate or full professor and having children under the age of six were associated with a higher likelihood that the respondent would express a desire to spend less time on these activities. Of these variables, only tenure status is related to the actual amount of time spent on such activities. Tenure increases the actual number of hours spent on academic activities other than teaching or research (r = .289**) and increases the likelihood that the respondent will indicate a desire to spend less time on such activities (r = -.237**). However, when I controlled on tenure status the relationship between hours actually spent on such activities and the amount of time the respondent would like to spend is weakened substantially (not controlling on tenure r = -.195**; controlling on tenure r = -.114, p < .102).

In sum, my examination of the relationships between commitment to an academic identity and both actual and desired time spent on various academic behaviors fails to support the proposition that higher levels of commitment to an identity will lead to greater allocation of resources toward that identity. Two factors may explain these findings. First, as discussed above, a great deal of time spent on occupational identities may be mandated and not at the discretion of the individual. Second, by restricting my sample to academic women in graduate degree granting programs at Research I and II universities, I may have obtained a sample in which there is too little variation in commitment to an academic identity to adequately test
this proposition. As reported earlier in this work, the vast majority of respondents had extremely high scores on commitment to academic identity; in fact, more than 80 percent had scores on this variable that were at least 90 percent of the maximum possible for this.

The dangers of sampling in a way that censors ( Heckman 1976) on an endogenous variable was discussed by Berk (1983). He points out the potential for this type of sample selection bias exists in all research based on a nonrandom sample. In my study the bias is particularly evident. Despite the problems created by such selection bias, I felt that it was necessary in order to maximize the number of respondents who likely to find themselves faced with the challenge of manage competing identities to which they were similarly and highly committed.

I also collected information about other identities that I are likely to be associated with greater variation in commitment level. In the next section, I examine the relationship between an individual’s commitment to the identities of feminist, mother, and woman and the amount of time spent on activities related to these identities. I also examined the relationship between commitment and the amount of time respondents would like to spend in these activities.

I begin with a discussion of the bivariate relationships between commitment to a feminist identity, time spent on feminist activities and the amount of time the respondent would like to spend on those activities as presented in Table 7.5. In

---

4 As discussed above and in the previous chapter, I believe this limitation is far outweighed by the benefits of restricting the sample in this way.
contrast to the findings regarding academic commitment, commitment to a feminist identity is strongly and positively correlated with both the number of hours the respondent spends on feminist activities and the desired amount of time in such activities. Also, in contrast to the academic behaviors, there was essentially no relationship between what they actually spend and what they would like to spend.

Table 7.5 Correlations Among Commitment to a Feminist Identity, Hours Spent on Feminist Activities, and Time the Individual Would Like to Spend on These Activities Relative to What They Now Spend (n=199)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours Spent in Feminist Activities</th>
<th>Desired Time in Feminist Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Feminist Identity</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent in Feminist Activities</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The multivariate regressions shown in Table 7.6, further support the hypotheses that commitment level to a feminist identity will be positively related to the number of hours the respondent reported spending in feminist activities (Hypothesis 3) and the amount of time the respondent would like to spend in such activities (Hypothesis 6). In fact, while the models still explain relatively little (R² <.1) variance in the dependent variable, commitment to a feminist identity was the only variable included in these analyses that was important in predicting the desired amount of time spent on feminist activities. The positive relationship between having a child between 6 and 12 may at first seem counterintuitive; however, some
respondents explicitly noted that they considered time spent in activities as a mother to be feminist activities.

Table 7.6 Regression of Number of Hours Spent on Feminist Activities and The Amount of Time the Respondent Would Like to Spend on Such Activities Relative to What They Now Spend on Constraints on Time (Having Children and a Partner), Tenure Status, and Commitment to the Feminist Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Time Now Spent on Feminist Activities</th>
<th>Desired Amount of Time on Feminist Activities Relative to Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Child</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Age Child</td>
<td>7.77‡</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Age Child</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Age Child</td>
<td>-2.51</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Child</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>-4.79</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>-7.52‡</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours on Feminist Activities</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Feminist Identity</td>
<td>1.85***</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2=.093 \]
\[ n=203 \]
\[ R^2=.074 \]
\[ n=196 \]

‡p <.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

The difference in the patterns of relationships between behavior and commitment to academic and feminist identities may be explained by differences in the identities themselves as well as by the previously discussed effect of the sample selection. The identity of feminist differs from that of academic in several ways. Many of the differences relate to the fact that being an academic places one within a
formal status, generally a member of the faculty at a university or college. In contrast, being a feminist is an ideology-based identity. One consequence of this difference is that the identity of feminist is not generally associated with mandated responsibilities. This allows the individual more freedom to behave in ways that reflect actual commitment levels.

In addition, the nature of the feminist identity is such that individuals may be more likely to recognize that being a feminist serves as a filter through which activities are structured. For example, one respondent made the comment that being a feminist "is a way of life and of looking at the world." The tendency to see the identity of feminist in this way may lead the individual to label more activities as "feminist" and lead to higher levels of reported time in this type of activity. Interestingly, none of the respondents made such an explicit statement about the identity of academic.

Finally, the identity of feminist may be more flexible and open to individual definition than the identity of academic. In other words, individuals may have a more limited number of venues in which to "be an academic" than to be "a feminist." In fact, a number of the respondents commented that they personally defined all of their activities as feminist in nature. Further, in response to the question of how many hours per week they spend in feminist activities, some respondents included comments such as "my whole waking existence is structured by feminist values." Others indicated that all of the hours in the week were spent in what they defined as feminist activities.
The analyses regarding the identities of academic and feminist present very different pictures of support for the general proposition that higher levels of commitment to an identity increase the likelihood of behavioral outcomes associated with that identity. To further examine the relationship between commitment and behavior, I examined the identity of mother. These analyses are restricted to those respondents who have at least one child. Bivariate correlations between commitment to this identity and time spent in the mother role and desired time in these activities are shown Table 7.7 and the results of multivariate regressions appear in 7.8.

Table 7.7 Correlations among Commitment to Mother Identity, Hours Spent in the Mother Role and Time the Individual Would Like to Spend on These Activities Relative to What They Now Spend For Respondents With at Least One Child (n=124)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours Spent in Mother Role</th>
<th>Desired Time in Mother Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Mother Identity</td>
<td>0.26**</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent in Mother Role</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

At the bivariate level, I found support for the hypotheses that higher levels of commitment to the mother identity are related to greater amounts of time in activities related to being a mother. Commitment to this identity of mother is also positively related to the desire to spend more time in these activities. In the case of actual time spent, the multiple regression analysis also showed support for the influence of commitment to the mother identity. However, having tenure and having a child between the ages of 6 and 12 were the factors most likely to influence actual time spent in activities related to the mother identity. In particular, having an elementary
school-aged child significantly increased the time spent in the mother role and having
tenure decreased the amount of time spent in the mother role. The relationship
between tenure and time spent on activities related to being a mother must be
considered cautiously. Based on cross-sectional data it is not possible to know
whether being an assistant professor rather than associate or full-professor decreases
the number of hours spent on mothering activities or whether spending greater number
of hours on these activities makes one less likely to receive promotions.

In the case of desired time spent on activities related to being a mother, support
for the effect of commitment on behavior was not found in the multivariate test. In
fact, when the amount of time the respondent desired to spend in activities related to
being a mother is the dependent variable, only tenure status had an effect that was
substantial, although not significant at the .05 level. Respondents without tenure but
who were mothers were more likely to indicate a desire to spend more time in the
mother role than were other respondents.

To elaborate on the discussion of the influence of constraint and flexibility in
defining identity-based behaviors, I considered various dimensions of the mother
identity. In the case of being a mother, as in the case of being an academic, numerous
expectations and demands may constrain the individual’s freedom to manage her in
ways that reflect actual commitment to an identity.

The level of constraint and the flexibility in mother related activities is likely to
vary by age of the child. It could be argued that the relationship between commitment
to the identity of mother and the behavioral outcomes will be strongest for women who have the most discretion and flexibility in the mother role. Specifically, commitment to the identity of mother is likely to be strongest for women with children who are both old enough to be somewhat self-sufficient but still available (in terms of both geography and maturation level) to be mothered.

Table 7.8 Regression of Hours Spent in the Mother Role and Time the Respondent Would Like to Spend on Such Activities Relative to What They Now Spend on Constraints on Time (Having Children and a Partner), Academic Rank and Commitment to the Mother Identity For Respondents With At Least One Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Time Now Spent in Mother Role</th>
<th>Desired Time in Mother Role Relative to Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>11.92₂</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Child</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Age Child</td>
<td>17.28*</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Age Child</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Age Child</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Child</td>
<td>-12.85</td>
<td>9.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>-16.66₂</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>-24.95**</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours in Mother Role</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Mother Identity</td>
<td>3.45*</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²=.317***
R²=.110
n=120
n=119

₂p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001, the probabilities for relationships involving commitment are presented as one-tailed
Examining the relationship between commitment and hours spent in the mother role, I found that the relationship is strongest for mothers whose youngest child were between the ages of 13 and 18. For these women, commitment and behavior were correlated at .417 (p=.02, n=30). The next strongest (although not significant) relationship was for mothers whose youngest children were between 19 and 23 (r=.251, n=27). This supports the idea that discretion and freedom are important moderators for the relationship between commitment and behavior. However, these findings are based on very small number of respondents and must be viewed with caution for this reason.

Thus far, the identities examined have varied in terms of the degree of latitude in defining identity supporting behaviors. It could be argued that the identity of feminist allows the greatest latitude and the identity of academic may be the most context based. In support of this argument, I found that the relationship between commitment and behavior is strongest for the feminist identity and weakest for the academic identity. In terms of both definition and the relationship between commitment to the mother role and behavior, the identity of mother falls somewhere in between.

I examined one final identity, that of woman. This identity provided an interesting context for investigating the relationship between commitment and behavior. The identity of woman may be relevant across a wide variety of settings. However, there is some question as to exactly what the identity of woman means and
how is it expressed through behaviors? Traditionally, this identity was expressed by
enacting related family roles such as mother, daughter, and wife and by adhering to
traditional gender roles such being nurturing, compassionate, etcetera. More recently,
women have had the option of performing and experiencing the identity of woman
through the feminism.

The data in this study were collected in such a way to encourage the
respondents to consider the identity of woman as an identity beyond being either a
mother or feminist. For example, the women first reported time spent on feminist
activities and then mother activities and finally woman-centered activities (i.e., book
clubs, or religious group focused on or restricted to women). At a later point in the
survey the women described the types of woman-centered activities in which they
participated.

Nearly half (49 percent) of the respondents indicated that they spent no time on
such activities. This suggests that for many of the respondents this identity may be
either ambiguous or simply not among their identities. For others, the woman identity
seemed better defined and for a few it appeared to serve as a world view in the same
manner as a feminist did for some respondents. The relationship between time spent
on feminist activities and woman activities and commitment to the identities of
woman and feminist were also strongly related. This suggests that despite efforts to
separate the two identities they are similar for a portion of the respondents in this
study.
I tested the hypotheses that commitment to the identity of woman would be positively related to time spent in woman-centered activities (Hypothesis 2) and the desire to spend additional time on such activities (Hypothesis 5). First I examined the bivariate relationships; these results are reported in Table 7.9. The results of the multivariate regressions are reported in Table 7.10. Again, the proposition that commitment leads to behavioral outcomes does not seem to be supported when the identity of woman is considered.

Table 7.9 Correlations Among Commitment to Woman Identity, Hours Spent in Woman-centered Activities Time the Individual Would Like to Spend on These Activities Relative to What They Now Spend (n=190)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hours Spent in Woman-Centered Activities</th>
<th>Desired Time in Woman-Centered Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Woman Identity</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent in Woman-Centered Activities</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>**p&lt;.05, *p&lt;.01, *<strong>p&lt;.001</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken together, the examination of the relationship between commitment to various identities and actual as well as desired time spent in behaviors related to those identities reveals only limited support for the proposition that commitment to an identity increases the likelihood of behavioral outcomes linked to that identity.

Further, with the exception of actual time spent on activities related to being a mother, the models presented in this chapter are of limited overall use in predicting actual or desired behaviors.
Table 7.10 Regression of Number of Hours Spent on Woman Centered Activities and The Amount of Time the Respondent Would Like to Spend on Such Activities Relative to What They Now Spend on Constraints on Time (Having Children and a Partner), Academic Rank and Commitment to the Woman Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Time Now Spent on Women-Centered Activities</th>
<th>Desired Amount of Time on Woman-Centered Activities Relative to Now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Child</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Age Child</td>
<td>5.54*</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Age Child</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Age Child</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Child</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>-4.21†</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>-3.68</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours on Women-Centered Activities</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Woman Identity</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2=.055 \quad n=216 \]
\[ R^2=.091 \quad n=190 \]

\[ †p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 \]

However, the patterns of support I found, have an interesting and theoretically important configuration. It appears that in some types of situations structural constraints may override an individual's level of commitment toward a given identity in predicting behavioral outcomes that reflect that identity. Commitment was most useful in predicting behaviors associated to the identity of feminist. This identity...
differed from the others examined in that it is both voluntary in nature and allows for a broad range of identity-based behaviors. When the relationship between commitment to the identity of mother and mother-related activities is examined, taking into account the age of the youngest child, this pattern was further supported.

In addition to predicting that commitment levels will be reflected in behavior, I also predicted that very high levels of commitment to an identity would make it more likely that the identity would be activated and enacted in situations where it was not directly relevant. One context in which this might occur is in the individual’s use of information related to a given identity to make decisions not directly linked to that identity. For example, gender could be an important element in decision making for those strongly committed to either a feminist or woman identity even in professional decisions such as which job candidate to support during departmental hirings (Hypothesis 10), decisions regarding promotions within the department (Hypothesis 11) and the choice of which students to mentor (Hypothesis 12). As shown in Table 7.11, those strongly committed to a feminist identity are likely to say that the gender is important in their professional decisions regarding which job candidates to support, votes regarding promotions, and in the selection of which students to mentor.

The patterns in Table 7.11 are similar to those presented earlier in this chapter. Commitment to a feminist identity is most useful in predicting the importance of various factors in decision making and in particular the importance of gender related highly qualified “yes”. Commitment does seem to be important in predicting
Table 7.11 Correlations Between Commitment to the Identities of Academic, Feminist, and Woman Identity and the Importance of Various Factors Regarding Personal and Professional Decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to Academic Identity</th>
<th>Commitment to Feminist Identity</th>
<th>Commitment to Woman Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Decisions regarding for whom to vote in political elections (n=206)
- The candidate’s political party: 0.01, 0.12, 0.00
- The candidate’s view on issues related to women: 0.07, 0.49**, 0.06
- The candidate’s gender: 0.02, 0.38**, 0.06

Decisions regarding departmental hiring (n=208)
- Prestige of institution where candidate received Ph.D.: 0.02, -0.10, -0.06
- Quality of candidate’s publication record: 0.05, -0.13, -0.02
- Candidate’s gender: 0.03, 0.32**, 0.03

Decisions regarding promotions (n=188)
- Prestige of institution where candidate received Ph.D.: -0.20**, -0.12, -0.19
- Candidate’s publication record: 0.08, 0.02, 0.08
- Candidate’s gender: -0.05, 0.17*, -0.05

Choice of students to mentor (n=206)
- Student’s performance in classes: 0.01, -0.02, 0.01
- Student’s similarity to you: 0.05, 0.08, 0.06
- Student’s gender: 0.01, 0.28**, 0.04

†p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

As discussed above, the constrained nature of my sample makes it likely that the effect of commitment to an academic identity will be underestimated.

In sum, the answer to the first question I posed, “is an individual’s level of commitment to a given identity related to behavioral outcomes?” appears to be a
behavioral outcomes for certain kinds of identities—in particular those voluntary identities with flexible definitions.

What factors influence commitment to a given identity?

Because commitment level is important in determining behavior in at least some types of situations, the question of what factors are likely to increase an individual’s level of commitment to a given identity becomes relevant. As discussed in earlier chapters, commitment has three components: the number of social relationships linked to a given identity, the value of those relationships, and the prominence or psychological centrality of that identity to the individual. The question of what factors influence commitment also has three parts. First, what factors facilitate the existence of relationships that are linked to a given identity? Second, what increases the value of some relationships? Third, what factors increase prominence and psychological investment in a given identity? These questions are highly related and therefore must be considered together rather than separately.

While social structure plays an important part in determining with whom we interact and for what purposes, individuals also play an active role in seeking and creating venues that support the views they have of themselves. We may have a large number of individuals in our lives with whom we have little choice but to interact (coworkers, neighbors, etcetera); however, we also have the freedom to structure the frequency, duration and content of those interactions.
To an even greater extent, we can make choices about the value and meaning of those relationships to us. In particular, we can seek out interactions and use self-information gained from interactions with others who support our view of self (Aronson 1968; Aronson and Carlsmith 1962; Backman and Secord 1962; Festinger 1957, Lecky 1945; Robinson and Smith-Lovin 1992; Secord and Backman 1965; Swann 1983, 1984, 1985, 1987).

In short, when the interaction partners with whom we must interact do not validate important elements of our view of self, we may seek out others who will do so. Modern society is filled with opportunities for such chosen interactions (e.g., voluntary and civic organizations, social support groups, community centers and religious organizations, etcetera). In addition, individuals may seek validation of identities through means other than face-to-face-interactions such as the internet or specialized periodicals.

The importance of a given identity is in part related to the current relationships we have but it is also linked to several other factors. For example, one proposition in the Identity Management Model is that the more successful at executing a given identity the individual feels the more likely she is to be highly committed to that identity.

If we assume that achieving tenure and promotion to full professor will increase feelings of success as an academic then we might expect that those with tenure would have higher levels of commitment to the identity of academic. Further,
those with the rank of full professor should be most committed to this identity. In the case of tenure, this expectation is supported; those with tenure have a higher mean level of commitment and the difference is significant (p = .001). However, we find essentially no difference in commitment levels between associate and full professors.

Table 7.12 Difference in Commitment to Academic Identity By Tenure Status, and Academic Rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenured</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Prof.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8.79</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We might also view survival within academia to represent both success and investment for the identity of academic. Therefore, we might expect that those who had received their Ph.D. most recently would have the lowest levels of commitment to the identity. In fact, the correlation between level of academic commitment and year the respondent received her Ph.D. is -.204 and is statistically significant at a .01 level (n=225). However, this relationship is due primarily to increases in commitment that occur during the first ten to fifteen years as an academic. This is also the time when the promotions to associate and then to full professor are likely to occur making it difficult to disaggregate these two effects.
What are the determinants of the mechanism an individual will use to manage competition between identities with similarly high levels of commitment?

In Chapter Three, I suggested three sets of factors that are likely to influence the mechanism an individual will use to manage competition between similarly highly committed identities. These were characteristics of the individual’s social network, characteristics of the general social environment, and characteristics of the identities themselves. The present data allow examination of the first two sets of factors. Table 7.13 presents results of the analyses using characteristics of the social network the general social environment to predict amalgamation for non-prioritizes (i.e., those who are potential amalgamators).

The analyses presented in this table examine the propositions that smaller (Hypothesis 13) and more dense (Hypothesis 14) networks will increase the likelihood of amalgamation. According to the analysis in Table 7.13, neither network size nor density is important in predicting amalgamation.

While the analyses regarding network structure and the likelihood of amalgamation do not support the propositions developed in the Identity Management Model, further work is needed in testing these propositions is necessary for several reasons. First, the network measures included in this study were only general aggregate measures and these propositions would be better tested with information about specific associates rather than based on aggregate measures. Second, the social network measures used in this study refer to the core network of associates whom the
respondent considered close personal friends or with whom they discussed important issues. The propositions developed may actually operate in the larger social network but not necessarily in the smaller core network.

**Does the amalgamation of two identities result in a new identity that can be used to predict behavior?**

The final question I have addressed in this dissertation is related to whether the amalgamation of two identities results in a new identity that can be used to predict behavior. Based on the lack of clear patterns regarding the relationship between

---

Table 7.13 Regression of Amalgamation on Network Structure, Network Composition, and Departmental Climate For Respondents Who Do Not Show Substantial Prioritization of Either An Academic or A Woman Identity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female Academic Salience</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>se</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Child</td>
<td>-1.16*</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Child</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen-Age Child</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Age Child</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Child</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Size</td>
<td>&lt;-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Density</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R²=.05

‡ p<.10, *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001
factors predicted to influence amalgamation and the measure of amalgamation, I have examined the relationship between amalgamated behaviors and network size, density and amalgamation as well as rank. The bivariate relationships are shown in Table 7.14.

Table 7.14 Correlations among Predictors of Amalgamation, Amalgamation Indicators, and Amalgamated Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender as an Academic Interest</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of Participation in Women's Studies</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hours Per Week in Female Academic Related Activities</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Female Academic Salience</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>0.21**</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Network Size</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Network Density</td>
<td>-0.15*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rank</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female academic salience (the measure of amalgamation) is positively related to level of participation in women's studies (Hypothesis 15), to identifying gender as an academic interest, and the number of hours per week the respondent reports spending in activities related to being a female academic.

With regard to the expected predictors of amalgamation, neither the size nor the density of the respondents' core networks was positively related to behaviors based on an amalgamated identity. In fact, network density was negatively related to all three amalgamated behaviors (although the relationship was significant only for having gender as an academic interest). The findings regarding network density and size must be considered in light of the fact that the propositions in the Identity
Management Model are based on the overall network of the individual. The data from the survey refer only to the respondents' core network of close friends and those with whom they discuss important matters. For this core network size and density may work differently.

I examined whether these relationships persisted when controlling for constraints on time; these results are shown in Table 7.15. Female academic salience continued to be significantly and positively related to both having gender as an academic interest and level of participation in women's studies activities. Amalgamation does appear to be useful in predicting behaviors related to the amalgamated behavior. However, as shown by the low $R^2$ for each of these models much of the variation in these dependent variables is left unexplained and thus the conclusions presented here must be considered with caution.

Table 7.15 Regression of Amalgamated Behaviors on Female Academic Salience, Network Structure, Academic Rank, Departmental Climate and Time Constraints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level of Participation in Women's Studies</th>
<th>Hours Per Week in Female Academic Activities</th>
<th>Gender as An Academic Interest*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$se$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Child</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Network Size</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportiveness of</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Climate</td>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female Academic Salience</td>
<td>0.20**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2=.079^{**}$  \hspace{1cm}  $R^2=.052$  \hspace{1cm}  $R^2=.063$

$n=170$  \hspace{1cm}  $n=169$  \hspace{1cm}  $n=189$

* The regression for this categorical dependent variables is a logistic regression.
Summary of Findings

In this chapter I have offered answers to four questions. First, is an individual’s level of commitment to a given identity related to (1) hours spent on identity related behaviors (2) desired time on such behaviors and (3) the activation of an identity in situations where it is not directly relevant? It does appear that commitment is useful in predicting behaviors related to some types of identities—those that are voluntary in nature and broadly defined. Recall that the relationships between commitment and behaviors as well as desired behaviors were strongest for the identity of feminist and weakest for the identities of woman and academic. For the identity of mother, the relationships were strongest for the mothers of adolescents and young adults. In other words, the relationship between commitment and behavior appears to be strongest for the mother identity at the stages of life when it is most voluntary in nature and flexible in definition.

I also found support for the proposition that some identities may be activated and influence behaviors in situations where they are not directly relevant. For example, commitment to the identity of feminist was positively correlated with the importance of the candidate’s gender in making professional decisions such as hiring, promotion, and the selection of students to mentor.

The current analyses offer only a limited exploration of the second question, “What factors influence commitment to a given identity?” The only factor directly examined in this dissertation was whether rewards for successful performance of an
identity are related to higher levels of commitment to a given identity. As a group, the respondents with tenure did have a significantly higher mean academic commitment score; however, the promotion from associate to full professor did not appear to have an effect on commitment.

The third question, "What are the determinants of the mechanism an individual will use to manage competition between identities with similarly high levels of commitment?" requires further exploration. Recall that I proposed three sets of factors that were likely to be important in determining when amalgamation would occur. The first of these were characteristics of the individual’s social network. I made some preliminary explorations regarding these factors. However, the conclusions that can be drawn are limited by the fact that the data available relate only the core network and the propositions relate to the more general social network. In addition, more in-depth data regarding ties among associates and the content of specific relationships are needed to understand the effect of network structure on the management of competing identities.

The final question, "Does the amalgamation of two identities result in a new identity that can be used to predict behavior?" is closely related to the first question. It does appear that amalgamation, which is closely related to commitment, may be useful in predicting behaviors related to the amalgamated position. The measure of amalgamation used in this dissertation, female academic salience, was related to three types of behavior—level of participation in women’s studies, identifying gender as an
academic interest, and the number of hours the respondent reports spending in activities related to being a female academic.

In the final chapter, I will discuss refinements to the theory suggested by these findings. I will also discuss ways future research may overcome some of the limits encountered in these analyses.
CHAPTER 8

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this dissertation, I have built on work that seeks to understand the structure and content of the self as well as the relationship of individual self-definition to both behavior and social structure. In general, this research has shown that social positions and relationships are important in structuring self-concept and that the self-concept of individuals is inherently social and multidimensional in nature.

Researchers in this area have been very clear in the theoretical descriptions of how self-concept influences behavior. However, empirical work has been only moderately successful at predicting actual behavioral outcomes. I argue that this is in part a result of the tendency to consider identities within the hierarchy separately and as independent from one another and the failure to adequately address competition or conflict among identities.

I directly addressed these issues through the development of the Identity Management Model. Recall that this model is based on the premises that (1) individuals have two or more identities to which they are similarly committed and (2) the identities held by an individual can be in competition or conflict with one another. In this model, I proposed three ways in which individuals may deal with such competition or conflict. They were (1) compartmentalization, (2) amalgamation, and (3) prioritization. I predicted that the likelihood of a particular strategy being used to manage conflict is influenced by three sets of factors (1) characteristics of the
identities themselves; (2) characteristics of the individual's social network; and (3) characteristics of the social environment.

I tested some of the propositions relating by focusing on a type of conflict that is likely to be particularly problematic—the competition or conflict between the master identities of gender and occupation. Previous research on individuals employed in occupations associated with, and occupied predominantly by, those of the opposite gender has highlighted the difficulties individuals face in managing the discrepancies between gender and work identities. Based on these findings, I collected data from women sociologists employed at research universities for this dissertation.

My findings suggest several avenues for future theoretical developments and empirical investigations. These avenues can be divided into three groups. The first group relates to refinements that are necessary to fully understand the structure and content of the self. The second group relates to suggestions for future tests of the Identity Management Model and for some refinements of the model itself. The third group represents findings of more general substantive interest that are worthy of future attention.

The data from this study demonstrate that individuals do have multiple identities to which they are highly and similarly committed. The ramifications of this likelihood must be considered in future refinements of theories seeking to understand the relationships among social positions, self-definitions, social relationships, and individual behavior. The findings regarding the relationship between commitment and
behavior reflect a general pattern found in empirical work in this area. Commitment level is often found to be only weakly related to actual behavioral outcomes and in some cases to not be related at all. As previously noted, commitment is somewhat better at predicting desired and hypothetical behavior. I argue that this may be a result of a lack of attention to the influence of other identities. By attending to both the possibility of similarly valued identities and to the influence of identities on one another, researchers may be better able to predict behavior.

In support of this argument, I found that the identity of feminist was likely to influence a variety of behaviors and activities including those not directly related to the feminist identity. For example, among those with a strong feminist identity the importance of a political candidate's gender was more important than party affiliation in choosing how to vote in elections. Similarly, those with a strong commitment to a feminist identity were more likely to consider the gender of others in making professional academic decisions regarding such things as hiring or promotion.

The result of this pattern is that the relationship between more directly related identities and behavioral outcomes might be weakened by the effect of other identities. As an example of the consequences for researchers, consider a study looking at the relationship between party affiliation and voting behavior. This study may find surprisingly weak results if the sample includes a substantial number of people who prioritize identities not under investigation.
An understanding that identities not immediately apparent in a situation may exert substantial influence on outcomes can be useful from both theoretical and applied endeavors. For theories seeking to understand human behavior from a rational choice perspective, this tendency may help to explain behaviors that are otherwise irrational. For example, investment decisions based on a pure cost/benefit analysis should lead individuals to place funds in ways that gave the greatest return while minimizing risk. Knowing that occupancy of identities such as feminist, environmentalist, anti-gay rights advocate may also influence decisions about investment may help illuminate why people invest money in ways that may at first appear irrational.

The findings presented in this dissertation also call attention to the possibility that different types of identities may function in different ways. Specifically, commitment to some types of identities may be more closely related to behavior than others. Recall that I found the link between commitment and behavior to be strongest for the identity of feminist. Based on a comparison of the relationship between commitment to the identities of academic\footnote{Recall, that as discussed in Chapter 7, that the lack of a relationship between commitment to an academic identity and academic behaviors must be considered with caution. This is a result of the decision to select a sample in which all respondents were likely to rank high on commitment to an academic identity.}, mother, woman and feminist, I concluded that commitment seems most useful in predicting behavior when the identity in question is both voluntary in nature and flexibly defined.
The rationale underlying this argument is based on the constraints and opportunities for enacting identities. The relationship between commitment and behavior is likely to be influenced by a number of outside constraints and demands on time. In some cases, these behavioral requirements, obligations, and demands on time may overshadow the influence of commitment. Many identities are linked to social positions require certain behaviors. For example, occupational and professional identities are generally linked to positions in formal organizations with clearly defined requirements for behavior (e.g., number of hours worked, minimums for productive, etcetera). Other identities are linked to social positions governed by strong societal norms and in some cases legal requirements. For example, to avoid prosecution for neglect the parent of a young child must provide a minimum level of care that can be time consuming. In situations such as these, an individual’s behavior may not reflect his or her commitment to a given identity. Thus, we might expect that commitment will be most strongly related to identities that are linked to voluntary positions.

Second, the nature of the identity may also influence the relationship between commitment and behavior. Some identities are linked to behaviors that are so narrowly defined or that require such specific venues for performance that the individual’s commitment may be of little relevance in predicting actual behavior. In contrast, identities that are flexible allow individuals the freedom to show their commitment to identities through observable behavior. Therefore, we might expect
that commitment would be most useful in predicting behaviors associated with identities that are flexible and broad based.

I found further support for this argument in an examination of the relationship between commitment to the identity of mother and hours spent in mothering activities for women with children of varying ages. While the results must be considered with caution due to the small number of cases; I found that the relationship between commitment to the identity of mother and behavior was strongest for mothers whose youngest child was an adolescent or young adult. It seems plausible that it is at this point in the motherhood career that there is the greatest freedom to define what it means to be a mother and to voluntarily engage in related behaviors.

Taken together these findings demonstrate the need for further refinements of existing theoretical frameworks. Specifically these refinements should: (1) directly address how identities influence one another and (b) explore the possibility that various classes of identities may function in different ways.

The second set of conclusions that may be drawn from my dissertation are related to the value of the Identity Management Model as a contribution to these refinements. In this model, I identified three ways that individuals may manage competition or conflict between identities. The first two of these methods are readily apparent from existing work. The first, prioritization, is the basis for the hierarchical arrangement of identities and is implicit or explicit in both identity and role-identity theories. The second strategy, compartmentalization, is based on work regarding role-
conflict. The third strategy, amalgamation, is perhaps the most innovative and
certainly the least discussed in existing literature. However, as I discussed in Chapter
4, this idea is implicit in the work of Turner (1978) and both the term and a related
idea can be found in the work of Averett and Heise (1987). Averett and Heise showed
that identities in specific interactional settings may be modified by supplementary
statuses, personality traits, and mood descriptions to alter the definition of identities
within a given setting. I have suggested that as a result of repeated modifications of
this type a more permanent amalgamation of identities may take place in a manner
similar to that suggested in Ralph Turner’s (1978) work on role-person merger.

I find support for the usefulness of the concept of amalgamation in my findings
that the number and value of relationships linked to an amalgamated identity are
correlated with involvement in behaviors related to the amalgamated identities.
However, given the cross-sectional nature of my study, it is difficult to know whether
the amalgamation of identities such as feminist and academic lead individuals to be
more involved in women’s studies, to be more likely to have gender as an academic
interest, and to spend more time in female academic centered activities, or whether
those actions lead to a sense of having an amalgamated identity. To fully understand
this process, longitudinal studies tracking individuals over time and through identity
changes are necessary to observe shifts in self-definition, behaviors, and social
networks.
The preliminary tests of my predictions regarding the circumstances under which academic women would amalgamate their gender and occupational identities were not as successful. I believe this is a result of two factors. First, as discussed earlier, the sample of respondents in this study was chosen because its members were likely to have high levels of commitment to the academic identity. This may have resulted in a sample with too little variation on this dimension to adequately examine the issues presented here.

Second, the measures related to characteristics of the social networks were broad based and designed to collect only general aggregate data on social networks as a preliminary step toward collecting more in-depth data at a later time. The decision to collect data in this way was made after weighing the benefits of collecting more intensive data on a small number of issues and/or from a small sample against those of a more preliminary data collection effort covering a wider range of topics for a larger sample. In order to make it feasible to collect network data in a self-administered survey, I focused on a specific portion of the network and requested general aggregate data rather than specific tie information. Therefore, the network information available in this study is limited to the general size and composition of the core network with whom the individual discusses important decisions or those that they consider close personal friends. In actuality, the various portions of the social network may function quite differently and serve very different purposes in the validation of identities held.
by an individual. Further tests of this portion of the Identity Management Model should examine the various portions of the network separately.

More detailed information about the individual's social network is also needed. Work in the area of social support has shown specific associates and ties within a network are important sources of both support and stress. Therefore, it would be desirable to focus on tie level data to examine these issues. Tie data would also allow specific communication patterns within the network to be examined. With these data, the linkages among various clusters that influence the flow of information within a network as well as overall density could be examined.

In sum, I believe that the Identity Management Model represents a promising approach for understanding the relationships among the identities held by an individual and in particular for understanding how individuals manage competition between similarly valued identities.

The final group of conclusions relate to more general substantive areas of interest that merit further investigation. Perhaps the most interesting of these is related to a need for improving our understanding of what identities mean. It is often argued that gender identities are important in structuring both individual activities and self-concept as well as influencing social structure. However, the data in this study suggest that as an independent identity "Woman" is rather ambiguous. Few of the individuals in this sample reported activities that they defined as being woman-centered. However, they were much more able/willing to identify activities associated with the
related identities of mother or feminist. The distinctiveness of these identities from the
more general identity of woman was evidenced by statements and comments that
either (1) defined activities directed at individuals other than their own children as "mothering"; for example, redefining the mentoring of students as a maternal activity but not necessarily as a woman-centered activity; or (b) commented on the need to include other female-based roles (e.g., daughter, sister, etcetera) in the survey. Thus it appears that for a substantial number of respondents the identity of woman lacked either meaning or desirability. Further investigations into the content of the woman identity and related identities such as feminist, mother, daughter, etcetera would be valuable for those interested in gender as well as those interested in identities.

Finally, the data collected in this study suggest that while the climate of academics for women may have warmed considerably, being a female academic still presents a number of challenges. This was particularly evident in responses to a question about whether respondents planned to have children in the future and if so what factors were likely to influence if and when that occurred. Several respondents commented that obtaining tenure or at least completing the tenure review process was a critical factor in this decision. These patterns combined with other recent research on women in professions suggests that women in traditionally male professions and occupations provide an interesting arena in which to study issues of identity conflict and competition. Specific venues that might prove useful would include science, the military, engineering, medicine, law enforcement, academics, and law.
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In sum, this dissertation contributes to an understanding of the structure and content of the self as well as the relationship of the self-definition behavior and social structure in three ways. First, I call attention to the issue of competition and conflict between identities. Second, I provide an initial theoretical framework for understanding how individuals manage these identities. Third, I offer a possible explanation for relatively weak findings regarding the relationship between commitment and behavior and identify. In doing so, I also direct attention to a need to consider the nature of identities and suggest that commitment to some classes of identities may more directly influence behavior than commitment to other kinds of identities.
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APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

A DISSERTATION STUDY OF FEMALE ACADEMICS
conducted by Shirley A. Keeton

You have been selected to participate in a dissertation research project that focuses on ways in which women sociologists manage some of their various social roles. Your participation is entirely voluntary. However, I am attempting to collect information on an entire sub-population of women academics; therefore, your participation is extremely important to the success of the project and will be greatly appreciated. Full participation in the project requires only the completion of this survey. By completing and returning the survey you will have both consented to being a participant in the study and fulfilled all study requirements.

We have made every effort to minimize both the time and effort necessary to complete the survey. In pretests, completing and returning the survey took an average of 20-25 minutes.

All information you provide will be kept strictly confidential and will be used only for the purpose of scientific research. No individual responses will be stored, reported, or shared in a manner that would allow individual respondents or universities to be identified. In addition, completed surveys will be kept in a secure environment that is accessible only to the researchers.

If you have any questions or if you would like a summary of our results, please feel free to contact Shirley A. Keeton (E-mail: skeeton@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu) or Dr. Dawn T. Robinson, (E-mail: sodawn@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu). We may also be reached by phone in the Department of Sociology at Louisiana State University at (225) 388-1792.

IMPORTANT: We are interested in your first impressions and ask that throughout the survey you answer with the first responses that come to mind.

Our target population for this study consists of female sociologists. If you are not a member of this target population, we would appreciate it if you would check the appropriate box below and return the survey in the enclosed envelope.

[ ] I am not female  [ ] I am not a sociologist.

*****THANK YOU VERY MUCH*****
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We are interested in the perceptions you may have about various social positions and roles. In other words, when you think of the following social categories what impressions do you have? We realize that all social categories contain widely diverse individuals; however, we would like you to try and provide your general impressions of the following types of individuals. To describe your feelings about each of the following social positions, put an X on each line in the space that best indicates your impressions of that position. For example, if you feel that each of the adjectives good and bad equally describes the position of an academic, put an X in the middle box in the first row below. Please be sure to put an X on each row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An academic is</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>powerful</th>
<th>weak</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A feminist is</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>powerful</th>
<th>weak</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A mother is</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>powerful</th>
<th>weak</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A woman is</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>powerful</th>
<th>weak</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A female academic is</th>
<th>good</th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>powerful</th>
<th>weak</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ Ⅸ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thinking about yourself in an overall way, place an X on each line below in the box that best describes how that pair of adjectives relates to you. For example, if you feel that the adjectives of good and bad equally describe you, put an X in the center box on the first row.

I am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>good</th>
<th>powerful</th>
<th>active</th>
<th>bad</th>
<th>weak</th>
<th>passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Now, I would like you to think specifically about yourself. Beside each statement below, please mark the box that corresponds with how strongly you agree or disagree with that statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Does Not Apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being an academic is something I rarely even think about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an academic is an important part of who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a feminist is something I rarely even think about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a feminist is an important part of who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a mother is something I rarely even think about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a mother is an important part of who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a woman is something I rarely even think about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being a woman important part of who I am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe your usual style of dress by placing an X on each line in the box that best indicates how often each of the following statements describes your appearance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I dress in a style that MOST PEOPLE would consider feminine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dress in a style that I consider feminine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dress in a style that MOST PEOPLE would consider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dress in a style that I consider androgynous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dress in a style that MOST PEOPLE would consider formal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dress in a style that MOST PEOPLE would consider fashionable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Now think specifically about yourself. Please describe your feelings about yourself as an occupant of the following social positions. Again, place an X on each line in the space that best indicates your impressions.

**As an academic, I am**
- good □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □ ^{
Often social relationships are linked to various social positions and roles. Please think about all of your social relationships. Approximately what percentage of these relationships are based on you being each of the following? In other words, what percentage of these relationships would not exist or be seriously damaged if you were not . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0-20%</th>
<th>21-40%</th>
<th>41-60%</th>
<th>61-80%</th>
<th>81-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an academic?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a feminist?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a mother?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a woman?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a female academic?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The various social relationships in your life may vary in their importance to you. I would like you to think now about how important some sets of relationships are to you. Please indicate below how important the social relationships based on your being each of the following are. In other words, if you were not each of the following how important to you are the relationships you would lose?

**Value of Relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>extremely important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>slightly important</th>
<th>slightly unimportant</th>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>extremely unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an academic?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a feminist?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a mother?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a woman?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a female academic?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now I would like to ask you about some of the activities in which you may spend your time. For each of the following roles and activities, please indicate the average number of hours per week you spend in those activities or roles. How many hours do you spend . . .

- in activities related to the role of academic teacher? [____]  
- in activities related to the role of academic researcher? [____]  
- in other academic activities? [____]  
- in feminist activities? [____]  
- doing housework? [____]  
- in the role of mother? [____]  
- in woman-centered activities? [____]  
- in activities specific to female academics? [____]  
  (e.g., participation in AAUW, Women's Faculty Club, Women's Caucuses, etc.)
For each of these roles and activities, please indicate how much time you would like to spend in that type of activity or role relative to what you spend now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role/Moment</th>
<th>MUCH MORE</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT MORE</th>
<th>THE SAME AS NOW</th>
<th>SOMEWHAT LESS</th>
<th>MUCH LESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>academic-teacher</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic-researcher</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other academic activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminist activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>housework</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the role of mother</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in woman-centered activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the role of female-academic</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to ask you about some of your attitudes regarding women in our society. For each statement below, please put an X in the box that corresponds to your level of agreement with that statement.

What happens to women generally in this country will have an impact on my life. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

When I talk to other women I frequently feel as if we have a lot in common just by being female. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Childrearing, whether done by men or women, needs to be valued more by society. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Pregnancy and childbirth make a woman a real woman. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

A woman should not let bearing and rearing children stand in the way of a career if she wants it. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

The first duty of a woman with young children is to her home and family. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Women need to unite and work together to achieve equal political and social rights. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

In order to change inequities between the sexes, we have to do more than just treat men and women fairly in our ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
The next few questions concern factors that could impact various decisions you might make. For each decision, consider the factors listed and indicate how important each factor is likely to be in your choice.

When you are voting in elections, how important is the
- candidate’s political party? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- candidate’s view on issues related to women? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- candidate’s gender? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

When you are considering where to make purchases, how important is the
- convenience of the store’s location? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- company’s policy regarding equal rights? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- business owner’s gender? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

When you are making decisions regarding the hiring of job candidates within your department, how important is the
- prestige of institution granting the candidate’s Ph.D.? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- quality of the candidate’s publication record? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- candidate’s gender? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

When you are making decisions regarding promotions within your department, how important is the
- prestige of institution granting the candidate’s Ph.D.? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- quality of the candidate’s publication record? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- candidate’s gender? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

When you are considering mentoring a student, how important
- is the student’s performance in classes? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- is the student’s similarity to you? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
- is the student’s gender? [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
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Now, I would like to ask about what it is like to be a woman academic in your department. Below are some statements that may or may not be true of your department. Please put an X on each line in the box that corresponds to how strongly you agree or disagree with that statement.

In meetings, people pay just as much attention when female faculty members speak as when male faculty members speak.

Most faculty members would be as comfortable with a female chairperson as with a male chairperson.

Female faculty members are less likely than their male counterparts to have influence in departmental politics.

The working environment for female faculty members is about the same as for their male counterparts.

Most faculty members are supportive of female colleagues who want to balance their family and career.

Compared to the way that women within sociology as a discipline are treated, how would you say that women in your department are treated?

- MUCH BETTER
- A LITTLE BETTER
- ABOUT THE SAME
- A LITTLE WORSE
- MUCH WORSE

Compared to the way that women in your university as a whole are treated, how would you say that women in your department are treated?

- MUCH BETTER
- A LITTLE BETTER
- ABOUT THE SAME
- A LITTLE WORSE
- MUCH WORSE

In your opinion, how much impact has being a feminist had on your academic experiences and decisions?

- A GREAT DEAL
- SOME
- A LITTLE
- NONE
- DOES NOT APPLY

In your opinion, how much impact has being a mother had on your academic experiences and decisions?

- A GREAT DEAL
- SOME
- A LITTLE
- NONE
- DOES NOT APPLY
In your opinion, how much impact has being female had on your academic experiences and decisions?

- [ ] A GREAT DEAL  - [ ] A LITTLE  - [ ] DOES NOT APPLY
- [ ] SOME  - [ ] NONE

Now, I would like to ask you some questions about your professional life and activities. For each of the following questions about academic journals, please indicate your answer by checking a box in the table. For your convenience columns are provided for some journals. Please use the remainder of columns for any other journals relevant to your answers by simply writing each additional journal title in a free column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For which journals do you serve as a reviewer?</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>American Sociological Review</th>
<th>Social Forces</th>
<th>American Journal of Sociology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To which journals do you subscribe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For which journals have you served on the editorial board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To which journals are you most likely to submit your own work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list the academic organizations to which you belong and indicate any offices you hold and any committees you actively serve on within these organizations.
What are your main teaching interests?


What are your main research interests?


Where did you receive your Ph.D.?

________________________________________________________

Please indicate when you received your Ph.D.


Is your current academic appointment a full-time position within the sociology department?

☐ YES  ☐ NO, JOINT APPOINTMENT WITH ANOTHER DEPARTMENT OR UNIT
☐ NO, PART TIME WITHIN SOCIOLOGY ONLY

What is your current tenure status?

☐ TENURED → In what year did you achieve tenure? ________
☐ ON TENURE TRACK BUT NOT TENURED
☐ NON TENURE TRACK → Does your university have a tenure system? ☐ NO ☐ YES

What is your current academic rank?

☐ FULL PROFESSOR  ☐ ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
☐ ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR  ☐ OTHER → please specify ______________________

In what year did you first achieve this rank? ________________

How long have you been at your current university?

☐ LESS THAN 1 YEAR ☐ 4 - 6 YEARS ☐ 11-14 YEARS
☐ 1-3 YEARS ☐ 7 -10 YEARS ☐ 15 OR MORE YEARS
Please describe the types of university service in which you are involved.

Are you involved with Women's Studies at your university?

[ ] YES  [ ] NO  If there is a particular reason why you are not involved, please describe those reasons below?

IF YOU ARE NOT INVOLVED IN YOUR UNIVERSITY'S WOMEN'S STUDIES PROGRAM, PLEASE SKIP THE REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE

Do you regularly attend general meetings and programs held by the unit?  [ ] NO  [ ] YES
Do you serve on committees for this unit?  [ ] NO  [ ] YES
Have you ever served on the executive board for the unit?  [ ] NO  [ ] YES
Have you ever taught classes for this unit?  [ ] NO  [ ] YES

Relative to your current level of involvement, how much would you like to be involved in your university's Women's Studies Program?

[ ] MUCH LESS THAN NOW  [ ] A LITTLE MORE THAN NOW
[ ] A LITTLE LESS THAN NOW  [ ] MUCH MORE THAN NOW
[ ] ABOUT THE SAME AS NOW

What are the main reasons you decided to become involved in Women's Studies?
Please list any feminist activities in which you engage and any feminist organizations to which you belong. Please note any offices you hold or any committees on which you actively serve within these organizations. Finally, list the feminist publications to which you subscribe or regularly read including electronic resources.

Are you involved in community service, social activities, or spiritual/religious activities that focus on women and women’s issues or that are comprised only of women?

[ ] NO  [ ] YES→PLEASE DESCRIBE THOSE ACTIVITIES BELOW

The final few questions relate to basic socio-demographic information. First, what is your marital status?

[ ] NEVER MARRIED  [ ] DIVORCED
[ ] MARRIED  [ ] WIDOWED
[ ] LIVING WITH A LONG-TERM PARTNER

In what year were you born? [__________]

Do you have children?

[ ] NO
[ ] YES→What are the ages of your children? [____] [___] [____] [____] [____]

Do you plan to have children in the future? [ ] NO  [ ] MAYBE  [ ] YES

What specific factors, if any, will influence if and when you have children in the future?

How do you describe your race?_________________________________________

Thank you very much for your participation in this dissertation research. Please feel free to use additional sheets of paper for any further comments you would like to make.
APPENDIX B

INITIAL SURVEY COVER LETTER

September 14, 1998

Dr. FIELD(first) FIELD(last)
FIELD(a)
FIELD(b)
FIELD(c)
FIELD(d)

Dear Dr. FIELD(last):

I would like your assistance with a study designed to help better understand the lives of women academics. Your participation in this project is greatly appreciated and is, of course, completely voluntary. I am attempting to collect information on an entire sub-population of women academics; therefore, your individual response is crucial to the overall success of my project.

The information you provide will be used only for research purposes including my doctoral dissertation that is being supervised by Dr. Dawn T. Robinson in the Department of Sociology at Louisiana State University. Your responses will remain strictly confidential. Neither your name nor university affiliation will appear on the survey at any time. When completed, the questionnaires will be kept in a locked file cabinet and only I will have access to them. Finally, data will not be stored, reported or shared in any way which would allow individual respondents or departments to be identified.

I would very much appreciate your participation and have made every effort to design the survey in a manner that makes it as efficient as possible to complete. Based on pre-testing I believe it should take between 20 and 25 minutes to complete the survey. I would greatly appreciate it if you would please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me by September 28, 1998; however, having your response is much more important than this specific deadline so please feel free to send the survey after this date if necessary. I have included a prepared envelope for your convenience in returning the survey to me.

If you have any questions or concerns about the project, please feel free to contact me at 225-388-1792 or by E-mail at skeeton@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu. Dr. Robinson may be reached at 319-335-2487 or by E-mail at sodawn@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu.

Thank you very much for your time and candor.

Sincerely,

Shirley A. Keeton
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Doctoral Student in Sociology

APPENDIX C

REMINDER POSTCARD TEXT

| A few weeks ago I mailed a you a survey regarding the lives of women academics; this information is needed for the completion of my dissertation. If you have already returned you survey, thank you very much. Unfortunately, when I mailed the survey I did not realize how long it would take to reach its destinations; therefore, my requested return date was unrealistic. I apologize for this oversight. I would still very much appreciate receiving your responses at your earliest convenience. If you discarded the survey or did not receive it, I will be happy to send you another copy. To receive a second copy or to request additional information please contact me by either E-mail <skeeton@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu> or phone (225-388-1792).

Thanks very much for your help.

Shirley A. Keeton |
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APPENDIX D

COVER LETTER FOR SECOND SURVEY MAILING

Dr. FIELD(first) FIELD(last)
FIELD(a)
FIELD(b)
FIELD(d)

Dear Dr. FIELD(last):

This is a follow-up to a mailing you should have received several weeks ago regarding a study of women academics. If you have already returned your survey, please disregard this letter and accept my gratitude for your participation.

I am writing to you again because, as of today, I have not yet received your response. I realize that you are very busy but I am hoping that you can assist me by participating in this research. Your response is important to the success of my project.

Let me again assure you that the information you provide will be used only for research purposes including my doctoral dissertation that is being supervised by Dr. Dawn T. Robinson in the Department of Sociology at Louisiana State University and that your responses will remain strictly confidential. Neither your name nor university affiliation will appear on the survey at any time and the data will not be stored, reported or shared in any way which would allow individual respondents or departments to be identified.

In the event that you have not returned your questionnaire because you did not receive the original copy or because it has been misplaced, I have enclosed a replacement. If you are not a female sociologist, it would be very helpful if you could check the appropriate box on the first page of the survey and return it to me in the enclosed reply envelope.

I would very much appreciate it if you would please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed reply envelope. If you have any questions or concerns about the project, please feel free to contact me at 225-388-1792 or by E-mail at skeeton@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu. Dr. Robinson may be reached at 319-335-2487 or by E-mail at sodawn@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu.

Thank you very much for your time and candor.

Sincerely,

Shirley A. Keeton, Doctoral Student in Sociology
Dept. of Sociology
126 Stubbs Hall
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803-5411
VITA

Ms. Keeton attended public schools in Fairview, Oklahoma from August, 1972 until January 1984. Ms. Keeton graduated with honors from Merritt High School, Elk City, Oklahoma in May of 1985. Following high school, she attended Southwestern Oklahoma State University in Weatherford, Oklahoma where she graduated with honors in May 1990 with both a B.A. in Sociology and a B.S. in Office Administration. Ms. Keeton was awarded at Board of Regent’s Graduate Fellowship at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, and began her work there in the fall of 1992. She completed her Master's of Arts Degree in August of 1996 and she is currently a candidate for a Doctor of Philosophy degree Sociology. She is employed as an Assistant Professor in the Sociology and Anthropology Department, University of Central Florida in Orlando, Florida.
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