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ABSTRACT

More women are entering the workforce (Betz, 2005), and these women have an interest in managing multiple life roles (Hoffnung, 2004). Multiple roles can be beneficial (Barnett & Hyde, 2001) or problematic (Adelmann, 1994) for one's overall well-being, and can be determined by one's subjective perception of ability to manage roles. This study examined multiple role management through the lens of social cognitive career theory (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) within a female sample. Maternal role modeling and feminist identification were proposed to function as predictors of self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations for multiple role management. Within the social cognitive career theory model, these predictors were operationalized as learning experiences of young women hypothesized to influence confidence to manage life roles of worker, parent, and partner. These three roles were selected for the present study based on their common assessment in prior literature (Hoffnung, 2004; Kerpelman & Schvaneveldt, 1999; Riggio & Desrochers, 2006; Tingey, Kiger, & Riley, 1996) and research that indicated these three roles as ideal life roles among young women (Bridges, 1987).

Data were collected from 422 undergraduate women at a Midwestern University. Participants completed a self-efficacy for multiple role management measure modeled from the SEERM (Lefcourt, 1995), the Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale (Nauta & Kokaly, 2001), a maternal role modeling measure developed based on literature (Weer et al., 2006), the Feminist Identity Composite (Fisher et al.,...
2000), the Feminist Beliefs and Behavior measure (Zucker, 2004), a multiple roles outcome expectations measure developed based on literature (Fouad & Guillen, 2006; Lent & Brown, 2006), a checklist to assess participants’ identified primary role models, and an open-ended item for participants to describe concluding comments. Structural equation model analyses demonstrated inadequate fit between the model and data. Findings demonstrated significant paths extending from feminist identity to self-efficacy expectations, feminist identity to outcome expectations, and self-efficacy expectations to outcome expectations. Exploratory analyses involving substitution of maternal role modeling items with the IOACDS revealed maternal role modeling significantly predicted self-efficacy expectations. Findings were explained based on the conceptualization of variables and measurement concerns.
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CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The occupational climate has changed over the past fifty years as women are now more consistently represented as members of the workforce in America (Betz, 2005). More specifically, statistics indicate that 59 percent of women of working age are active in the workforce nationally and internationally as compared to 43 percent of women roughly four decades ago (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics, 2011). Thus, it is clear that more women find themselves in the working world.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor (2011), traditionally women have worked in farm settings, manufacturing, trade, transportation and utilities industries, and local government. There has been some fluctuation in the types of industries in which women are typically employed, yet employment of women continues to represent a pattern of placement in select fields. That is, in 2010 the majority of women were employed in the following three industries: education and health services, trade, transportation and utilities, and local government.

Managing Multiple Roles

Although statistics indicate more women are entering the workforce, how confident women feel about managing this added component of their identity is less clear. Multiple role management, women’s perception of their ability to manage their varied
roles, may influence psychological health, well-being and professional success (Ahrens & Ryff, 2006). In general, people hold several different types of roles based on their relationships and their various positions. For instance, one might have a daughter role in relation to one’s mother and father, a sister role in relation to one’s sibling, or a friend role in relation to one’s friends. Common additional roles among adult women include the partner role reflecting the relationship one has with a significant other, the parent role reflecting the relationship(s) one has with one’s children, and the work role reflecting the position and related responsibilities one has in the professional realm. The combination of mother, partner, and worker roles is not universally developed among women; however, review of literature examining the impact of multiple roles suggests they are commonly assessed roles. That is, some studies include these and additional roles (Pietromonaco, Manis, & Frohardt-Lane, 1986; Thoits, 1983, 1986), yet many studies target these three roles (partner, mother, worker) specifically (Hoffnung, 2004; Kerpelman & Schvaneveldt, 1999; Riggio & Desrochers, 2006; Tingey, Kiger, & Riley, 1996). Additionally, research suggests college women indicate this combination of roles as ideal (Bridges, 1987). To augment existing research on multiple roles, these three roles were selected as target roles assessed in the present study among a sample of university women.

Both men and women are impacted by the presence of multiple roles in their lives, and they may consider their ability to manage said multiple roles as they plan to enter the workforce (Amatea, Cross, Clarke, & Bobby, 1986). Women’s ability to manage these multiple roles was of particular interest for the present study as it may
inform some of the previously highlighted career trends of women and may relate to broad societal expectations of women as partners and mothers.

The expectation for women to develop partner and mother roles is based largely on the belief that women are best suited for family role responsibilities, hence the salience of mother and partner roles among young women (Barnett, 2004). Although the development of these family and mother roles is not universal, among women for which such roles are developed, an emphasis on specific home-related roles may make the management of a career complicated and overwhelming for women. For example, Tal (2006) described the addition of career with family roles as one of the greatest challenges faced by working women today. Further, Werbel (1998) noted that the biological event of childbirth results in a larger impact for women’s careers in comparison to men’s careers based on the greater percentage of resultant household tasks that typically fall into the mother’s hands. Further, single mothers trying to manage the demands of mother and work roles may be presented with additional challenges and responsibilities to uphold. As such, withdrawal from the working world can serve as a realistic solution for some women so as to be available for family role obligations. Based on the likelihood for mother and partner roles to influence strongly women’s careers, greater emphasis needs to be placed on balancing multiple roles among women.

There are conflicting perspectives in the literature, however, regarding the impact of multiple roles for an individual’s well-being. Some research suggests that having too many roles, the role strain perspective, may negatively impact a woman’s health and well-being such that she feels overwhelmed and incapable of successfully fulfilling the obligations associated with her various roles (Adelmann, 1994; Goode, 1960; Marks,
1977). Additional research highlights the protective nature of multiple roles as one’s roles in some areas can counteract negative experiences or aspects of roles in other areas of a woman’s life in which she may be struggling (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Pietromonaco, Manis, & Frohardt-Lane, 1986; Sieber, 1974; Simon, 1997; Thoits, 1983). Research investigating this latter perspective has considered the possibility of role overload from these multiple roles, yet recognized a woman’s ability to manage multiple roles as something that can prevent the experience of overload from developing (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Sieber, 1974). Thus, the subjective perception of one’s ability to manage roles appears central to the actual influence of multiple roles as positive or negative, and the presence of multiple role management self-efficacy among women may result in less opportunity for role overload to develop.

Regardless of the potential benefit demonstrated in developing multiple roles, women, particularly traditional women, may hesitate to add potentially unnecessary roles (e.g., employment) for fear that this addition may serve as a threat to her ability to succeed in other roles (e.g., partner, mother). Such fear could raise questions for a woman of the necessity and potential negative impact of employment. Alternatively, if a woman finds herself in an economic position in which she must work, her uncertainty and fear about managing her multiple roles may influence her professional performance or her choice to add roles of partner or parent. Therefore, consideration of women’s perceptions of multiple roles and the ability to manage multiple roles was at the heart of the present study.

Although there is research evidence illustrating the positive impact of multiple roles on well-being and psychological health (Cochran, Brown, & McGregor, 1999;
Kikuzawa, 2006; Kopp & Ruzicka, 1993; Thoits, 1986), less research has targeted women’s confidence regarding management of multiple roles. One of the first studies reviewing self-efficacy in relation to multiple role management was conducted to evaluate differences in self-efficacy for management of career, home, and family among men and women. In this study, Stickel and Bonnett (1991) demonstrated that women reported greater self-efficacy toward traditional (e.g., education) as compared to nontraditional (e.g., engineering) careers. Women also demonstrated greater self-efficacy to manage a traditional career with home and family responsibilities. In contrast, Lefcourt (1992) revealed that female graduate students enrolled in female-dominated graduate programs reported greater confidence for managing multiple roles of parent, partner, self, worker, and family member than did those in male-dominated graduate programs. Dukstein (1994) demonstrated that both multiple role self-efficacy and gender-role attitudes served as predictors of career aspirations among a sample of college women. More recent studies have examined the multiple role management self-efficacy construct through the lens of social cognitive career theory (SCCT).

Advancing this area of research, Tal (2006) examined two types of variables, personal inputs and contextual influences, proposed in SCCT to influence self-efficacy expectations of women. The target population within this study was women in their first pregnancy as this time period was expected to be an initial developmental phase in which women may have to consider how they manage current multiple roles and confidence for their ability to manage multiple roles in light of pregnancy. Results indicated support for SCCT in that self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management were influenced by partner support, other support, work culture, and exposure to role models. Partner and
other support were both strongly related to self-efficacy for holding individual roles of partner, parent and employee.

In a study specifically designed to assess multiple role management within SCCT, Gretchen-Doorly (2005) analyzed multiple role management self-efficacy expectations, outcome expectations for multiple roles, goals set by participants related to multiple role management and the collective impact on psychological well-being. Among a sample of young professional women, self-efficacy for multiple role management and outcome expectations accounted for 29% of the variance in psychological well-being. As seen in these recent studies, SCCT is a relevant theory from which to examine the multiple role management construct.

Social Cognitive Career Theory

There are many theories of vocational development in the literature (Dawis & Lofquist, 1984; Gottfredson, 1981; Holland, 1959), but only a subset of these theories specifically consider life roles of an individual and the influence of role models on vocational development, both of which are relevant to the present study. Super’s (1957, 1984) life-span, life-space theory of vocational development suggests certain criteria should be considered as individuals approach career development. How one develops an identity and examples of an identity provided by role models are among these criteria. That is, individuals are suggested to consider themselves and their self-concept as part of vocational development. Additional information to consider includes recognition that individuals evolve and adjust over time and the differing salience levels of one’s life roles. Specifically, career salience in relation to other roles may provide understanding regarding the realistic nature of vocational choices one makes. This theory takes a
developmental perspective, and as such it may be best assessed through longitudinal data (Savickas, 2001).

SCCT is an additional vocational theory that considers social, environmental, and personal variables in relation to vocational development (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). SCCT is an extension of Bandura’s (1977) social learning theory and serves to highlight various components of an individual’s experience that ultimately impact her career interests, career choice goals, and career choice actions. Two constructs in particular, self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations, are proposed to influence career interests, choice goals, and choice actions within the SCCT model. Self-efficacy expectations reflect an individual’s belief and confidence in her ability to complete a specific task or goal, whereas outcome expectations are the related and potentially resultant beliefs about the specific outcome one anticipates achieving. This theory has been well supported in the literature and is frequently used as a guiding theory for career counseling and related studies (Albert & Luzzo, 1999; Chartrand & Rose, 1996; Flores & Heppner, 2002).

Learning experiences unique to a given individual may contribute to self-efficacy and outcome expectations. SCCT also proposes personal and contextual factors that serve to influence these powerful expectation constructs. Personal characteristics (e.g., race, gender) and contextual factors (e.g., education, role models) contribute to one’s learning experiences that are delineated in the model as additional constructs that can collectively impact the development of both self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations.

There are four possible types of learning experiences: personal performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, social persuasion, and physiological and affective
states (Lent, 2005). These experiences and their influence differ for each person. As such, some experiences may be considered more closely or taken more seriously for one person as compared to her peers, resulting in a larger impact on self-efficacy expectations and resultant outcome expectations. Thus, merely having a learning experience will not necessarily automatically result in the development of self-efficacy expectations for an individual. Rather, attending to a learning experience one has had and applying it to her personal experience or situation increases the likelihood that the experience will influence related self-efficacy and outcome expectations.

A learning experience relevant to employment of women may be a young woman’s attention to the modeling provided by her working mother. Although research has demonstrated a familial influence on occupational choice among individuals in general (Whiston & Keller, 2004), career aspirations and guidance of mothers appear to illustrate a particularly large impact for youth (Lavine, 1982; Paa & McWhirter, 2000; Selkow, 1984). A mother’s career and the impact of this career role on her other life roles (i.e., ability to be a mother, time available to complete partner and home-related tasks) could serve as positive evidence of multiple role management (Weer et al., 2006). That is, if a young woman sees her mother managing her career and mother roles well, this could subsequently influence the confidence that the young woman may have in her ability to similarly manage a career and other roles well. Alternatively, if a young woman sees her mother struggle in managing her career in addition to other roles in her life, the young woman may have less confidence in her own ability to manage multiple roles. She may subsequently modify her career or life plan for mother or partner roles based on this vicarious learning experience. That is, a young woman’s self-efficacy expectations and
outcome expectations could be impacted by this type of learning experience, with positive expectations stemming from the observation of successful multiple role management by one’s mother and negative expectations stemming from the observation of unsuccessful multiple role management by one’s mother. Verbal persuasion from one’s mother is a subcomponent of this type of vicarious learning that may impact self-efficacy beliefs of a young woman.

Feminist Identity Development

Another possible contributor to women’s multiple role management self-efficacy may be identification as a feminist (Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006). Although feminist identity is not necessarily a stable characteristic of an individual, it is a personal quality that reflects how a given woman understands, conceptualizes, and sees the world (Downing & Roush, 1985). Therefore, it is a personal variable that may contribute to learning experiences and the extent to which a young woman attends to learning experiences, much like the previously noted contextual factor of available role models. As outlined by Lent, Brown and Hackett (1994), personal variables and contextual factors both contribute to self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations in the SCCT model.

Downing and Roush’s (1985) Feminist Identity Development Theory delineates a five stage model. In this model, women are proposed to progress from passively accepting a patriarchal society and related expectations of women as members of this type of society to active commitment toward a feminist society characterized by equal opportunities (socially, politically and economically) for both sexes. A woman, then, does not necessarily jump from awareness of a patriarchal society to being committed to
a society characterized by egalitarianism. Rather, a woman likely increasingly gains awareness based on various events, experiences and interactions that serve to guide greater identification with feminism. In this sense, a woman engages in learning experiences that serve to impact subsequent identity development.

Research has indicated that a feminist identity may be related to positive self-evaluations and self-efficacy among women. Specifically, Moradi and Subich (2002) demonstrated a positive correlation between self-esteem and the subscale of the fourth stage (accepting feminism as part of one’s self-concept) in the Feminist Identity Development Theory. Eisele and Stake (2008) illustrated that feminist attitudes and feminist identity predicted self-efficacy as measured by the Performance Self-Esteem Scale (Stake, 1979). Thus, a woman’s identification as a feminist may contribute to the confidence she has to handle stressors experienced from multiple roles.

A feminist identity may also relate to a woman’s values which in turn may influence such confidence. Brown (1996) proposed a model of career choice based on values with an emphasis on highly prioritized values serving as stronger contributors to preferences for one’s career. Specifically, values that are very important to an individual were proposed to result in either career choices that reflected these values or career choices that did not interfere with these values. Other vocational theorists have considered a person’s self-concept and values as important information to consider during the career development process (Savickas, 2001; Super, 1954). Brown and Crace (1996) further suggested that values are central not only to career choice but also to selecting life roles and the related satisfaction with life roles. Thus, important values were proposed to result in personal choices that reflect these values or personal choices that do
not interfere with these values. The identification as a feminist, then, could serve as a developed personal value based on prior learning experiences that would be considered as one makes choices about various roles. Feminist identity may also be considered as one evaluates how to manage multiple roles. That is, a feminist identity that is prioritized by a woman would be expected to guide subsequent choices that might be related to feminism such as accepting multiple life roles.

Furthermore, identification as a feminist may relate to multiple role management in other ways as well. Research has demonstrated that one way contemporary young women work to meet their expectations of balancing partner, mother and career roles is based on the type of romantic relationship they construct. Specifically, some women interested in pursuing career roles in addition to the traditionally expected mother and partner roles expect to be part of an egalitarian relationship characterized by a division of labor with one’s partner (Hallet & Gilbert, 1997; Hoffnung, 2004). As such, these women develop expectations aligning closely with characteristics of a feminist identity as they consider how to manage multiple roles. It is plausible, then, that identification with feminism influences outcome expectations of contemporary women as they consider multiple roles they may strive to develop.

The Present Study

The objective of the present study was to add to the paucity of research on self-efficacy for multiple role management. Although scholars have previously considered role complementary research by which work and family roles are considered supportive allies that buffer experiences within work and family contexts (Greenhaus, Collins, & Shaw, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2003; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006), this research does
not consider how an individual’s self-efficacy influences expectations for multiple role management. The present study targeted multiple role management of women in particular as women are increasingly represented in the workforce and are traditionally expected to manage the majority of the home responsibilities (Amatea et al., 1986; Barnett, 2004). Thus, women may experience greater pressure to manage multiple roles and may have a greater variety of roles to manage (e.g., mother, partner, home, work) as compared to men. This emphasis on mother and partner roles may not apply for all women as women may not develop partner and mother roles. However, to be consistent with literature assessing multiple roles and the societal expectation for family roles, the combination of partner, mother and worker roles were specifically examined within the present study (Hoffnung, 2004; Kerpelman & Schvaneveldt, 1999; Riggio & Desrochers, 2006; Tingey, Kiger, & Riley, 1996).

This study used SCCT as a guiding theoretical framework based on the emphasis on self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations within the model, and data which suggested self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations for multiple role management operate as expected in the SCCT framework (Gretchen-Doorly, 2005; Tal, 2006). Following the framework of SCCT, the present study sought to extend prior research and examine the potential influence of two constructs, vicarious learning via role models of mothers and feminist identity development level, on university women’s multiple role management self-efficacy and related outcome expectations. It was expected that the observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management and greater feminist identification would facilitate self-efficacy for management of multiple roles and expectations of positive outcomes when women
manage these roles. Much of the previous research examining SCCT in relation to multiple roles examined self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations as predictors of behaviors or goals. The present study, however, examined more closely what variables predict these self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations, providing a unique addition to the SCCT literature.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, the competing views regarding the influence of multiple roles are defined and explained to provide a backdrop for the importance of confidence for multiple role management. Multiple role management and self-efficacy for multiple role management research are specifically reviewed prior to an exploration of SCCT. This review supports the present study’s use of SCCT and highlights the inclusion of SCCT in previous multiple role management self-efficacy research. Feminism and the feminist identity development model subsequently are examined to support the particular focus on feminist identity as a predictor of multiple role management self-efficacy and positive outcome expectations in the present study. Lastly, a summary of the literature as it relates to the present study and the specific hypotheses of the study are provided.

Multiple Roles

There are two competing theories, the role strain theory and the role accumulation theory, about the impact of multiple roles on a given individual (Ahrens & Ryff, 2006). Specifically, some scholars believe in the role strain perspective which posits the presence of multiple roles results in role overload and strain for an individual, which can lead to negative physical and psychological consequences for that person (Goode, 1960; Marks, 1977). Thus, individuals may feel over committed to do various tasks based on
the numerous social roles they possess. Subsequently, they may have difficulty fulfilling the demands of these roles and suffer mentally and physically as a result. However, Ahrens and Ryff (2006) highlighted that in general research examining this role strain perspective struggles to consistently identify comprehensive support for this view.

Research Support for Role Strain

The theory of role strain was developed by Goode (1960) and based on the belief of a potential difficulty in being able to fulfill obligations within multiple roles. This strain is anticipated due to the assumed presence of multiple role relations and the likelihood that there are limits to one’s ability to fulfill demands of all roles. Based on the role strain theory, it is expected that a form of negotiation occurs when one is presented with various roles and must be able to manage these roles. These negotiations provide a person with an opportunity to select role behaviors that would allow one to decrease the presence of role strain. Specifically, a person can manage this role strain experience by incorporating compartmentalization, delegation, elimination of role relationships, extension of role relationships, or developing barriers to prevent intrusion of role relationships (e.g., vacation, limiting time available for others).

It is suggested that role strain may result from four sources, difficulty conforming to role demands, difficulty with diverse obligations, difficulty with norms, and difficulty with role partners (Goode, 1960). Essentially, however, role strain results from a limited amount of resources to allocate to one’s various roles so the person must try to minimize the proverbial cost of having multiple roles through one of the behaviors listed above. This cost may include pressure experienced by the individual and may lead to decisions with which one is not satisfied, impacting one’s psychological well-being (e.g., strain,
worry, anxiety). Physical demands on the person may also result (e.g., less personal time to allocate toward rest).

Marks (1977) provided a review of theoretical and empirical work on role strain prior to proposing that role strain may develop in the presence of certain circumstances. The emphasis of this review was on the scarcity of energy available to attend to multiple roles. Explained through an analogy with economic spending, that there is a limited supply of the energy commodity, it was proposed that it is likely that conflict between roles will emerge based on this limited energy supply. Based on Goode’s (1960) conclusion, compromises through role behavior choices (e.g., delegation) must occur to accommodate this conflict.

Although this perspective suggests that conflict is inevitable regardless of whether such role conflicts are believed to be difficult to manage or not difficult to manage, Marks (1977) highlighted that research has demonstrated that some participants with multiple roles illustrated an ability to avoid effects of energy scarcity that may contribute to role strain (Nelson, 1966; Rainwater, 1964). That is, some women in the studies reviewed did not express feelings of being overburdened and did not believe that they were drained by the presence of multiple roles in a manner that would prevent energy for additional roles. Therefore, although there may be a potential for role strain to occur, it appears that this experience may not be universal.

Although there is research support for role strain, this support does not necessarily suggest a negative impact of multiple roles. That is, strain may exist among roles, particularly regarding one’s time and energy, yet this strain has not necessarily predicted poor psychological or physical health. Pietromonaco, Manis and Frohardt-Lane (1986)
sampled employed women ($N=500$) between 22 and 66 years old to obtain data regarding the psychological impact of multiple social roles, particularly consequences stemming from multiple roles. Specifically, data obtained from a prior study (Center for Continuing Education of Women, 1981) were re-analyzed. Measures included social role information including worker, partner, parent, student, and volunteer roles, and questions regarding the respondent’s self-esteem, job satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, children satisfaction, perceptions of life stress and pleasure were included. Age, education level, and income were controlled. It should be noted that no standardized measures were used in this study and little psychometric information was reported for the measures that were created. Further, the sample was representative only of educated women as it included only women who attended the University of Michigan between 1974 and 1977 or went to a continuing education lecture at the University of Michigan during that time frame.

Results supported the role accumulation theory as women who reported more social roles reported higher levels of self-esteem, $F(4, 490) = 6.51, p < .00001$, and mean self-esteem scores increased as roles increased. Women with one ($M = 4.61$) to two ($M = 4.48$) roles were less satisfied with their jobs than were women with three, four and five roles ($M = 4.84$, $M = 4.78$, and $M = 4.76$, respectively). Women with two to five roles who indicated having a spouse or partner did not demonstrate more satisfaction with their romantic relationship, however, than did women who had one role. Stress level was found to be independent of the number of roles held by women. Further, although women who reported three to five roles indicated more positive areas in their life (e.g., work, home) than did women with fewer roles, this difference was not significant. Thus, having more roles was not indicated as a consistent contributor to psychological consequences
and the acknowledgement of stress was consistent across all women regardless of the number of roles held. Multiple roles, then, may not automatically result in negative psychological consequences based on these data, and more roles may correlate with more satisfaction for an individual.

Verbrugge (1983) examined the impact of multiple roles on physical health and provided data that suggest multiple roles do not compromise or serve to disadvantage an individual’s physical health. A total sample of 714 men and women recruited via multistage probability sampling in the Health in Detroit Study (Verbrugge, 1979) was used. Interview data were gathered regarding detailed self-reported health status, self-reported daily health records (e.g., number of symptomatic days, average physical feelings, number of prescription drugs taken daily), sex, employment status, family status, and marital status. Results suggested that men with the three possible roles (worker, partner, parent) demonstrated the best health status and both women with all three possible roles and women with the worker and mother roles demonstrated the best health status as compared to women with fewer roles. Thus, the assumption that multiple roles result in negative physical health consequences was not supported. It should be noted, however, that health status was assessed by self-report, and as such it may not be as accurate as physician health records. Nonetheless, these studies suggest mixed results regarding the impact of multiple roles; in particular, in some instances multiple roles appear to result in more positive psychological and physical consequences than have been suggested by theorists (Goode, 1960; Marks, 1977).

Sieber (1974) also questioned the conclusions drawn by Goode (1960) and suggested that role strain might not automatically result from time constraints. Further,
the rigidity of time constraints was challenged by Sieber in favor of an explanation that one can modify time allocation and this may naturally occur as a role system is expanded. Sieber (1974) also proposed a theory of role accumulation in which added roles are expected to provide positive advantages for an individual. Specifically, the following four positive outcomes were suggested to occur from the presence of multiple roles for an individual: role privileges, overall status security, resources for status enhancement and role performance, and enrichment of the personality and ego gratification. These positive benefits of multiple roles were suggested to counteract stress that may occur through one’s multiple roles, resulting in a general positive impact of multiple roles. For example, if a particular relationship one has with an individual results in a negative experience, one’s other relationships may serve to overpower the negative influence of that negative experience.

The predicted outcomes of Sieber’s (1974) role accumulation theory have gained interest as researchers focus on the positive impact of multiple roles. Although scholars continue to highlight the potential negative impact of multiple roles for an individual, they also emphasize the additional resources and benefit provided by multiple roles for an individual. As suggested by Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler and Wethington (1990), “Alternative resources provided by multiple roles outweigh these stresses and help dampen their emotional effects” (p. 96). The role strain theory, then, continues to be studied within the context of multiple roles literature, yet research support continues to highlight as well the beneficial effects of multiple roles.
Research Support for Beneficial Effects of Multiple Roles

Thus, the role strain perspective has failed to derive consistent support from research, but in response to these mixed findings, the role accumulation perspective has been proposed and supported. That is, psychological benefits of multiple roles for women, particularly incorporating both family and work roles into one’s life, have been suggested (Barnett, Marshall, & Singer, 1992; Baruch, Barnett, & Rivers, 1983; Greenhaus & Powell, 2006; Kopp & Ruzicka, 1993), and Barnett and Hyde (2001) highlighted the positive impact work can have on other aspects of one’s life. More specifically, they suggested work as a means to provide women with a source of income, social support, personal fulfillment, an expanded frame of reference and increased self-complexity. Moreover, managing multiple roles such as incorporating a career role can increase similarity between the experiences of men and women and influence the attainment of more egalitarian relationships. Barnett and Hyde (2001) concluded that having to manage multiple social roles is not necessarily a source of stress if an individual is able to manage and negotiate the demands of her roles. Thus, a woman’s ability to cope, her level of self-efficacy and ability to negotiate multiple roles, not the actual number of roles a woman pursues, are expected to predict a woman’s psychological adjustment.

An initial study supporting the positive impact of multiple roles was completed by Thoits (1983). Data were incorporated from 720 men and women who participated in the New Haven community survey (Myers et al., 1971, 1974) and were subsequently interviewed and re-interviewed two years later. Identity accumulation (i.e., the impact of added roles on one’s identity), psychological distress, and demographic data were
collected via standardized instruments. Specifically, participants were asked to list their social positions (e.g., spouse, parent, employee, student) prior to completing Gurin et al.’s (1960) revised psychological distress measure. Demographic information was obtained across nine categories including the participant’s age, sex, family income, and education. Descriptive statistics illustrated that among people with one to seven listed identities, a negative relationship between psychological distress and number of identities was revealed. That is, psychological distress decreased as the number of identities an individual listed increased. Analyses revealed that in contrast to the role strain perspective, identity accumulation significantly and negatively related to distress at both interview times.

Hierarchical regression also revealed that across the two interview time periods, identity accumulation significantly added to the variance accounted for in psychological distress. Further, the more identities added from time one to time two, the greater the reduction in psychological distress among participants, $\beta = -.12, p < .001$. These data provide evidence to suggest the positive impact of a greater number of social identities, or multiple roles. However, these results should be considered in light of measurement instruments incorporated. That is, basic listing of identity and demographic information may not be the strongest measurement of these variables, and the usage of these tactics was not supported by literature suggesting that these tactics are sufficient. Further, the psychological distress measure demonstrated strong reliability ($\alpha = .84$) but included some indices that had been criticized (Thoits, 1983). Therefore, it is necessary to look to subsequent research to provide further support for these findings.
A follow-up study completed by Thoits (1986) demonstrated further support for the role accumulation perspective. Using data from a two-wave panel study completed by colleagues (Pearlin & Lieberman, 1979; Pearlin et al., 1981), a sample of 2,300 people recruited through multistage cluster sampling was identified and a final sample of 1,106 participants was included in the study. By alternating male and female heads of households, the researchers sought to incorporate a sample representative of the adult population. Four years separated data collection waves with 82% of the original sample re-interviewed in the second wave. Similar to Thoits’ (1983) previous study, measures of role identities, psychological distress, and demographic information were obtained during data collection. However, psychological distress was indicated differently in this study as participants were asked to indicate the frequency of experiencing symptoms within the previous week from a list of 23 psychological distress symptoms (Derogatis et al., 1971). Pearlin and Lieberman (1979) had factor analyzed these symptoms and identified two factors among the items, anxiety and depression, and these were used in this study. Further, internal consistency was demonstrated with a Cronbach’s alpha greater than .80 for each factor. These factors were determined to be similar yet distinct factors based on a correlation of $r = .65$. Participants could be classified as having one through six roles depending on the demographic questions. Points were given for each role indicated (e.g., one point for being married, one point for belonging to a club or organization). Demographic data across fourteen categories were also examined (e.g., gender, marital status, age, race, education, and family income).

A review of the descriptive statistics indicated women experienced significantly greater distress as compared to men regardless of dichotomized marital status. Also,
greater psychological distress was experienced by married individuals who had fewer identities. Hierarchical regression revealed that the presence of more role identities reduced anxiety and depression. Further, the relationship between identities and distress was curvilinear; for individuals with very few and many identities distress was higher. A closer look at the data suggested that five identities were optimal for well-being, with greater difficulty experienced by people with more than five roles. Common roles included friend, relative, spouse, parent, and worker.

Similar to Thoits’ (1986) demonstration of an association with well-being and a range of multiple roles, Kopp and Ruzicka (1993) provided evidence of greater psychological well-being among women with two to three roles of partner, mother and worker compared to women with one or none of these roles. A sample of 162 middle-class women aged 23 and older at a community college was used. A randomized list of 300 female students at the college was used to identify potential participants. These individuals were contacted by mail to participate and roughly half of this original sample responded. The procedure involved the assessment of multiple roles including partner, mother, and paid worker in addition to assessment of locus of control and psychological distress. Rotter’s (1966) Locus of Control Scale, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965) and a measure of general happiness (Kammann & Flett, 1983) were also completed by participants. No psychometric data were provided regarding these measures. Results indicated a significant relationship between the measure of general happiness and the number of roles held by participants, $F(2, 159) = 3.48, p < .05$.

Multiple roles and psychological well-being are also reported to relate when assessed for women of different races and cultures. Cochran, Brown, and McGregor
(1999) assessed a sample of African American \((N=547)\) and Caucasian \((N=2,152)\) women in middle adulthood (e.g., 55-61 years old). Using data obtained through the Health and Retirement study (Juster & Suzman, 1995), a sample of 2,699 women was incorporated for this study. Similar to the Thoits’ (1983, 1986) studies, psychological distress, social roles and demographic information were obtained for data analysis. Specifically, the short form of the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977) was used. It was reported that this scale demonstrated adequate psychometrics based on factor analysis and internal consistency data, though these data were not specifically reported. Possible social roles assessed included partner, employee, care provider, grandmother and volunteer, and points were provided for each role a participant acknowledged. Demographic data included age, race, income, and education.

Results indicated a significant difference in depressive symptoms between African American women and Caucasian women, \(t = 4.27, p < .00\), with Caucasian women reporting fewer depressive symptoms than African American women. Further, the presence of more roles in a woman’s life, regardless of race, was related to having fewer depressive symptoms as depressive symptoms were significantly related to the total number of social roles for women, \(F(5, 2,642) = 34.99, p < .001\). It is also plausible, however, that healthier women pursue more roles. Further, there was a clear difference in number of African American participants as compared to Caucasian participants which should be considered when interpreting these results.

Support for the generalizability of the positive benefit of multiple roles was further illustrated by Kikuzawa (2006) who examined in Japan and the United States the relation of multiple roles to well-being. Similar to the Cochran et al. (1999) study, a sample of
American women \((N=3,617)\) that included many participants who were 60 years old and older \((N=1,669)\) was recruited using national survey data from the United States (House, 1986). A sample of 2,200 Japanese women with ages comparable to those in the American sample was also incorporated (Liang & Maeda, 1987). In the United States, data were obtained through multistage stratified area probability sampling and a two-stage probability sampling procedure was used to obtain the data in Japan. Measures included the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression scale (Radloff, 1977), an assessment of six roles including, spouse, parent, grandparent, worker, friend, and volunteer organization member, and demographic information regarding sex, age, education, income, physical health status, and income. Validity of these measures was verified through back translation tactics from English to Japanese to English, but the potential loss of meaning within measures is a potential limitation for this study.

Results indicated that American women are involved in a greater number of roles \((M=4.11)\) than are Japanese women \((M=3.96)\), yet this difference is not considerable and the significant difference may be a function of the large sample sizes included in the study. Further, having multiple roles was beneficial in both countries, yet the benefit of adding a role was significantly greater in the United States than in Japan. That is, the addition of a role reduced depressive symptoms by .19 for American participants compared to .08 for Japanese participants. The presence of multiple roles in the United States accounted for greater variance in psychological distress, 16%, than did the presence of multiple roles in Japan, 7%. Thus, multiple roles were beneficial for older women in both countries, yet it appears the presence of multiple roles was more beneficial for American as compared to Japanese women.
Cochran et al. (1999) and Kikuzawa (2006) provided data that support the stance that multiple roles are beneficial for women and that this effect is reflected in data obtained from women of different cultures and races. However, their data did not address the impact of multiple roles on young women, the target age of the present study. Further, sample sizes were skewed and did not reflect comparable numbers of African American to Caucasian participants (Cochran et al., 1999) and Japanese participants to American participants (Kikuzawa, 2006). Finally, although income was controlled in some studies, finances must be considered as a potential variable that may serve as a confound for the results obtained.

Across these studies, though, it appears that multiple roles did not necessarily negatively relate to psychological and physical health as results throughout the studies supported the suggestion of the beneficial nature of multiple roles. If multiple roles may be related to beneficial outcomes for women, then it is important to understand how women manage multiple roles.

Self-Efficacy for Multiple Role Management

There has been much support for the proposed positive influence of multiple roles, but less emphasis has been directed toward understanding the confidence individuals have regarding their ability to manage multiple roles. This is an important omission as Barnett and Hyde (2001) suggested that the perception regarding one’s ability to manage multiple roles, instead of the specific number of roles, may actually determine whether the impact of multiple roles is positive or negative for an individual.

Bandura (1977) proposed the construct of self-efficacy and described it as the control one perceives regarding behaviors in a specific situation or toward a specific task.
This anticipated control represents a judgment of an individual regarding his or her ability to manage the potentially ambiguous and stressful components of a situation or task and collectively this perception influences one’s decision-making regarding behaviors. As described by Bandura (1977), “Expectations of personal efficacy determine whether coping behavior will be initiated, how much effort will be expended, and how long it will be sustained in the face of obstacles and adverse experiences” (p. 191). As conceptualized by Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) in their career-relevant theory building, self-efficacy is a cognitive construct that reflects confidence for a certain task and influences subsequent expectations and actual behaviors for a certain task or situation.

Early studies of self-efficacy expectations for multiple roles stem from research focusing on self-efficacy related to one’s career and career decision-making (Betz & Hackett, 1981; Nevill & Schlecker, 1988). Stickel and Bonett (1991) conducted one of the first studies assessing self-efficacy for various social roles a person could hold. In this study, career, home and family roles were assessed among a sample of 130 college students, 71 women and 59 men. Participants completed the Career Attitude Scale, a measure developed by Stickel and Bonett (1991), to assess self-efficacy for engaging in specific careers and self-efficacy for combining roles of career, home and family. The measure consisted of 60 items assessing participants’ perceptions regarding ability to engage in a list of potential occupations, ability to combine the listed occupations with home and family roles, and the degree of consideration for the listed occupations.

Subsequently, a factor analysis of the responses related to engaging in specific careers was conducted which revealed two factors, traditionally female occupations (e.g.,
education) and traditionally male occupations (e.g., engineering). Analyses also indicated a greater confidence among women for the traditionally female as compared to traditionally male occupations whereas there were not significant differences in men’s confidence levels for the two factors. Moreover, women also indicated greater self-efficacy for the combination of home and family responsibilities and traditional careers as compared to nontraditional careers. These results demonstrate women’s greater confidence in following traditional home and work roles. This suggests expectations for managing multiple roles may be more positive if women follow a traditional trajectory for the work and home lives.

Self-efficacy expectations regarding managing multiple roles of work and home were subsequently assessed among a sample of female graduate students ($N = 134$) in majority female and majority male graduate programs (Lefcourt, 1992). This study served as an extension of the previous research as women in graduate programs do not necessarily follow the traditional trajectory for work and home lives. Participants completed a measure developed by the author, the Self-Efficacy Expectations for Role Management measure (SEERM), which included items relevant to situations, tasks, and responsibilities that were considered related to potential role conflict for dual-career women. Results indicated that, consistent with prior work, participants in the majority female graduate programs demonstrated greater self-efficacy expectations for multiple roles of work and home as compared to participants in the majority male graduate programs.

Factor analyses of the responses to the SEERM indicated seven factors: worker role, parent role, self role, spouse/partner role, worker and home caretaker role pair,
worker and spouse/partner role pair, and worker and family member role pair. These role pairs include the combination of two roles, and scores for role pairs on the SEERM reflect self-efficacy for the combination of the two roles specified in the pair. This factor structure accounted for 45.2% of the total variance. Female participants in the majority female graduate programs indicated stronger self-efficacy expectations for the following roles: parent, spouse/partner, self, and the worker and family member role pair. There was not a significant difference in self-efficacy expectations for the worker role among participants in these two program types. This finding was explained as a result of participants’ success in their occupational field based on their status in a graduate program. These results extend the Stickel and Bonett (1991) results as less traditional women (e.g., female graduate students) illustrated self-efficacy for multiple role management for both home and work roles, in addition to other roles as well. Further, the results suggest perhaps women have greater confidence in their abilities to manage less traditional roles when surrounded by other women.

It should be noted, however, that a close look at the SEERM reveals this measure largely assesses self-efficacy for managing many separate, individual roles instead of simultaneous assessment of numerous roles. For example, the roles are divided into different categories (partner, parent) and items tap into confidence for each individual role. Although the measure does incorporate several role pairs (worker and family member) that specifically assess confidence for simultaneously managing the two roles within the role pair, majority of the items within the measure assess confidence for managing individual roles. More accurate assessment of the construct of managing multiple roles would include examination of confidence for holding both partner and
parent roles simultaneously. Therefore, the SEERM may actually provide information regarding self-efficacy for these individual roles instead of information that reflects one’s confidence to simultaneously manage multiple roles. Many of the studies assessing management of multiple roles reviewed in this chapter incorporated this measure, and this limitation of the measure should be considered in those studies.

An additional early study assessing self-efficacy expectations for multiple roles (Dukstein, 1994) examined the relationship between self-efficacy, gender role attitudes, and women’s career development among a sample of female college students \((N=228)\). Measures included four scales (e.g., parent, worker and home caretaker role pair, worker and spouse/partner role pair, and worker and family member role pair) of the SEERM (Lefcourt, 1992) and developed assessments of career aspirations, prestige of career choice and the traditional nature of career choice which served as assessment of gender role attitudes. Results indicated that both gender role attitudes and self-efficacy expectations predicted career aspirations, yet gender role attitudes were the strongest predictor of career aspirations among this sample.

Dukstein anticipated self-efficacy expectations to serve as the strongest predictor of career aspirations in the study. However, this study came shortly after the development of the SEERM, and this measure and scales within the measure were modified for this study by Dukstein. Thus, these unexpected results may reflect the modification of the measure and may be a function of using this measure in a different manner than Lefcourt (1992) anticipated. Following this study, Lefcourt (1995) completed additional analyses to further examine the factor structure, validity and reliability of the measure which ultimately resulted in reducing the seven original factors to four factors based on results
of this second factor analysis. This specifically resulted in the removal of the three role pairs from the measure.

As illustrated, then, some of the early studies examining multiple role management self-efficacy demonstrated that women have differential self-efficacy expectations for managing multiple roles depending on certain criteria (e.g., pursuing a traditional career as compared to a nontraditional career). More recently, self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management have been assessed for further understanding of how these expectations are influenced by other factors in one’s life such as a supportive partner or a work environment. These studies have examined this construct within the theoretical foundation of SCCT (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994), a theory developed to understand predictors of self-efficacy for a given task or situation, outcome expectations based on these self-efficacy expectations, and their influence on goals, actions, and accomplishments.

Gretchen-Doorly (2005) provided an additional example of conceptualizing self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management through SCCT. This study assessed psychological well-being in relation to multiple role management self-efficacy expectations much like the previously reviewed studies assessing the positive impact of multiple roles on psychological well-being. Specifically, self-efficacy expectations for multiple roles, outcome expectations for multiple roles, goals set by participants based on multiple roles, and the impact of expectations of multiple roles on psychological well-being were assessed among a sample of young professional women (N = 216) ranging in age from 22 to 25 years old. Participants completed a survey packet including the
SEERM (Lefcourt, 1995), a scale assessing future difficulties, and the Scale of Psychological Well-Being (Ryff, 1989).

Results indicated 29% of the variance in women’s psychological well-being was accounted for by self-efficacy for multiple role management and outcome expectations. Thus, self-efficacy expectations for managing multiple roles and positive outcome expectations for management of multiple roles appear related to women’s psychological well-being. This study, however, targeted women in young adulthood, prior to their development of numerous multiple roles. Yet, this timeframe is important for the present study as young adulthood is a time in which women likely begin making decisions and developing goals regarding multiple roles. Confidence for management of these multiple roles not only may positively influence psychological well-being, but also might influence the actual development of multiple roles (e.g., partner, mother, worker) in the future.

Tal (2006) assessed self-efficacy expectations for multiple roles among a sample of women in their first pregnancy ($N = 115$) based on the belief that this developmental phase is an initial time period in which a woman may begin to experience uncertainty about her ability to manage multiple roles. To further understand self-efficacy expectations for role management within this sample, predictors of self-efficacy expectations were examined in light of current roles and the anticipatory mother role. Assessed predictors in this study included planning ability for multiple role integration, salience of work role, role models, partner support, employer support and support from other important people on participants’ lives. Specifically, participants were initially screened to verify they were in their first pregnancy, partnered, and employed with
intentions to return to work within three years. Completed measures included the Attitudes Toward Multiple Role Planning Scales (Weitzman, 1997), a role model measure developed for this study, The Life Role Salience Scales (Amatea, Cross, Clark, & Bobby, 1986), The Support Behaviors Inventory (Brown, 1986), Work-Family Culture Measure (Thompson, Beauvais, & Lyness, 1999), and the SEERM (Lefcourt, 1995).

Results indicated that self-efficacy expectations for multiple role integration were related to partner support, support from important others, and work culture predictors. Further, partner support and support from important others were strongly related with self-efficacy for the individual roles of partner, self, worker and parent. The planning ability for multiple role integration, work role salience, and support from partner, employer and other important people in participants’ lives accounted for 27% of the variance for self-efficacy for multiple role integration. In particular, women’s confidence in their ability to integrate multiple roles of partner, employee and parent was related to contextual factors of support in addition to the ability to plan for how multiple role integration may unfold and the importance allocated to the home and family roles.

This study served as an initial look at women’s beliefs about self-efficacy for multiple roles as they plan to add a new role in the immediate future (e.g., parent). It also assessed the three roles of interest for the present study and assessed predictors of self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management as opposed to assessing outcomes of self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Thus, Tal (2006) incorporated a research design that is similar to the present study and provided a similar conceptualization of self-efficacy expectations for multiple roles management within SCCT. However, a major limitation of this study is the inclusion of the SEERM as the
measure assessing the criterion variable. This measure assesses self-efficacy of various roles, yet this assessment does not accurately reflect self-efficacy for multiple roles, the construct of interest in this study. Additionally, completion of all study materials occurred online, resulting in no formal verification that participants were indeed pregnant.

Collectively, this research suggests self-efficacy for multiple roles is related to psychological well-being and contextual support among women. Additionally, it is a construct that continues to be studied among women, suggesting it is a relevant area that may inform our understanding of vocational behavior among women. Of particular interest is Tal’s (2006) assessment of self-efficacy for multiple roles as this study highlighted the three roles of interest in the present study (worker, partner, mother) and Tal included this assessment within the framework of SCCT. Although the illustrated relationship of contextual support and self-efficacy for multiple roles is limited by the usage of the SEERM, these results suggest SCCT may be a relevant framework to assess self-efficacy for multiple role management.

Social Cognitive Career Theory

The review of the literature on self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management illustrated that this construct fits within the theoretical framework of SCCT (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). SCCT focuses on the impact and influence of the interplay between personal and cognitive aspects of an individual, and the environmental and social factors to which the person is exposed (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). Important cognitive factors include an individual’s self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals, and social factors include demographic and environmental influences such as
socioeconomic status, educational opportunities and presence or lack thereof of role models. The theory purports that career path options related to one’s self-efficacy, outcome expectations and goals are more desirable to an individual, and career path options not related to these factors are less desirable (Lent, 2005). That is, one garners interest for certain career options based on confidence in one’s abilities and positive outcome expectations. Figure 1 below illustrates the original model and the proposed relationships among variables within the model.

![Figure 1. Social Cognitive Career Theory Model (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994)](image)

This model is well supported in the literature. In their introduction of the model, Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994) reported intercorrelations among variables they included within the model such as .49 between self-efficacy and outcome expectations, .53 between self-efficacy and interests, and .52 between outcome expectations and
interests. They concluded through their review of literature incorporating these career-related variables that studies supported the predictions within the model.

As described by Lent and Brown (2006), a considerable amount of research has developed following the original publication of SCCT. This research has focused on a variety of constructs within the scope of the original model and valid and relevant measures have been developed to support the measurement of variables within the model. However, much of this research has emphasized the self-efficacy expectations component of SCCT with less available research investigating specifically the influence of aspects of this model on outcome expectations (Diegelman & Subich, 2001).

Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) completed a meta-analysis of 114 studies that assessed the relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance which illustrated support of the hypothesized relationship between these two constructs. Specifically, results demonstrated a significant weighted mean effect size of .38.

Rottinghaus, Larson and Borgen (2003) completed a meta-analysis of 60 studies examining the link between self-efficacy and interests with other vocational behavior variables included in the SCCT model. Results were consistent with Lent, Brown and Hackett’s (1994) theorizing, with an overall mean effect size of .59 with a 95% confidence interval ranging from .58 to .59 for the relation between self-efficacy and interests.

Multon, Brown and Lent (1991) completed a meta-analysis of 36 studies to specifically assess self-efficacy beliefs and academic outcomes. Results indicated a significant mean effects size of .38 for academic performance and .34 for academic persistence. More recently, a meta-analytic path analysis that examined the SCCT model
with academic performance variables as predictors of self-efficacy expectations demonstrated that the model provided a strong fit for the variables, though the fit was better when ACT/SAT scores were used to assess prior ability and performance compared to GPA (Brown, Tramayne, Hoxha, Telander, Fan, & Lent, 2008).

Specifically, the standardized path coefficient from ACT/SAT to academic self-efficacy was .70, from academic self-efficacy to academic goals was .49, and from academic goals to academic persistence was .23. The standardized path coefficient for academic self-efficacy, academic goals, and persistence were .51, .76, and .83, respectively.

As can be seen, research has demonstrated support for the utility of the SCCT model. Of particular interest for the purpose of the present study is clarification of the role of self-efficacy and outcome expectations within the overall context of SCCT. As illustrated in Figure 1, person inputs and distal contextual affordances are expected to contribute to learning experiences and are ultimately expected to influence self-efficacy expectations. In the present study, maternal role models were predicted to serve as a distal contextual affordance and a woman’s identification as a feminist was expected to serve as a person input. These two predictors are explained further in the following sections.

Role Models

As explained in SCCT, learning experiences are suggested to directly influence self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Further, Lent (2005) noted that there are four possible learning experiences (i.e., personal performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, social persuasion, and physiological and affective states) that can influence self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Maternal role models,
then, may provide vicarious learning experiences for young women as these young women begin to consider their personal confidence to manage multiple roles.

The claim that children develop career aspirations from parental influence was explored by Otto (2000) who directly evaluated male and female youths’ beliefs regarding parental influence. Cross-sectional survey data from junior level students across six separate high schools in North Carolina were included. Participants consisted of 362 students who provided usable data and had parental consent for inclusion in the study. Specific information describing the survey questions was not provided, though Otto (2000) explained questions were provided in a Likert response format and included questions pertaining to parental influence on career aspirations of participants, the frequency of career discussions with parents, and related areas.

Results indicated that 82% of male and female students reported their career aspirations were similar to their parents’ beliefs about careers the participants should pursue, and female participants reported discussing career options more frequently with parents as compared to male participants. Further, 86% of the young women indicated their mother as the person in their life with whom they seriously discussed career options, and among the young men and women mothers were noted as the person most aware of their career interests and abilities, with more women acknowledging their mother’s awareness of these issues. Mothers were noted by both men and women as more helpful with discussions regarding career plans. Fathers and friends were noted as other sources for such discussions, but more men as compared to women reported a friend and father having awareness of their career interests and abilities. Thus, not only parents in general, but especially mothers appeared to serve as guiding forces for young women beginning to
explore potential career options. With such an emphasis on the discussions, opinions and support provided by mothers for young women, mothers likely model how to manage career and other roles for young women.

Results of a study examining the importance of same-gender role models demonstrated that after exposure to a successful woman, female participants viewed themselves as more successful while a similar impact after exposure to a successful man was not obtained (Lockwood, 2006). Further, such exposure impacted ratings among female participants as they viewed themselves as currently more similar to the successful woman role model and indicated a belief that they too could be as successful as the successful woman in the future. Lockwood (2006) explained that young women may be inspired by successful same gender role models because they illustrate a potential level to aspire to professionally and symbolize the ability to overpower barriers and discrimination in an occupational context.

Li and Kerpelman (2007) further explored parental influence regarding career aspirations. A sample of 304 female undergraduates ranging from 18 to 24 years from a southeastern university was recruited to complete a questionnaire assessing perceived parental influence on career certainty, parent-daughter connectedness and separateness and career discussions with parents. Results indicated more frequent career discussions occurred among mothers and daughters than fathers and daughters with daughters indicating being more upset if disagreements occurred with mothers regarding career aspirations. The likelihood of being upset from disagreements with mothers regarding career aspirations was predicted by mother connectedness.
Further, participants indicated they were more likely to acknowledge disagreement with mothers more easily than with fathers. Connectedness with mothers and connectedness with fathers among participants positively predicted willingness to change career choice to align with those of their mothers and fathers should such disagreement occur. It appears that being connected with parents impacts daughters’ feelings of being upset if parents do not agree with daughters’ career choice, resulting in willingness to alter career choice to more closely align with parents’ views. Thus, parents, especially mothers, appear to be influential in career choice among young women.

Extending this line of inquiry, Whiston and Keller (2004) provided an overview of roughly 20 years of research focusing on the influence of family of origin on occupational choice and career development. Of particular interest to this review were studies providing evidence of an effect of family variables on career expectations and aspirations. Specifically, five studies were identified by the authors as providing evidence to suggest general family influence on career ideas; several additional studies identified gender traditionality of career plans was related to familial influence.

Maternal influence on children’s career aspirations was explicitly explored by Lavine (1982) who demonstrated among elementary school aged children that girls who viewed their mothers as holding considerable power in the family unit believed more careers were available for both men and women and aspired to obtain less traditionally female occupations as compared to girls who believed that their mothers held less power in the family. Further, Selkow (1984) assessed career aspirations among kindergarten and first grade boys and girls and found more career options and more interest in masculine-
oriented careers among children whose mothers worked outside the home as compared to children of nonworking mothers. In particular, girls with mothers in less stereotypically female occupations indicated interest in less stereotypically female occupations. Thus, employment trends of mothers were related to beliefs about career options among children.

Wall, Covell and MacIntyre (1999) studied perceived social supports, perceived opportunities, educational aspirations and expectations and career aspirations and expectations among Canadian participants ranging in age from 15 to 18 years. Across male and female participants, the path linking family factors to career plans was through family support to perception of opportunities to educational expectations to occupational expectations. Among young women in particular, peer, family and teacher support were collectively predictors of perceived opportunities, highlighting the influence of role models in the lives of young women. Further, Paa and McWhirter (2000) demonstrated among a sample of freshman and sophomore high school students that participants reported their same-sex parent had more influence on career expectations than other sources. More specifically, female participants noted mothers were influential, provided positive feedback, supported their autonomy and were open to discussion regarding career decisions.

More specifically, maternal employment has been suggested to provide role modeling for daughters by increasing career-orientation, decreasing sex-typing behaviors, and increasing typically masculine goals for employment (Tangri, 1972). One explanation provided for influences on these behavioral patterns was that direct learning occurs based on maternal values and the examples provided by mothers.
These studies highlight that role models, particularly mothers, appear to influence young women’s career aspirations and expectations. Additional literature illustrates the influence working mothers have on college students’ beliefs about managing expected work-family conflict. Specifically, Barnett et al. (2003) demonstrated that university seniors’ exposure to a mother who worked more while her children were growing up reported less concern about managing multiple roles than did university seniors whose mother worked less while her children were growing up. Data were gathered within a larger study focusing on future expectations and aspirations of college freshmen and seniors. Researchers subsequently assessed data from a smaller sample of 324 college seniors within the study to understand life balance concerns among future professionals. Participants were sent mail surveys to complete which included a developed measure assessing future career-marriage conflict, questions assessing the work history of participants’ mothers, the Trait Anxiety Scale (Spielberger, 1983), and demographic questions assessing minority status, gender, religious affiliation, mother’s education history, and family size.

Results indicated significant effects for the hypothesized predictors of mother’s work history and participants’ family plans. Participants with mothers who worked more were less concerned about future career-marital conflict, highlighting a potential contextual influence of maternal modeling. Participants with plans for a relationship and children later in life demonstrated less concern about future career-marital conflict as compared to participants with more immediate family plans. However, this study utilized a methodology with measures largely developed for the study, and as such the psychometrics of the measures is uncertain.
Further, Weer et al. (2006) highlighted that role modeling of mothers may play a role in how some students view anticipated conflict between work and family roles. A sample of 259 university students consisting of mostly male participants was used. Participants completed items developed to assess expected work-family conflict, items assessing maternal employment history, items taken from the Career Success Scale (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000), and items assessing plans for relationship and family planning. Similar to Barnett et al. (2003), the majority of the measures included lacked psychometric data.

Results demonstrated maternal employment was positively related to expected work-family conflict, $\beta= 0.13, p < 0.05$, with women expecting to experience more work-family conflict than men, $\beta= 0.13, p < 0.05$. Additionally, male participants with mothers who worked extensively throughout their childhood expected more work-family conflict than male participants with mothers who did not work extensively throughout their childhood. All female participants, regardless of the extensive nature of maternal employment history, anticipated a high level of work-family conflict. Contrary to Barnett et al.’s (2003) results, mothers who worked more appeared to have a different influence on participants’ anticipation of work-family conflict.

Additional literature illustrates that interactions with mothers and teachers (e.g., verbal persuasion) as well as vicarious learning serve to influence how young students view their own career aspirations and expectations (Kalmijn, 1994; Otto, 2000; Wall, Covell, & MacIntyre, 1999). These experiences, then, serve as learning experiences that
may collectively impact views toward managing multiple roles as well as one’s self-efficacy for her ability to manage multiple roles and related positive outcome expectations.

Although women may have a variety of people in their life to turn to as role models for this guidance, the previously reviewed literature illustrates the influential role that mothers serve for children, particularly women. As such, specific attention to maternal role models was incorporated in the present study. In addition to providing an example for employment options, maternal role modeling through employment may also influence young women’s values based on these learning experiences.

Feminist Identity Development Model

In addition to maternal role models, a personal characteristic that may be relevant to developing self-efficacy and outcome expectations for multiple role management is the development of a feminist identity. Feminist identity is not a stable characteristic of an individual, but rather a personal characteristic that evolves through life experience and may influence a woman’s understanding and application of her abilities (Downing & Roush, 1985).

The Feminist Identity Development Model (FIDM; Downing & Roush, 1985) emerged from the foundational elements of Cross’s (1971) Black Identity Development theory. That is, in a five stage theory Cross (1971) delineated different stages of identity development that an individual may fall into at any given period based on his or her personal experiences and resultant beliefs. Similarly, FIDM outlines five stages (Passive Acceptance, Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, Synthesis, Active Commitment) of feminist identity development that are a function of experiences and beliefs. These stages
essentially serve to track a woman’s transition from traditional, non-feminist beliefs to recognition of inequality and ultimately a woman’s desire to identify as a feminist and take on related meaningful action to promote this identity. It has been suggested, however, that women likely do not fluidly progress in a linear fashion through each stage of the model, but rather alternate between stages and move through some of the stages several times as is expected in the development of identity (Yoder, Perry, & Saal, 2007).

A closer look at the five stages of the model follows to illustrate this progression.

It is suggested in FIDM that a woman originates with a lack of awareness or disinterest in recognizing inequality, prejudice, and discrimination targeted against women. This stage is denoted as Passive Acceptance, and women in this stage are suggested to be accepting of a Caucasian patriarchal society (Downing & Roush, 1985). As such, in Passive Acceptance women may intentionally avoid messages, experiences, and interactions with people that may counter their investment and support of the patriarchal status quo. What results is that women support the notion that men are superior to women and that traditional sex roles are a satisfactory and preferable way to view society. Thus, there is no desire among women in this stage to modify negative attitudes or actions toward women because such behavior is deemed expected and typical. As such, this type of learning experience may be ignored. Perpetuation of such attitudes has been noted as a function of distorted perceptions women have been socialized to accept (Downing & Roush, 1985).

It is important to recognize women in a given stage in the theory may differ from one another in perspective as a function of their different progression through the model. That is, a subset of Passive Acceptance women who are moving toward the next stage in
the theory may view patriarchy and traditional sex roles with some skepticism and less acceptance. Further, these women may begin to experience more openness to change or modification in their stance regarding sex roles (Downing & Roush, 1985).

Revelation, stage two of the FIDM, is characterized by women who begin to actively recognize the negative impact of unequal treatment toward men and women. This recognition is largely a function of experiences in which women are unable to ignore, deny or rationalize the personal negative impact of a traditional, patriarchal society (e.g., divorce, denial of job application, consciousness raising groups). As one might imagine, however, this alteration of perspective in women is typically gradual and a result of a series of negative experiences as highlighted above. Therefore, women’s perspectives are likely to be initially resistant to messages that counter patriarchal beliefs despite experiencing events highlighting the negative impact of the beliefs. Downing and Roush (1985) suggested women in this stage experience emotions of anger and guilt. More specifically, experienced anger stems from believing they have been taken advantage of and fooled by the perpetuation of the patriarchal beliefs, and subsequent guilt is a function of their role and participation in supporting this oppression. Furthermore, women are suggested to collectively view women as positive while men begin to be collectively viewed as negative.

Following the Revelation stage, Downing and Roush (1985) explained that women progress to the Embeddedness-Emanation stage in which they experience connectedness with other women. It is a time for women to adapt to their new understanding of women, and this sense of connection can be achieved through many avenues including participation in women’s groups and expressive art. This period is suggested to aid
women in releasing anger regarding their revelation and becoming close with supportive women who hold a similar perspective toward feminism. It is important to highlight, however, that this can be a difficult time for women as they manage their roles as mothers, wives, sisters, and partners to men. That is, although adjusting to a new identification as a woman resistant to the messages of traditional society, women must continue to recognize and manage the relationships that persist with men in their lives. Downing and Roush (1985) noted that dissonance can also occur in women in this third stage as they accept their new identity and consider how it conflicts with their previously stable roles and beliefs.

Emanation is experienced toward the end of this third FIDM stage as women become more open to different viewpoints and recognize the limits of a dualistic stance toward men and women. Women begin to understand that in some ways the anger and rigidity typically experienced toward the end of stage two and beginning of stage three mirrors the stringent perspective previously held in Passive Acceptance.

Increased recognition of positive attributes of women and incorporation of these positive traits into one’s self-concept as a woman is described as the Synthesis stage of the model (Downing & Roush, 1985). This fourth stage involves overpowering traditional sex roles, further adjustment of one’s view of oneself as a woman, and movement toward individually assessing men as opposed to previous assumptions that men are undeniably negative. The woman in Synthesis accepts the presence of discrimination and oppression in society while simultaneously self-identifying as a feminist.
Active Commitment is the fifth and final stage of the model. This is a period in which women incorporate their new feminist identity into productive action to reduce sexism. Women begin to commit themselves to social change characterized by transcending sex roles via selection of personally relevant social issues. Men are now viewed through an egalitarian perspective with the understanding that men are different from women. It is noted that this is a less frequently experienced stage in the model (Downing & Roush, 1985).

The earliest research evaluating the FIDM was a factor analytic examination of a developed measure, the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS), used to determine a woman’s position in the proposed stages of the model (McNamara & Rickard, 1989). Rickard (1987) provided this examination as a paper presentation at an Association of Women in Psychology annual meeting, and demonstrated empirical support for the validity of the proposed five stages of the FIDM (McNamara & Rickard, 1989). Moreover, results indicated that women identifying with stages further along in the model exhibited greater levels of self-esteem as illustrated via a positive relationship between self-esteem and identity development stage in the model. Rickard also found evidence to conclude that the further along women were in the FIDM stages, the more positive attitudes women had toward the idea of working women (McNamara & Rickard, 1989). These results are particularly relevant to the present study. That is, greater identification with feminism appears to illustrate positive attitudes toward multiple roles that include employment.

Subsequently, Rickard’s (1987) FIS was used to evaluate dating behaviors in heterosexual female college students. Three of the five levels of FIDM, Passive Acceptance, Revelation and Synthesis, were used to investigate the relation of responses
consistent with these stages to dating behaviors of women. Rickard (1989) described two main reasons for studying dating behaviors in this study. First, college aged women are believed to be exposed to dating, a developmental experience for women in early adulthood, while they simultaneously undergo identity exploration. Further, women and men begin to grapple with power and dominance in relational roles as they begin dating. Participants included a total sample of 21 female students with each participant categorized as representing one of the three FIDM levels examined in the study based on responses provided on the FIS. This resulted in seven participants representing Passive Acceptance, seven participants representing Revelation, and seven participants representing Synthesis. All participants had gone on three or more dates in the three weeks prior to the study. The procedure included completion of the developed FIS and a dating questionnaire.

Results indicated that women agreed with dating behaviors consistent with the different stages of the model that they represented. For example, women in the Passive Acceptance stage reported significantly greater likelihood of following sex-typed behaviors (e.g., enters the door first on a date, does not pay for the date) than did women in the other two groups. Thus, results further validated the FIS and provided behavioral validation of the FIDM. This study answered a call (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Wohlers, 1986) to emphasize actual behaviors as a means to assess the variables of interest, yet the participants self-monitored these behaviors and may have overlooked or inaccurately assessed their behaviors during the process. Further, participant recruitment largely targeted students in women’s studies courses, which may have resulted in a confound regarding participants’ potentially greater awareness toward feminism.
Rickard (1990) further examined feminist identity in a study focusing on evaluations of artwork of men and women. In this particular study, however, only four of the five FIDM stage levels were included as a function of the author’s conclusion that the fifth stage merely serves as a behavioral manifestation of the fourth stage of the model. Participants included four groups of women who were categorized in stages one through four of the FIDM. A total of 100 women ranging from sophomore through senior undergraduate level and who were enrolled in a Human Sexuality course participated. Participants were asked to provide five individual ratings of slides of watercolor paintings (described as the work of either a man or a woman) that were being considered for inclusion in a future textbook for the course. Half of the participants in each FIDM level group saw work described as completed by a woman. Results indicated an effect for artist sex and student feminist identity stage for all five artist ratings. That is, participants in different FIDM stages judged the men’s artwork significantly different across five artwork criteria than the women’s artwork. Results suggested women further along in FIDM stages are less likely to base judgment of the artwork as a function of sex; this is as expected in the model. The author appeared to be thoughtful in developing the study and procedure by utilizing a measure with demonstrated psychometric support and a design modeled after prior research (Pheterson, Kiesler, & Goldberg, 1971). However, extra information (e.g., age, occupation) was provided regarding the artists that might have been unnecessary and influential for participants’ ratings.

Numerous additional empirical studies have been completed examining the FIDM in relation to women’s attitudes toward women, eating behaviors, heterosexual interactions, and applications of the model to educational and therapeutic settings.
Indeed, Moradi, Subich and Phillips (2002) initiated a comprehensive review of feminist identity development literature by providing an overview of the history of the model, the developed instruments to measure the model, and the applied empirical literature to aid the reader in understanding the current status of the model. For many of the studies reviewed, Moradi, Subich and Phillips (2002) noted findings fit well with the tenets of FIDM when it was used with populations comprised of mostly undergraduate, Caucasian women. This research examined attitudes toward women and heterosexual interactions such as dating behaviors, affective reactions to sexual scenarios and anti-rape activist behavior and these variables demonstrated the expected relationships with the stages of the model. Inconsistent results were found in reviewing eating behaviors and applied educational and therapeutic studies, but Moradi, Subich and Phillips (2002) concluded consistent and relatively strong support for the ideas of the model were illustrated in the literature reviewed as evidenced by significant hypothesized relationships between FIDM stages and constructs studied. Further, although not all studies demonstrated relationship results in the expected direction, unexpected patterns of results were illustrated on rare occasions.

Since 2002, however, little literature was published further investigating the model. There were some further examinations of the relations between FIDM and gender-role orientation (Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006), what it means to recognize oneself as a feminist (Zucker, 2004), internalized heterosexism as related to feminist identity (Szymanski, 2004) and broad literature questioning the status of feminism in general, yet there was a long time period in which little literature was produced that more directly evaluated the use of the model.
Then, Yoder, Perry and Saal (2007) investigated the relation between FIDM stages and adherence to egalitarian role expectations in romantic relationships. The premise for this study was based on the belief that modern women seek egalitarian romantic partnerships and sexual assertiveness in these partnerships. Participants included 165 postsecondary high school students through advanced college students with ages ranging from 18-63. The majority of participants were Caucasian, identified as heterosexual and were either not in a committed relationship or were in a nonmarital, committed relationship. Participants were gathered via online and in-class recruitment through the Department of Psychology at a Midwestern university. The procedure included completion of a 45 minute survey investigating attitudes.

More specifically, participants were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire, the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC) (Fisher et al., 2000), form F of the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory (Dunn, 1960), and the Sexual Assertiveness Scale (Morokoff et al. 1997). The authors provided comprehensive psychometric data to inform readers of the strength of these measures. Results indicated negative correlations between the Passive Acceptance FIDM stage and egalitarian marital role expectations and positive correlations between Synthesis and Active Commitment FIDM stages and egalitarian marital role expectations. This response pattern was demonstrated across the seven subscales of the marital role expectations measure. Negative overall and subscale correlations were found between Passive Acceptance FIDM stage and sexual assertiveness. The authors concluded that feminist identity serves as a third confound linking nonegalitarian role expectations and sexual unassertiveness. Additionally, the study provides a further illustration of egalitarian and assertive beliefs aligning with the
FIDM’s later stages as expected and not aligning with earlier stages as expected. However, as noted by the authors, some of the subscales of the marital expectations measure and the Synthesis scale of the FIC demonstrated low internal consistency.

More recently, Erchull et al. (2009) sought to examine the relevance of the FIDM for twenty-first-century women despite the original development of the model in the 1980s. A subset of female research participants in an Introduction to Psychology course as well as participants from online listservs, discussion groups for older women and blogs to target younger women provided Erchull et al. (2009) with a variety of participants (N=217) comprising the categories of younger, ages 18-35, and older, ages 40-78, women. These arbitrary age cutoffs were intended to highlight second wave feminists for whom the model was originally developed and modern young women. The procedure involved completion of an online survey comprised of the following measures, demographic questions, the FIC (Fisher et al., 2000), questions assessing prior FIDM stage experiences, and qualitative responses highlighting themes in one’s life when women endorsed certain prior stage items strongly. However, it is unclear if participants completed the FIC before the prior FIDM stage experiences section of the survey or if the prior FIDM stage experiences section of the procedure was the only time participants responded to FIC items.

In the prior FIDM stage experiences component of the study, participants were provided with a version of the FIC that categorized each item with the stage of the model that the items assessed. Participants were given a group of items of the FIC related to a given stage of the model and were asked “Has there ever been a time in your life when you would have endorsed this group of items as a whole more strongly than you do
today?” This question was followed by, “If yes, tell us about that time in your life. How and why have your views shifted?” The responses to this latter portion of the procedure were considered as qualitative data. These data were subsequently assessed and coded by two trained, undergraduate readers. However, only experiences occurring prior to the fourth stage of FIDM were coded, and the authors did not explain the rationale for this decision.

Results indicated younger women endorsed higher Passive Acceptance and Revelation scores. All women demonstrated higher Revelation scores as compared to the other stages in the model and no difference was found for Synthesis scores between the two groups of women. Additionally, older women had higher Active Commitment scores on the FIC items. Erchull et al. (2009) concluded that support for the model was provided, particularly support for age effects in relation to the model. That is, younger women had higher stage two scores while older women had higher stage five scores. The authors argued that this pattern reflects suggestions of Downing and Roush (1985) that as women become older, they are more likely to feel less anger typically seen in stage two regarding patriarchy and more likely to feel greater acceptance typically seen in the later stages.

Overall, then, the FIDM has considerable research support. It has been demonstrated as a relevant variable in research on personal relationships and the behaviors associated with these relationships (Rickard, 1987; Yoder, Perry, & Saal, 2007). The model has also demonstrated a positive relationship with career attitudes among women (McNamara & Rickard, 1989). Specific to the present study, feminist
attitudes and identity also have predicted self-efficacy (De Man & Bentoit, 1982; Eisele & Stake, 2008; Moradi & Subich, 2002).

Specific to self-efficacy, Eisele and Stake (2008) assessed the relationship between feminist attitudes and feminist identity and self-efficacy among a sample of 435 college students enrolled in 29 women’s and gender studies courses. Participants included students across six universities and junior colleges and they completed measures at the beginning and end of a semester. Completed measures included a combination of two feminist identity measures, the Self-Identification as a Feminist Scale (Szymanski, 2004) and an item developed by Myaskovsky and Wittig (1997), the Global Goals subscale and the Gender Roles subscale of the Liberal Feminist Attitude and Ideology Scale, the Performance Self-Esteem Scale (Stake, 1979), a self-efficacy measure developed to assess commitment to feminist activism, and a measure developed to assess feelings of empowerment. Results indicated significant effects of feminist attitudes predicting feminist identity, β = .49, p < .001, R² = .23, feminist attitudes predicting performance self-efficacy, β = .18, p < .001, R² = .03, and feminist identity predicting performance self-efficacy, β = .15, p < .01, R² = .02. Based on this demonstration of feminist identity predicting performance self-efficacy and the positive relationship between feminist identity and self-esteem, it is plausible that feminist identity may influence a woman’s confidence in other areas.

Indeed, Foss and Slaney (1986) demonstrated support for the relationship between feminist identity and self-efficacy. Among a sample of 80 university women, the authors assessed traditionality of desired careers (Department of Labor, 1980), attitudes about societal rights and roles of women (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973), self-efficacy for
performing both traditional and nontraditional vocations (Betz & Hackett, 1981), and self-efficacy in career decision-making (Taylor & Betz, 1983). Appropriate psychometric data were provided for these measures. Results indicated feminism, as assessed by the attitudes toward women measure, related to self-efficacy. Specifically, a significant main effect was demonstrated between attitudes toward women and the vocational self-efficacy scale, $F(14, 142) = 3.67, p < .05$, and between attitudes toward women and the career-decision making self-efficacy measure, $F(14, 142) = 5.84, p < .01$. Thus, empirical support suggests a feminist identity is associated with different types of self-efficacy, including performance self-efficacy and career decision-making self-efficacy, providing additional support for the proposed relation between feminist identity and multiple role management self-efficacy in the present study.

Although research demonstrates support of FIDM and feminist identity as a predictor of self-efficacy, there is less available research illustrating a relationship between a feminist identity and positive outcome expectations. Identified studies related to this component of the present study are reviewed next.

In a study assessing gratification and strain of having multiple roles among women, Gerson (1985) demonstrated a positive correlation between positive outcomes of multiple roles and feminism. A sample of 168 female students and nonstudents between ages 30 and 50 were included in the study. The positive and negative outcomes of role accumulation (Sieber, 1974) and role strain (Goode, 1960) were operationalized and developed into two measures, one for role gratification and one for role strain, with 12 items each. The author provided appropriate psychometric data for each measure. Housework and childcare were assessed based on amount of time spent on tasks specific
to these areas per week. Participants also completed a feminism scale developed by Mason and Bumpass (1975) and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). No psychometric data were provided for these additional measures.

Results indicated that significantly greater role gratification and role strain were reported by students as compared to nonstudents, suggesting more roles influence both greater strain and gratification. Of particular interest, though, was the demonstrated significant positive correlation between feminism and role gratification for students and nonstudents, \( r = .196, p \leq .05 \), illustrating that perceived positive outcomes of multiple roles related to feminism. These results are similar to the proposed relationship between feminist identity and positive outcome expectations for multiple role management within the present study. Further, they suggest that a feminist identity may be influential in understanding the relationships of multiple role management self-efficacy and outcome expectations for multiple role management.

Moreover, a feminist identity appears to be related to outcome expectations for multiple roles through the value of work-family balance among women. Answering a call for more studies examining gender role socialization and cultural factors that influence career development among women, Weathers et al. (1994) assessed the relation between both racial and feminist identity and identified values used to guide career decision. A sample of 72 African American female students at a predominately Caucasian university were recruited for participation. Participants completed a career values survey, a Racial Identity Development Scale developed by the authors, and the Feminist Identity Development Scale (Bargad & Hyde, 1991). These were assessed to determine if nine
values relevant to career decision (financial wealth, balance between career and family) that were gleaned from literature were predicted by racial and feminist identity.

Results indicated balance between career and family was the most frequently reported value among participants and that racial identity significantly predicted achieving self-fulfillment, $F(4, 70) = 2.80, p < .05$. Additionally, relevant to the present study, feminist identity stage significantly predicted balancing career and family $F(4, 69) = 2.43, p < .05$. Further, the first stage of FIDM (Downing & Roush, 1985) was significantly related to balancing family and career, ($t = -1.97, p < .05$), which suggests that work family balance is less valued among women upholding traditional, non-feminist views toward women. Taken together, this research demonstrates that African American women with a feminist identity may seek positive outcomes of multiple roles based on the identified value of balance of family and career roles. A feminist identity, then, may be associated with positive outcome expectations for multiple role management.

The relationship between a feminist identity and managing multiple roles may be additionally reflected by research on the egalitarian relationships some modern women seek (Hoffnung, 2004; Yoder, Perry, & Saal, 2007). That is, women who want to manage multiple roles of career, partner, and mother may invest in relationships characterized by feminism through role-sharing among partners. As such, characteristics of feminism upheld by these women may relate to positive expectations among them for managing these roles.

Yoder, Saal and Perry (2007) assessed egalitarian role expectations in relationships among women to determine if a stronger feminist identity resulted in greater egalitarian role expectations in romantic relationships. Among a sample of 165 post-secondary and
undergraduate women, results indicated that greater acceptance of non-feminist ideals was associated with fewer expectations for egalitarian relationships. Alternatively, women who accepted feminist ideals and committed to uphold these ideals had greater expectations for egalitarian relationships. Tal (2006) also demonstrated women’s confidence in their ability to integrate multiple roles of partner, employee, and parent was related to support from one’s partner. Thus, egalitarian features of romantic relationships appear consistent with a feminist identity and may in turn influence self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations of managing multiple roles among women.

Hallet and Gilbert (1997) examined role-sharing and perceptions of combining work and family responsibilities among 174 university women. Participants completed a series of measures assessing relationship (Gilbert et al., 1991), vocational (Holland, 1985; Holland, Draiger, & Power, 1980), and personal agency (Rosenberg, 1965; Spence, Helmreich, & Strapp, 1974) variables. Results indicated participants represented two groups: women planning ahead for role sharing dual-career marriages and women planning for conventional dual-career marriages. Women committed to role-sharing marriages demonstrated significantly more self-esteem and reported having more liberal attitudes and friends and partners with liberal attitudes as compared to women committed to conventional dual-career marriages. These results do not clearly indicate a relationship between feminism and positive outcomes of multiple role management. However, they demonstrate a focus on role-sharing among women which may be a way to seek positive outcome expectations for multiple role management. As noted above, such role-sharing also aligns with tenets of feminism.
Overall, there is only a modest literature illustrating the potential influence of a feminist identity on self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations and most of the reviewed research did not assess the relation of specific FIDM stages to these constructs. However, the reviewed literature highlights how aspects of a feminist identity may relate to self-efficacy expectations and positive outcome expectations. This component of the present study provided a unique combination of feminist and vocational literature that was expected to inform the present understanding of how women approach balance among their roles.

Summary

Although there are competing perspectives in literature regarding the influence of multiple roles, there is greater empirical support for the role accumulation perspective that predicts positive influence of multiple roles. Research has indicated that stress can stem from role accumulation, yet studies did not indicate significant differences between stress reported among individuals engaged in few as compared to more life roles (Pietromonaco, Manis, & Frohardt-Lane, 1986). Empirical support for the role strain perspective highlights potential strain on energy and time resources yet does not necessarily suggest a negative impact of multiple roles (Pietromonaco, Manis, & Frohardt-Lane, 1986; Verbrugge, 1983). Further, scholars have indicated that the subjective perception of ability to manage multiple roles may influence a positive or negative impact of multiple roles for an individual (Barnett & Hyde, 2001).

However, less research assessing self-efficacy for multiple role management is available in literature. Stickel and Bonnett (1991) conducted an initial study assessing self-efficacy for life roles and demonstrated that women indicated greater self-efficacy
for balancing home and family roles with traditional careers. Lefcourt (1992) extended these findings by demonstrating that women in majority female graduate programs demonstrated greater self-efficacy for multiple roles of work and home as compared to women in majority male graduate programs. Additional studies demonstrated self-efficacy and gender role attitudes predicted career aspirations, that variance in women’s psychological well-being was accounted for by self-efficacy expectations for managing multiple roles and positive outcome expectations, and that self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management were related to support from others and participants’ work culture within a sample of pregnant women (Dukstein, 1994; Gretchen-Doorly, 2005; Tal, 2006).

SCCT was used as a guiding theoretical framework in more recent studies assessing multiple role management self-efficacy. SCCT incorporates self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations as primary constructs expected to influence career goals, actions, and performance. The present study similarly incorporated SCCT as a guiding theory as it appeared that self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations were important in better understanding the positive or negative influence of multiple roles for an individual (Barnett & Hyde, 2001).

SCCT delineates that learning experiences can predict self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Therefore, two learning experiences considered relevant to self-efficacy and outcome expectations for multiple role management were proposed to influence these expectations constructs within the present study. Maternal role modeling was proposed to predict these expectations constructs based on research suggesting an influence of maternal role models on career exploration and aspirations (Otto, 2000;
Tangri, 1972; Whiston & Keller, 2004). Feminist identify was also proposed to predict self-efficacy and outcome expectations based on research indicating the influence of feminist identity as a predictor of self-esteem and self-efficacy (Eisele & Stake, 2008). Additional research indirectly suggested that incorporation of feminism within romantic relationships has been a way in which some women manage multiple roles and facilitate positive outcome expectations (Hoffnung, 2004). The present study, then, sought to further explore how a young woman’s observation of a maternal role model who managed such multiple roles as well as her feminist identity development related to her self-efficacy and outcome expectations for multiple role management. The conceptualization of this project is illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Operationalization of Social Cognitive Career Theory for Present Study

This study added to existing literature in several ways. As was evident in the literature review on multiple role management, this construct and its contributing factors...
have not been thoroughly examined. Therefore, the present study served to add to the limited existing literature on multiple role management. Additionally, as noted earlier, a close look at the previous research on self-efficacy for multiple role management, particularly studies incorporating Lefcourt’s (1995) Self-Efficacy Expectations for Role Management measure, reveals that the original measure separately assesses multiple roles. This means that earlier studies did not accurately assess the construct of interest. The present study provided a more accurate examination of self-efficacy for management of multiple roles by simultaneously assessing multiple roles with the use of a measure that specifically considers simultaneous management of multiple roles.

Although some research examining multiple roles (Gretchen-Doorly, 2005) and potential conflicts between work and family (Barnett et al., 2003; Weer et al., 2006), assessed outcome expectations, much of the management of multiple roles research only focuses on self-efficacy expectations. Indeed, overall few studies of SCCT have specifically examined outcome expectations. Therefore, the inclusion of outcome expectations as a specific construct assessed in the present study served to fill these collective gaps in the literature and addressed this important component of understanding management of multiple roles among women. Finally, although Tal (2006) assessed predictors of self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management, the majority of prior research assessing SCCT specifically targeted the variables predicted by self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Thus, the present examination of predictors of self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations provided an opportunity to examine a component of SCCT that is less frequency explored.
The incorporation of feminist identity development provided another unique component to the present research distinguishing this study from other multiple role management and SCCT studies. Two specific stages of the feminist identity development model, Passive Acceptance and Synthesis, were selected as relevant to the present project. These stages represent both the initial stage of the model in which women are expected to resist the ideals of feminism and the fourth stage in which women are expected to support and promote the ideals of feminism, respectively. Additionally, some literature suggests women support beliefs of feminism yet reject the label of a feminist. These women are categorized as egalitarian (Yoder, Tobias, & Snell, 2011; Bay-Cheng & Zucker, 2007; Zucker, 2004). Therefore, consistent with literature assessing feminism through categorization of feminists, egalitarians, and non-feminists, participants were similarly categorized in the present study.

Hypotheses

Following the framework of SCCT, it was expected that observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management and greater adoption of advanced feminist identity stage beliefs (and lesser adoption of earlier feminist identity stage beliefs) related to self-efficacy for management of multiple roles and expectations of positive outcomes for women who manage these roles. It was hypothesized that:

1. Data obtained with a sample of young women in a college setting demonstrate an adequate fit with the specified model (Figure 2).

2. The individual relationships specified between the predictors and self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations for multiple role management are supported.
Specifically:

2a. Feminist identity is related to observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management such that attitudes typical of earlier stages are related negatively and attitudes typical of later stages are related positively to effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management.

2b. Feminist identity is related to multiple role management self-efficacy such that attitudes typical of earlier stages are related negatively and attitudes typical of later stages are related positively to multiple role management self-efficacy.

2c. Observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management relates positively to multiple role management self-efficacy.

2d. Feminist identity relates to outcome expectations for multiple role management such that attitudes typical of earlier stages are related negatively and attitudes typical of later stages are related positively to outcome expectations for multiple role management.

2e. Feminist identity indirectly influences outcome expectations for multiple role management through multiple role management self-efficacy.

2f. Observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management relates positively to outcome expectations for multiple role management.

2g. Observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management indirectly influences outcome expectations for multiple role management through multiple role management self-efficacy.
2h. Observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management indirectly influences multiple role management self-efficacy and outcome expectations for multiple role management through feminist identity.

2i. Multiple role management self-efficacy relates positively to outcome expectations for multiple role management.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

The present study assessed young women’s multiple role management self-efficacy and outcome expectations through the guiding framework of SCCT (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). Participants for this study included female students enrolled in Psychology courses at a Midwestern University. Participants were recruited through advertisement on a research website run through the Department of Psychology in addition to announcements made by instructors of psychology courses. This website was available to university students enrolled in a psychology course and listed research studies with which students could elect to participate. The website directed students to informed consent and subsequently transitioned students to the study measures. Students were compensated with extra credit toward their psychology class in exchange for participation.

Following strategies described by Raykov and Marcoulides (2006), it was determined that there are 35 parameters in this model. Further, Kline (2011) recommended following a cases to parameter ratio of at least 10:1 for structural equation modeling with maximum likelihood estimation. Therefore, a minimum sample size of 350 was necessary.
A final sample of 422 women was used in data analysis. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 53 years old ($M = 21.08$, $SD = 5.00$). In terms of race, 317 (75.1%) of the women identified as White or European American, 56 (13.3%) identified as Black or African American, 15 (3.6%) identified as Asian American, 7 (1.7%) identified as Hispanic or Latin American, and 2 (.5%) women identified as American Indian or Alaskan Native. Additionally, 19 (4.5%) women identified as more than one race (e.g., Hispanic and African American). Six (1.4%) women chose not to disclose their race. Further, 393 (93.1%) of the women identified as heterosexual, 11 (2.6%) identified as homosexual, and 18 (4.3%) identified as bisexual.

Among women in the sample, 6 (1.4%) of the women were post-secondary students, 133 (31.5%) were freshmen, 103 (24.4%) were sophomores, 86 (20.4%) were juniors, 90 (21.3%) were seniors, and 4 (.9%) women reported college rank as other (e.g., 7th year in college). Additionally, majority of women in the sample identified as middle class. Specifically, 17 (4.0%) of the women identified as lower class, 112 (26.5%) identified as lower middle class, 233 (55.2%) identified as middle class, 45 (10.7%) identified as upper middle class, and 15 (3.6%) women identified as upper class.

In terms of relationships status, 1 (.2%) of the women identified as separated, 2 (.5%) identified as divorced, 23 (5.5%) identified as married or partnered, 195 (46.2%) identified as single, and 201 (47.6%) women identified as in a relationship. Further, 30 (7.1%) of the women reported having one or more child while 391 (92.7%) women reported having no children. Number of children ranged between one and four children ($M = 1.70$, $SD = .82$), and children’s ages ranged from 7 months to 27 years old ($M = \ldots$)
 Lastly, 126 (29.9%) of the women reported that they were unemployed while 296 (70.1%) women reported that they were employed.

With respect to information about participants’ mother or maternal role model, 129 (30.6%) of women reported having no siblings while 293 (69.4%) of women reported having one or more siblings. Of women with siblings, a range of one sibling to nine siblings ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 2.26$) was reported by participants.

Further, 398 (94.3%) of the women reported that their mother or maternal role model had paid employment when participants were growing up, while 24 (5.7%) of the women reported that their mother or maternal role model did not have paid employment when participants were growing up. Among participants with an employed mother or maternal role model, 218 (51.7%) of the women indicated that their mother or maternal role model had a job while 204 (48.3%) of the women indicated that their mother or maternal role model had a career.

### Measures

Measures for the present study included a demographic questionnaire, a self-efficacy for multiple role management measure modeled from the SEERM (Lefcourt, 1995), the Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale (Nauta & Kokaly, 2001), a maternal role modeling measure developed based on literature (Weer et al., 2006), the Feminist Identity Composite (Fisher et al., 2000), the Feminist Beliefs and Behavior measure (Zucker, 2004), a multiple roles outcome expectations measure developed based on literature (Fouad & Guillen, 2006; Lent & Brown, 2006), a checklist to assess participants’ identified primary role models, and an open-ended item to allow
participants an opportunity to describe concluding responses regarding witnessing maternal multiple role management.

Participants were presented with the materials in the following order: demographic questionnaire, maternal role modeling measure, the Feminist Identity Composite, the Feminist Beliefs and Behavior measure, the Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale, the developed self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management measure, the multiple roles outcome expectations measure, the primary role model checklist, and the open-ended item. The order of measures was intended to prevent the development of a priming effect for participants. That is, should participants complete the self-efficacy for multiple role management measure initially, that experience may influence subsequent completion of the other measures in a manner that may differ from responses provided without consideration for roles and management of multiple roles.

Demographic Questionnaire

Each participant was asked to complete a demographic questionnaire. Questions on the questionnaire provided information regarding gender, race, age, year in college, relationship status, sexual orientation, social class, number of children, and current employment status.

Feminist Identity Composite

To assess participant feminist identity, the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC) was included in the stimulus materials. As noted previously, items specifically assessing stages 1 (Passive Acceptance) and 4 (Synthesis) were of interest in the present study. Fisher et al. (2000) developed the FIC by combining two previously developed feminist
identity measures, the Feminist Identity Scale (Rickert, 1987) and the Feminist Identity Development Scale (Bargad & Hyde, 1991).

Rickard (1987) developed the first measure assessing feminist identity development, the Feminist Identity Scale (FIS). Although information regarding the initial item development was not provided, psychometric information for this measure was available. Test-retest reliability over a three week period was demonstrated as follows for the first four stages of the model, .93 for Passive Acceptance level, .90 for Revelation level, .84 for Embeddedness-Emanation level, and .83 for the Synthesis level (Rickard, 1987 as cited in Rickard, 1989). This author later concluded the fifth stage of FIDM appeared to be a behavioral manifestation of stage four (Rickard, 1990).

In an effort to develop an additional measure, the Feminist Identity Development Scale (FIDS), was based on the original feminist development model. Bargad and Hyde (1991) conducted an initial factor analysis of developed measures and their relation to FIDM as part of the measure development process. Study one of this process included 156 female, Introduction to Psychology undergraduate students from a Midwestern university. Items were developed by female faculty and graduate students based on the different stages of FIDM. Forty items per stage were developed and further evaluated for repetitiveness and ambiguity. One hundred and sixty three items were retained and evaluated for face validity by ten female faculty and graduate students with expertise in psychology and/or women’s studies. Ninety items were retained and re-examined by the previous reviewers for redundancy, ambiguity and alignment with the five stages of FIDM, resulting in a final set of 73 items. The remaining items were placed in a five-point Likert scale format ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Groups
ranging from ten to 20 participants completed the measure at a given time period, and 50 of the initial 156 participants completed the measure approximately one week following initial completion of the measure to evaluate test-retest reliability.

Participant responses were subjected to factor analysis, and results revealed a five factor structure comprised of 41 items mirroring the five stages of FIDM. Additionally, Bargad and Hyde (1991) concluded that the developed measure directly reflects the identified FIDM provided by Downing and Roush (1985). However, it should be noted many items written for the Synthesis subscale of FIDS loaded highly on the Active Commitment subscale, and the reliability for this fourth subscale was somewhat low.

Although Rickard (1989) exhibited skepticism about stage five of FIDM and Bargad and Hyde (1991) highlighted some problems with the Synthesis and Active Commitment subscales, Fisher et al. (2000) concluded that these last two stages of the model are actually separate as evidenced by nonsignificant correlations between the two stages. As part of their examination into the validity of FIDS and FIS, Fisher et al. (2000) had raters read the original Downing and Roush (1985) article and complete a content analysis of items from both measures via assigning items to the correct FIDM stage.

Results for the FIDS analysis indicated an 85% to 97% hit rate among the five judges and a 92% hit rate overall. The FIS analysis indicated a 78% to 89% hit rate among the five judges with a 82% hit rate overall. Due to psychometric problems demonstrated in prior research incorporating these scales (low alphas for some subscales, hit rates lower than 60% for some items) Fisher et al. (2000) considered combining items from these independent measures to develop a more psychometrically sound measure.
These authors also provided data supporting the use of a combined FIS and FIDS measure entitled the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC).

The FIC consists of 33 items, 20 items from the original Feminist Identity Scale and 13 items from the original Feminist Identity Development Scale. Problematic items from both measures were eliminated in an effort to create a stronger measure overall. Specifically, items had to meet the following criteria to be included, corrected item-total correlations had to be greater than correlations with other scales, corrected item-total correlations had to be .30 or higher, a highest factor loading of $\geq |.40|$ on the factor that reflected positive or negative loading of characteristics related to the feminist identity level of the original item, and items had to earn a hit rate of 60% or greater across the five judges. Thus, a total of 33 items are included in the measure that assesses the five scales. Specifically, the scale is comprised of seven Passive Acceptance items, eight Revelation items, four Embeddedness-Emanation items, five Synthesis items, and nine Active Commitment items.

The Feminist Identity Composite incorporates a five point Likert scale with response options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher mean scores signify greater agreement with the given feminist identity stage. An example of an item assessing the first stage (Passive Acceptance) is: “I think that men and women had it better in the 1950s when married women were housewives and their husbands supported them.” An example of an item assessing the fourth stage (Synthesis) is: “I enjoy the pride and self-assurance that comes from being a strong female.”

Fisher et al. (2000) reported that confirmatory factor analysis performed on this composite measure provided a five factor solution aligning with the five stages of the
model. Further, 97% of items aligned with intended subscales and 36% of the total item variance was accounted for by the measure. Strong internal consistency was established as evidenced by Cronbach’s alphas of .77, .80, .84, .68, and .77 for the five successive stages of the feminist identity development model. Moradi and Subich (2002) conducted further analyses on the three developed feminist identity development measures and internal consistency for the Feminist Identity Composite was demonstrated with alphas of .74, .76, .84, .73, and .77 for each successive stage of the feminist identity development model. Yakushko (2007) demonstrated similar psychometric properties with coefficients ranging from .68 for Synthesis and .90 for the Embeddedness-Emanation stages. Test-retest reliabilities after a two week period were described as acceptable for all stages of the model except the Active Commitment stage, a stage that has consistently produced results suggesting it may not be reliable. Internal consistency was demonstrated within the present study with alphas of .74, .78, .84, .79, and .87 for each successive stage of the feminist identity development model.

Feminist Beliefs and Behavior

To augment the FIC, Zucker’s (2004) Feminist Beliefs and Behavior measure was included in the stimulus materials. These items were developed to more closely examine feminist identity level. This measure combines beliefs about feminism with behavioral assessment of accepting the feminist label. This results in the classification of respondents into three groups, nonfeminists, egalitarians, and feminists, with egalitarians representing respondents who align with feminist beliefs but resist the feminist label.

The measure is comprised of three items specifically assessing core beliefs of feminism which were developed following a thorough review of feminism literature.
A sample item is, “Women and men should be paid equally for the same work.” These three items are presented with a yes or no response format. This is followed by a behavioral task that requires participants to self-label as feminists or nonfeminists. Specifically, a statement is provided explaining that there are two versions of the subsequent question set and the specific questions presented are based on whether participants identify as feminists. This is followed by a request to respond to a series of subsequent questions if participants identify as feminists or skip to a separate series of questions if participants do not identify as feminists. This decision made by participants represents self-labeling as a feminist. The actual questions in the set are fillers and all participants are asked to respond to the same question set. A sample item in the set is, “How many hours are you enrolled in this semester?” Responses are categorized with feminists representing participants who self-label as a feminist and endorse all belief items, egalitarians are those who self-label as a non-feminist and endorse all belief items, and non-feminists as those who deny at least one belief item and self-label as a nonfeminist.

Several studies have incorporated this measure as part of their methodology and have demonstrated data for its validity. Zucker (2004) reported 45% of participants were categorized as feminists, 31% of participants were categorized as egalitarians, and 24% of participants were categorized as nonfeminists among a sample of 272 women. Feminists scored significantly higher on measures of feminist attitudes and behaviors as compared to egalitarians and nonfeminists, and being a feminist was a significant positive predictor of feminist activism, $R^2 = .23, p < .001$. Yoder, Tobias and Snell (2011) demonstrated similar results among a separate female sample of feminists (18%).
egalitarians (48%), and nonfeminists (71%). That is, feminists reported significantly more feminist activism ($M=1.64$) than did nonfeminists ($M=.39$) and egalitarians ($M=.35$), $p < .05$. Among the 422 participants in the present study, 102 (24.2%) of women were categorized as feminists, 150 (35.5%) of women were categorized as egalitarians, and 129 (30.6%) of women were categorized as nonfeminists. Thus, majority of women within the sample endorsed the beliefs consistent with feminist identity yet refrained from actively self-labeling as feminist, resulting in an egalitarian label.

Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale

The subjective influence of the young woman’s maternal role model was assessed using the Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale (IOACDS; Nauta & Kokaly, 2001). This information was used as background information to provide a more comprehensive understanding of whether participants viewed maternal role models as influential and assisting with academic and career decisions; this measure does not assess maternal role modeling of multiple role management. Therefore, data from this measure was not used as the primary assessment of maternal role modeling of multiple role management within the present study.

The IOACDS is intended to evaluate the influence of role models on academic and vocational decisions made by participants. This measure was developed to specifically assess the influence of role models on the academic and vocational decision-making of young adults. For the purposes of the present study, the measure was slightly modified to specifically assess how influential was one’s mother on one’s academic and vocational decision-making. This involved the specification of mother in the item
prompts of the measure as compared to the original item prompts that do not specify specific individuals as having influence on this decision-making. An example of a modified sample item is, “My mother is someone I can count on to be there if I need support when I make academic or career choices.”

Nauta and Kokaly (2001) developed the IOACDS to assess how role models influence career development among young people. Through a series of four studies, a final 15 item measure was developed. The items were initially generated by university students through a process that initially asked students to identify role models in their lives and subsequently to spend one minute to determine how these role models had influenced academic and career decisions and three minutes to write about this influence. Responses were coded by two undergraduate research assistants and categorized among 13 categories. Responses were coded based on content provided in response to how role models had influenced academic and career decision (e.g., gives advice, inspires) with kappa inter-rater agreement statistic of .64. Discrepancies were resolved by the first author of the study. Five frequently used categories among the 13 were identified (family members, peers, teachers/advisors/coaches, famous people/characters, others) and items were developed based on these categories. This resulted in seven items per category with a total of 35 items generated.

The items for the IOACDS were subsequently examined to explore their reliability and validity. Six months following the original study, 190 different students were recruited to complete the 35 item measure. Exploratory factor analysis of the collected data demonstrated an interpretable two factor solution. Factor one was identified as a support/guidance factor and accounted for 34% of the variance following
oblique rotation. A second inspiration/modeling factor accounted for 26% of the variance. These factors were correlated moderately with each other ($r = .51, p < .001$).

The final version of the measure included eight items with the highest factor loadings from factor one and seven items with the highest factor loadings from factor two.

The factor structure of the revised IOACDS was analyzed in a separate study using a sample of different participants from the previous two studies. Additionally, the Social Provisions Scale (Cutrona & Russell, 1987), and the short form (Reynolds, 1982) of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Marlow-Crowne, 1960) were completed by participants to assess validity of the IOACDS. Data confirmed the two factor structure previously identified with the support/guidance factor accounting for 37% of the variance and the inspiration/modeling factor accounting for 20% of the variance. The two factors were correlated, $r = .41, p < .001$. Cronbach’s alphas for each subscale and the total scale were high and ranged from .87 to .91. A significant relationship between the two factors and the Social Provisions Scale was illustrated with a stronger relationship, $r = .51$, identified between the support/guidance factor and this measure than the inspiration/modeling factor and this measure. The authors argued this provided additional evidence of convergent validity between the support/guidance factor and the measure. No significant correlations were identified between the factors and the social desirability scale, providing some evidence to support discriminant validity.

A final study was conducted to verify the measure’s factor structure through confirmatory factor analysis, to provide further evidence of validity for the measure, and to evaluate subscale score validity over time. A different sample of 183 university students completed the IOACDS, the vocational identity and occupational information
scales of the My Vocational Situation measure (Holland, Daiger, & Power, 1980), and the Career Decision Scale (Osipow, Carney, Winer, Yanico, & Koschier, 1976). The entire sample was called 10 weeks following the initial completion of the measures and invited to take the IOACDS for extra credit. Confirmatory factor analysis with the subscales serving as latent variables suggested the presence of two factors, support/guidance and inspiration/modeling, that demonstrated a good fit, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .07, and CFI = .93. Test-retest reliability over the 10 week period was illustrated by coefficients of .71, .78, and .80, $ps < .001$ for factor 1, factor 2 and the total scale, respectively. Convergent validity was demonstrated by significant positive relationships between the occupational information subscale of the My Vocational Situation and the certainty subscale of the Career Decision Scale and significant negative relationships between the two IOACDS subscales and the indecisions subscale of the Career Decision Scale.

The final version of the measure, then, includes 15 items and asks participants to respond to question prompts with agreement or disagreement across a five point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Greater scores represent greater presence and influence of role models for the participant’s academic and career decisions. Negative worded items are recoded, and scores are determined for each of the individual scales. Scores are subsequently summed to determine a total scale score ranging from 15 to 75. A sample item consists of agreement or disagreement that, “There is someone I am trying to be like in my academic or career pursuits.” Internal consistency was demonstrated within the present study with an alpha of .73 for the support/guidance
subscale and an alpha of .84 for the inspiration/modeling subscale. The full scale yielded an alpha of .85.

**Maternal Role Modeling Measure**

Consistent with measurement of the influence of maternal employment on variables in other studies, maternal employment was assessed with stimulus questions. (Bub & McCartney, 2004; Gupta, 2006; Riggio & Desrochers, 2006; Weer et al., 2006). That is, no developed measure assessing maternal employment was identified during the literature review and as such, questions for the present study were developed based on the stimulus items used in other studies of maternal modeling of multiple role management. These items specifically assess behavioral aspects of maternal employment which are expected to relate to the identification with feminist identity, self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management, and outcome expectations for multiple role management.

These items included assessment of maternal employment (mother or maternal role model had paid employment or did not have paid employment), assessment of paid employment as full-time (40 or more hours a week) or part-time (less than 40 hours a week), assessment of mother or maternal role model effectively managing multiple roles (disagreement or agreement of management of multiple roles well across a 5 point Likert scale), assessment of participant interest in managing multiple roles similarly to their observation of maternal multiple role management (interest in performing dissimilarly or similarly to maternal management of multiple roles across a 5 point Likert scale), and assessment of participant age periods when mother or maternal role model worked, including birth to 12 years old, 13 years old to 18 years old, and birth to 18 years old, which were subsequently collapsed to include part of one’s life or all of one’s life. It has
been suggested that maternal employment may vary during these developmental periods of a child’s life and multiple role management may be more difficult as one’s children are in earlier developmental periods. Similarly, full time employment would be expected to be associated with greater work related demands and as such, it may result in greater obstacles to multiple role management as compared to part time employment and unemployment. These responses were included as indices assessing the latent variable of maternal role modeling of multiple role management in the structural equation analysis.

Additional screening items were included to verify that participants had a mother or maternal role model, assessment of this individual’s paid employment as a job or a career (Blustein et al., 2011), indication of percentage of time one’s mother or maternal role model dedicated to mother, partner, and worker roles, and indication of percentage of time participants dedicated or expected to dedicate to mother, partner, and worker roles (Kerpelman & Schvaneveldt, 1999).

**Self-Efficacy Expectations for Multiple Role Management Measure**

To assess participants’ self-efficacy for management of multiple roles, a measure modeled after Lefcourt’s (1995) SEERM measure was completed by participants. As described by Lent and Brown (2006), development of measures to assess components of SCCT is common based on the specific, individualized types of self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations that studies desire to assess. Lefcourt’s original measure was developed to examine the confidence among women to complete various tasks encompassed in multiple roles taken on by women, including worker, parent, spouse/partner, self, and home caretaker. It consisted of 150 items developed through
preliminary analyses among female graduate students and was subsequently modified for use among general samples of women (Lefcourt, 1995).

The original development of this measure consisted of identifying statements addressing situations and tasks that may influence conflict among dual-career women. In total, 69 statements were developed from literature addressing intrarole and interrole conflict and dual-career family dilemma. In the second draft of the measure, an additional 81 statements were added based on suggestions received from a pilot study incorporating a sample of female graduate students and working women. These statements were divided among 12 sections in the measure with three basic themes of conflicts occurring within a given role, conflicts occurring between roles, and multiple role conflicts in general. Researchers reviewed this larger item pool and subsequently revised items based on suggestions provided. This measure was further revised with changes including the omission of section labels on the actual measure and the deletion of statements in the items that could confuse participants. Specifically, conditional and qualifying statements within items were omitted.

In this measure, however, there is a lack of simultaneous assessment of roles as the items individually assess confidence for roles and ultimately combine these ratings to provide what is claimed to be an overall assessment of self-efficacy for multiple role management. This is a limitation of the assessment of self-efficacy for multiple role management. For this reason, the actual measure used in the present study was modeled after the original SEERM but was not the actual SEERM measure.

The measure developed for the present study explored the three roles of worker, mother, and romantic partner simultaneously and incorporated tasks and situations from
the original SEERM measure. That is, participants were asked to consider being an employed mother with a romantic partner and were presented with tasks and situations related to these three roles. Participants were provided a stem of “I expect I will” and asked to indicate their confidence level for handling the specific task or situation. This provided a clearer assessment of confidence in management of multiple simultaneous roles as compared to confidence in management of numerous individual roles that the original SEERM assessed. Participants were asked to respond on a 10 point Likert scale ranging from 1 (no confidence) to 10 (complete confidence). A sample item of the measure is: “I will defer professional goals in order to devote more time to parenting responsibilities.” Scores were summed and averaged with higher scores reflecting greater self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management.

Data on Lefcourt’s (1992) measure obtained from a sample of female graduate students offers some support for the present adapted version of the measure. Psychometric data from Lefcourt's (1992) study illustrate test-retest reliability of .70 to .81 over a two week period among seven scales (homecare role, work role, parent role, spouse/partner role, and self role, multiple role conflicts, and other associated conflicts) and internal consistency was supported with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .76 to .92 among the seven scales. Construct validity was also noted through the demonstration of significant positive relationships between the scale on the measure evaluating parent roles and Amatea’s (1986) Parental Role Reward Value Scale. Among the three scales used in the present study, Cronbach’s alphas were strong with .88 for the partner role, .90 for the work role, and .93 for the parent role. The full scale yielded an alpha of .96.
Multiple Roles Outcome Expectations Measure

Lent and Brown (2006) noted that to measure person and situation-specific variables within their model, measures sometimes need to be developed by the researchers interested in those variables based on the lack of ready-made and all-purpose measures. An outcome expectations measure assessing a participant’s expectations for outcomes of managing simultaneous roles of partner, mother, and career roles was not identified. Therefore, the present measure combined pre-existing measures assessing components of expectations for these specific roles and modifying items from these measures to meet the need of the present study.

To guide development of this measure, Bandura’s (1986) suggestions for the source of outcome expectations development were included. Specifically, it has been suggested that outcome expectations stem from physical outcomes, (e.g., financial gain), social reactions (e.g., benefits to one’s family), and self-evaluation (e.g., self-approval) outcomes. Thus, items should assess these three types of outcome expectations with a combination of possible positive and negative outcome expectations included within a given measure (Fouad & Guillen, 2006; Lent & Brown, 2006).

The developed measure for the present study assesses these three types of outcome expectations and asks participants to consider these items as if they were employed mothers with a romantic partner. A literature review (Baber & Monaghan, 1988; Bridges & Etaugh, 1996; Sabatelli, 1984; Spring, Larson, Tilley, Gasser, & Quinn, 2001) of existing measures that assess the three roles of interest for the present study was conducted to identify information regarding content relevant to these three roles. Items were developed based on content gleaned from this literature. Items were developed to
incorporate a combination of positive and negative outcome expectations within the mother, partner and worker roles.

The Multiple Roles Outcome Expectations Questionnaire developed for this study consisted of 24 items assessing positive and negative outcomes of being an employed mother with a partner. Participants were instructed to consider being an employed mother with a romantic partner and one stem was incorporated, “I expect I will,” throughout the measure. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree to items within the measure. Sample items include, “I will be happy about my life,” “I will have support from my partner,” and “I will have feelings of guilt.” Participants were provided with a 10 point Likert scale with response options ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 10 (Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating greater agreement with the item. Negative worded items were recoded prior to analyses.

This measure was developed specifically for the present study, and as such there was no available psychometric information to illustrate the appropriateness of its use. However, items were derived from content included in items of other measures including the Marital Comparison Level Index (Sabatelli, 1984), the Career and Family Questionnaire (Baber and Monaghan, 1988), and the Career Outcome Expectancy Scale (Spring, Larson, Tilley, Gasser, and Quinn, 2001). Psychometric data are available for these measures. For example, internal consistency among items in the Marital Comparison Level Index was demonstrated with a coefficient alpha of .93. Construct validity was also demonstrated through positive significant relationships of .62 to .65 and .58 and .59 between items on the Marital Comparison Level Index and the relational equity and relational commitment measures, respectively. A factor analysis of items
within the Career and Family Questionnaire indicated that the child orientation factor of the Career and Family Questionnaire had factor loadings that range from .41 to .82. This factor was used to aid the development of the items assessing the mother role in the present study. Additionally, internal consistency was demonstrated for the Career Outcome Expectancy Scale through a coefficient alpha of .83 and medium to high item correlations ranging from .41 to .73. Internal consistency was demonstrated within the present study with Cronbach’s alphas of .70 for the parent role, .72 for the partner role, and .80 for the work role. The full scale yielded an alpha of .89.

**Concluding items**

Following the completion of stimulus materials, participants were asked to identify individuals in their life who represent role models and indicate the individual that serves as their primary role model. This item included a checklist response option and multiple individuals who may serve as a role model for participants. Additionally, participants were asked to provide any thoughts regarding their experience of witnessing maternal role modeling of multiple role management prior to the conclusion of the study. These concluding items served as background information within the present study.

**Analysis of Data**

Structural equation modeling was used to examine the fit of the proposed model. Prior to this analysis, data was screened to determine if missing data and outliers were present and if assumptions underlying regression were met including, normality, linearity and homoscedasticity, following the recommendation of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007).

Data screening procedures were followed by calculation of descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation as well as internal consistency reliabilities and
intercorrelations of variables. Additionally, structural equation modeling was used to assess the measurement model of the measured variables and their latent variables. Latent variables represent a given construct and are measured by specific indicators in a model (Muthen, 2002). In total, five items assessing maternal work history were assigned to the maternal role modeling latent variable and sixteen items assessing participants’ identification as a feminist, assessing acceptance of the feminist label, and assessing feminist identity level were assigned to the feminist identity development latent variable. Twenty five items from the Self-Efficacy Expectations for Multiple Role Management Measure were assigned to the self-efficacy for multiple role management latent variable, and 24 items from the Multiple Role Management Outcome Expectations Measure were assigned to the outcome expectations for multiple role management latent variable.

Subsequently, the fit between the data collected and the proposed model was assessed. Using M Plus 7.1 software (Muthen & Muthen, 2013), maximum likelihood estimation procedures were completed. In particular, data was assessed for fit in which observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management influenced feminist identity and multiple role management self-efficacy; feminist identity influenced observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management, multiple role management self-efficacy, and outcome expectations for multiple role management; and, multiple role management self-efficacy influenced outcome expectations for multiple role management. Item parceling was completed for indicators of multiple role management self-efficacy and outcome expectations for multiple role management to strengthen accuracy of these parameter estimates within the model (Hall, Snell, & Foust, 1999). Additionally, the chi-square significance test, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI),
the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) were evaluated.

Final analyses included bootstrapping to assess for the proposed indirect effects. As described by Kline (2011), bootstrapping is a computer-based re-sampling method in which new data sets are created when randomly selected data within a sample are replaced. Therefore, bootstrapping simulates drawing many random samples from a population. An indirect effect is considered statistically significant when confidence intervals exclude zero (Shrout & Bolger, 2002).

A macro for SPSS software created by Preacher and Hayes (2008) facilitated bootstrapping analyses in the present study. This macro allows researchers to request the execution of total or indirect effects using the bootstrapping method within a confidence level of their choice. This macro was accessed for current analyses. Specifically, the macro was run within SPSS (20.0) software. This included the execution of syntax specific to the variables with proposed indirect effects in the present study. The generation of numerous path estimates (e.g., 1,000) was specified within the macro, and these paths were subsequently multiplied to achieve an indirect effect with a 95% confidence interval.

Bootstrapping procedures in the present study tested indirect effects of observed effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management on multiple role management self-efficacy and outcome expectations for multiple role management through feminist identity. The indirect influence of feminist identity on outcome expectations for multiple role management through multiple role management self-efficacy was tested. Additionally, the re-sampling procedure tested indirect effects of
observed effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management on outcome expectations for multiple role management through multiple role management self-efficacy.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The present study was made available online to students at a Midwestern University, and a total of 508 surveys were accessed by students. Instructions indicated that female participants were invited to complete the study, yet 38 male participants completed the study. Therefore, survey responses from male participants were removed from the data set. Of the 470 remaining participants, 34 participants did not complete the entire survey packet. This group of participants included 11 participants with more than 5% of items missing from a given measure. The remaining participants skipped multiple pages of the study, responded to each item with the same response throughout the entire study, or terminated participation prior to completing the study. Therefore, survey responses from these 34 participants were removed from the data set. Four women were less than 18 years old, and their responses were removed from the data set. Data from an additional eight participants were removed from the data set because they did not endorse the screening question of having a mother or maternal role model. This resulted in a total of 424 surveys within the data set.

Missing Data

The data set was further assessed to identify missing data. Cases with more than 5% of missing data from a given measure were removed. This resulted in a final data set
with less than 5% of missing data. Specifically, a total of 115 data points were left blank by participants. Of the 115 data points, 50 data points were not used in the primary analyses. Specifically, these 50 data points were items within the Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale (IOACDS) and the Revelation, Embeddedness-Emanation, and Active Commitment stages of the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC) which were not used in primary analyses. Therefore, a total of 65 data points were missing from the primary analyses. These data points were replaced with the overall mean from a participant’s available data for the measure to which the data point belonged as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007).

Data Screening

Data were subsequently screened using SPSS (20.0) to assess normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity and to determine if outliers were present within the data set. Tabachnick and Fidel (2007) suggested the use of graphical methods to determine normality for data sets with large sample sizes (e.g., greater than 200 participants). This recommendation is based on the likelihood that standard error for skewness and kurtosis will decrease with the increase of participants. Assessment of graphical methods indicated no large deviations from normality. Specifically, histograms, normal probability plots, and residual plots were created and assessed. Histograms were plotted on a near normal curve and indicated near normal distribution. Normal probability plots illustrated that values lined up along the diagonal and suggested linearity. Plots of residuals indicated error variance was constant with varying values of predictor variables and suggested homoscedasticity.
The presence of outliers was assessed by reviewing standardized residuals, Leverage, Cook’s D, and Mahalanobis Distance. Pedhazur and Schmelkin (1991) noted that standardized residuals greater than 2.0 represent outliers. Standardized residuals within the dataset ranged from -1.72 to 1.79 (\(M = .00, \ SD = .99\)), suggesting that no outliers were present within the data set. D’Agostino and Stephens (1986) cautioned that Leverage values greater than .08 should be removed from data. The data set did not indicate violation of this guideline as the largest Leverage value within the dataset was .02. D’Agostino and Stephens (1986) also reported that a Cook’s D value greater than 1.0 should be removed from the data set. Assessment of the data set indicated that the largest Cook’s D value for the measures was .02. Therefore, the data set met this specified guideline.

Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) stated that a significant Mahalanobis Distance within a chi-square distribution should be considered an outlier. Therefore, the data set was assessed for the presence of a significant Mahalanobis Distance. It was determined that two cases within the data set included a significant Mahalanobis Distance with \(p < .001\).

Further analyses of these cases were run to determine how these cases deviated from the remaining data set. The first case demonstrated a significantly different score on the IOACDS, The Multiple Role Management Outcome Expectations Questionnaire (MRMOE), the Self-Efficacy Expectations for Multiple Role Management Measure (SEEMRM), as well as the Passive Acceptance, Embeddedness-Emanation, and Synthesis stages of the FIC. The second case demonstrated a significantly different score on the MRMOE, the SEEMRM, and on the Inspiration/Modeling subscale of the
IOACDS. Following recommendations of Tabachnick and Fidell (2007), these two cases, which did not appear to be representative of the population of interest, were removed from the data set. This resulted in a final data set of 422 participants.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were run on the respecified measures within the SPSS (20.0) system. Specifically, means, standard deviations, and internal consistency reliabilities were computed and are included in Table 1. Coefficient alphas among the scales included in the study ranged from .71 to .96 and were comparable to reliability coefficients reported by other researchers. The stages of the FIC demonstrated internal consistency with alphas of .74, .71, .84, .79, and .87 for each successive stage of the feminist identity development model. Similarly, Fisher et al. (2000) reported alphas of .75, .74, .80, .75, and .84, and Moradi and Subich (2002) reported alphas of .74, .76, .84, .73, and .77, respectively for the five stages.

The coefficient alpha for the IOACDS was .85. Nauta and Kokaly (2001) reported similar yet slightly larger alphas for the IOACDS of .91, .90, .89, and .91 for the full scale across four studies. Alphas for the support/guidance subscale, .73, and inspiration/modeling subscale, .84, of the IOACDS in the present study were also somewhat lower than those previously reported. Specifically, Nauta and Kokaly (2001) reported alphas of .90, .91, .89, .94 for the support/guidance subscale and alphas of .89, .87, .87, and .91 for the inspiration/modeling subscale across four studies.

The alpha for the SEEMRM, the modified SEERM for the present study, was .96. Lefcourt (1992) reported coefficient alphas for the individual scales of the SEERM, yet psychometrics were not available for the entire measure. The three scales included in the
present modified measure, the SEEMRM, demonstrated similar alphas to those previously reported by Lefcourt (1992). That is, Lefcourt (1992) reported a range of .76 to .92 among the seven scales of the measure while alphas for work, partner, and parent roles in the modified measure were .90, .88, and .93, respectively.

The MRMOE was developed for the present study and yielded a coefficient alpha of .89. This is within the .83 to .93 range of coefficient alphas for measures modeled in the development of items for the MRMOE (Sabatelli, 1984; Spring, Larson, Tilley, Gasser, & Quinn, 2001). The three roles included in the developed measure demonstrated coefficient alphas of .70 for the parent role, .72 for the partner role, and .80 for the work role.

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations, and Alpha Coefficients for Measures Included in the Present Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance Stage of the FIC</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Stage of the FIC</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/Guidance Stage of the IOACDS</td>
<td>31.33</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiration/Modeling Stage of the IOACDS</td>
<td>21.28</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full IOACDS</td>
<td>52.61</td>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of Effective Maternal Role Modeling</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Manage Multiple Roles Similar to Mother</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEMRM</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRMOE</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (N=422 for all scales). Observation of Effective Maternal Role Modeling and Desire to Manage Multiple Roles Similar to Mother are single items within the Maternal Role Modeling measure.
The remaining descriptive statistics of the measures are reviewed prior to intercorrelations of variables. Feminist identity variables included Passive Acceptance and Synthesis stages of the FIC, which could range from 1-5. The mean Passive Acceptance stage score was 2.93, while the mean Synthesis stage score was 4.24.

The variables assessing the influence of mothers as role models include the support/guidance subscale, the inspiration/modeling subscale, and the total Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale. Scores for the subscales could range from 7-40. Scores for the total scale could range from 15-75. The mean support/guidance subscale score was 31.33. The mean inspiration/modeling subscale score was 21.28. The mean for the total scale was 52.61.

The variables assessing various aspects of multiple role management include effective observations of multiple role management, self-efficacy for multiple role management, and outcome expectations for multiple role management. Scores for the specific item assessing observation of effective multiple role management could range from 1-5, and the mean for this variable was 4.37. Scores for self-efficacy for multiple role management could range from 1-10, and the mean for this variable was 8.15. Scores for the outcome expectations for multiple role management could range from 1-10, and the mean for this variable was 7.37.

Intercorrelations of variables are included in Table 2. Using Cohen’s (1992) description of correlation criteria, correlations within the present study were determined to range from small (less than .30) to large (.50 and above), yet the majority of the correlations represented small relationships.
Table 2. Intercorrelations of Variables for Primary and Exploratory Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Passive Acceptance Stage of the FIC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Synthesis Stage of the FIC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feminist Identity</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Support/Guidance Stage of the IOACDS</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.82**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inspiration/Modeling Stage of the IOACDS</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.89**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Full IOACDS</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Observation of Effective Maternal Role Modeling</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SEEMRM</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. MRMOE</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Age</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. (N=422 for all scales). *p < .05, one-tailed, **p < .01, one-tailed. Observation of Effective Maternal Role Modeling is a single item within the Maternal Role Modeling Measure.

In addition to descriptive statistics analyses, a between subjects Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was run assessing participant race and the measures included in the present study. Participants could select from eight possible race categories when responding to demographic questions in the study and all eight race categories were included in the MANOVA analysis. Results indicated there were no significant differences between participant race and responses within the various measures used in the current study, $F(54, 2079) = 1.23$, $p > .05$. Subsequently, a second MANOVA assessing participant race and measures included in the study was run which included race categories with which a minimum of five participants identified. After eliminating race categories with less than five participants, five possible race categories remained. Results of the second MANOVA indicated there were no significant differences between
prior participant race and responses within the various measures used in the current study,

\[ F(24, 1411) = .77, \ p > .05. \]

**Analysis of the Measurement Model**

Prior to assessing the hypothesized model, analyses were completed within Mplus (7.1) software to verify the measurement model. Specifically, analyses evaluated the relationship between individual indicators and the latent constructs they were expected to represent. The measurement model included 16 indicators representing the feminist construct, five indicators representing the maternal role model construct, 25 indicators representing the self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management construct, and 24 indicators representing the multiple role management outcome expectations construct. Results indicated that some indicators significantly loaded on the latent constructs they were expected to represent while other indicators were not significant.

Analysis of the measurement model indicated all seven Passive Acceptance indicators from the FIC significantly loaded on the feminist identity construct. Three of the five Synthesis indicators from the FIC significantly loaded on the feminist identity construct. Specifically, the following Synthesis items did not significantly load on the feminist identity construct, “I have incorporated what is female and feminine into my own unique personality,” and “As I have grown in my beliefs I have realized that it is more important to value women as individuals than as members of a larger group of women.” One of the three Zucker (2004) feminist belief items significantly loaded on the feminist identity construct. The nonsignificant Zucker (2004) items included, “Women and men should be paid equally for the same work,” and “Women’s unpaid work should be more socially valued.” Lastly, the Zucker (2004) item that asked participants to accept
or reject the feminist label significantly loaded on the feminist identity construct within the measurement model.

All five indicators of the maternal role model construct were significant within the measurement model. Similarly, all 25 indicators of the SEEMRM significantly loaded on the self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management construct.

Among the 24 indicators of the MRMOE, 19 indicators significantly loaded on the multiple role management outcome expectations construct. Thus, five indicators did not significantly load on the multiple role management outcome expectations construct. The five nonsignificant indicators included, “I expect to have less privacy,” “I expect to be criticized,” “I expect to argue with my romantic partner,” “I expect to feel overloaded,” and “I expect to make mistakes.” The full measurement model is illustrated in Figure 3 below.
Figure 3. Measurement Model of Latent Constructs.

Note. (N=422). *p < .05. **p < .01
Fit indices for the measurement model were also reviewed. Good fit is demonstrated by a non-significant chi-square statistic. In addition to this statistic, it is recommended that researchers assess additional fit indices based on the sensitivity to sample size of the chi-square statistic (Kline, 2011). Therefore, the chi-square significance test, the chi-square with degrees of freedom ratio, the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Tucker Lewis Index (TLI), the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR) were evaluated.

The fit statistics for the original measurement model ranged from reasonable to poor fit. Although there is variance among structural equation model fit indices, Markland (2007) noted that SRMR and RMSEA indices should be assessed with caution given their lack of sensitivity to some types of simple structure distortion. Further, TLI and CFI have been referenced as more conservative indices of fit (Beauducel & Wittmann, 2005). Within the present study, then, multiple indices were considered; yet, TLI and CFI were more closely referenced in determining overall model fit. The various fit indices for the measurement model are reviewed below.

Specifically, the chi-squared test was significant, $X^2 = 7707.88, p < .00$. However, researchers warn that with larger sample sizes, the chi-squared test is more likely to reach significance despite other fit indices demonstrating adequate fit between a proposed model and data (Kline, 2011; Todman & Dugard, 2007). In particular, Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) noted that the chi-square test is only recommended for moderate sample sizes between 100 and 200 participants.

The ratio between the chi-square statistic and degrees of freedom was assessed as an alternative fit index. Typically, a chi-square/df ratio less than 2 suggests good fit while
a chi-square/df ratio between 2 and 5 suggests reasonable fit (Chou & Kim, 2009). The chi-squared/df ratio for the data was 3.29, indicating that the data suggested reasonable fit. The TLI and CFI can be considered with respect to perfect fit, excellent fit, adequate fit, and poor fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Both CFI and TLI measure fit of a target model against the fit of the baseline model (Geiser, 2013). Values of 1.00 for these fit indices reflect perfect fit while values of .95 or greater reflect excellent fit. Adequate fit is determined by values between .90 and .94, and poor fit is demonstrated by values equal to or less than .90. The TLI value for the proposed model was .67 and the CFI value for the proposed model was .68. Based on the above guidelines, these fit indices suggested poor fit.

SRMR and RMSEA are two final fit indices that were considered. SRMR assesses the model residuals and RMSEA measures approximate model fit (Geiser, 2013). Perfect fit between a proposed model and data is suggested when SRMR and RMSEA values are zero. Excellent fit is demonstrated when SRMR and RMSEA values are .05 or less. SRMR and RMSEA values between .06 and .10 suggest adequate model fit. Lastly, values of .10 or greater indicate poor fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999). For the present study, the SRMR value was .09 and the RMSEA value was .07, suggesting adequate fit. Within these results, CFI and TLI clearly demonstrated poor fit, and the less conservative indices yielded values that are close to the limit of the adequate fit range. These collective fit indices can be reviewed in Table 3 below.
Table 3. Goodness-of-Fit Indices for the Measurement Model

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X²</td>
<td>X²/df</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>TLI</td>
<td>SRMR</td>
<td>RMSEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7707.88</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CFI= comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR= standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA= root mean square error of approximation.

Although nonsignificant feminist identity and outcome expectations indicators were identified, particular focus was directed toward the nonsignificant feminist identity indicators. This emphasis was based on prior research questioning the construct validity of feminist identity measures (Erchull et al., 2009; Moradi & Subich, 2002) and concern that feminist identity indicators may be better represented by an alternative factor structure. Therefore, an exploratory factor analysis with oblimin rotation was completed to further explore the factor structure of individual feminist indicators. Results indicated three factors were identified, representing the original factor structure of the feminist identity indicators within the study. That is, Passive Acceptance indicators loaded on the first factor, Synthesis indicators loaded on the second factor, and Zucker’s (2004) Beliefs and Behavior indicators loaded on the third factor. The first factor explained 19.48% of variance and had an eigenvalue of 3.12. The second factor explained 17.02% of variance and had an eigenvalue of 2.72. The third factor explained 7.72% of variance and had an eigenvalue of 1.24. In total, 44% of variance was explained by the three factors. Results of the exploratory factor analysis can be found in Appendix H.

Given the measurement model results that demonstrated poor fit, particularly with respect to feminist identity indicators, it is important to consider the utility of Downing and Roush’s (1985) Feminist Identity Development Theory. Previous literature has
questioned the linear fashion with which women are expected to transition through the stages of the theory, and scholars have unveiled psychometric questions with the measures used to assess feminist identity. For example, Moradi and Subich (2002) indicated that at times correlations between adjacent stages of the model are lower than correlations between stages of the model that were not in sequential order. Researchers have cautioned that items within the Synthesis stage do not explicitly assess tenets of feminism, and this stage has been suggested as representing women in general as opposed to women identifying with facets of the Synthesis stage of the theory (Erchull et al., 2009). The results of the measurement model in the present study taken together with prior research that raised questions regarding the original Downing and Roush (1985) model suggest that a revision of the model may be merited.

Following the initial review of the measurement model, additional internal consistency analyses for the feminist identity indicators and multiple role management outcome expectations indicators were run using SPSS (20.0) software. These analyses were completed to assess if internal consistency was stronger when the nonsignificant indicators were removed. Internal consistency for all indicators of the feminist identity construct was .67 while internal consistency slightly decreased to .66 when the four nonsignificant feminist identity indicators were removed. Alternatively, internal consistency for multiple role management outcome expectations increased from .88 to .90 with the removal of the five nonsignificant indicators of the multiple role management outcome expectations construct.

Based on the internal consistency results, it was decided that the multiple role management outcome expectations construct was better represented with the removal of
the five nonsignificant indicators. However, because internal consistency for the feminist identity construct did not improve with the removal of the nonsignificant indicators, it was less clear if these indicators should be removed from the measurement model. Therefore, further analyses within the measurement model were completed to assess if the overall fit statistics indicated better fit with the inclusion of these indicators or if fit was stronger with the removal of these feminist identity construct indicators. Specifically, the measurement model was rerun with the removal of only nonsignificant feminist identity construct indicators.

The fit statistics for this modified measurement model did not change when the nonsignificant feminist identity indicators were removed. Based on these results, it was decided that all feminist identity indicators would be retained to better represent the original hypothesized model. Subsequently, the measurement model was run again with the removal of only the nonsignificant outcome expectations indicators (as had been decided based on internal consistency analyses). The fit statistics for this modified measurement model improved with the removal of the nonsignificant outcome expectations indicators. However, fit indices for the modified measurement model still ranged from adequate to poor fit. Specifically, the chi-squared test was significant, \( X^2 = 498.36, p < .00 \). The chi-squared/df ratio for the data was 4.33, indicating that the data suggested reasonable fit. The TLI value for the proposed model was .81 and the CFI value for the proposed model was .84. Based on the above guidelines, these fit indices suggested poor fit. Lastly, the SRMR value was .09 and the RMSEA value was .08, suggesting adequate fit. These results illustrate that CFI and TLI demonstrated poor fit and the less conservative indices yielded values that almost exceed adequate fit range.
Based on these findings, the five nonsignificant outcome expectations items were not included in the structural analyses. These fit statistics are included in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Goodness-of-Fit Indices for the Modified Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$X^2/df$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>498.36</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

Collectively, these results suggested that the individual indicators within the measurement model significantly loaded on the four constructs of feminist identity, maternal role modeling, self-efficacy expectations, and outcome expectations. However, fit analyses from the original measurement model and modified measurement model indicated poor fit. Given these results, the hypothesized structural model was cautiously run to assess fit with the data. It is important to note, however, that typical practice with measurement model results that suggest poor model fit would incorporate further assessment of fit of each construct, assessment of indicators that may not accurately capture a given construct, and assessment of indiscriminant items that may warrant removal (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008). Scholars emphasize the importance of considering both theoretical and statistical rationale for model changes and deletion of items within a model (Kenny, 2012; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

Tests of the Hypotheses

Structural Model Analyses

Subsequently, final calculations were completed for the structural equation model analysis. Because it had been determined that the self-efficacy expectations and outcome
expectations measures would be parcelled, it was decided that items that similarly assess a variable within a construct (e.g., Passive Acceptance within the feminist identity construct) would be parcelled to be consistent within analyses.

Item parceling is an item aggregation strategy and is suggested to increase chances of model identification, increase chances of proper solutions, and assist in determining latent errors (Hall, Snell, & Foust, 1999). Further, it was noted that item parceling can increase the reliability of the indicators within structural equation models. Hall, Snell, and Foust (1999) encouraged researchers to parcel items into three to four indicators per latent construct. Further, there are multiple recommendations within statistical literature regarding how to parcel items together. Among these recommendations, researchers are encouraged to complete analyses to determine the factor structure of a measure and parcel items together that represent similar facets of a construct or similar content within an overall measure (Hall, Snell, & Foust, 1999; Holt, 2004; Nasser & Takahashi, 2003). The SEEMRM represented an identified factor structure established through prior factor analyses completed by Lefcourt (1992). As such, items associated with the individual scales of partner, parent, and work roles were parcelled accordingly into three item parcels, meeting the above noted guidelines for item parceling.

The MRMOE was developed for the purposes of the present study. Therefore, empirical data determining the factor structure of the measure were not available. Within recommendations for practice, Hall, Snell, and Foust (1999) suggested completion of a factor analysis of items to identify between two to four factors. Items with higher loadings on the same factor should be incorporated into the same item parcel. Therefore,
items of the MRMOE were included in a principal components exploratory factor analysis with oblimin rotation. Examination of the scree plot suggested three factors, consistent with the original creation of items representing three roles of parent, partner, and worker. Further, the first factor explained 38% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 9.12. Factor loadings for the first factor ranged from .42 to .89. The second factor explained 14.2% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 3.41. Factor loadings for the second factor ranged from .45 to .77. The third factor explained 5.36% of the variance with an eigenvalue of 1.29. Factor loadings for the third factor ranged from .79 to .84. Thus, a total of 58% of the variance was explained by the three factors.

In addition to the above analyses, items were assessed for content similarity, particularly regarding their development to represent three constructs of parent, partner, and worker. That is, items assessing a similar role within the MRMOE were considered as the three item parcels were created. Items corresponding to the three factors were subsequently aggregated to yield three item parcels for the MRMOE based on both the exploratory factor analysis and content similarity. Specific results of the exploratory factor analysis can be found in Appendix I.

The Passive Acceptance and Synthesis stages of the FIC were parceled separately based on content similarity. The Zucker (2004) belief items were also parceled. Collectively, then, there was a total of three indicators for the feminist identity construct in the structural model. All five original indicators for the maternal role modeling construct were retained, but these items were not parceled as they independently assessed different aspects of the maternal role modeling construct.
The structural model was run using maximum likelihood estimation procedures within Mplus (7.1) software. Results indicated poor fit between the model and data. Specifically, the chi-squared test was significant, $X^2 = 391.38$, $p < .00$. The chi-squared/$df$ ratio for the data was 5.36, indicating that the data suggested poor fit. The TLI value for the proposed model was .83, and the CFI value for the proposed model was .87. These fit indices suggested poor fit. The SRMR value was .09, suggesting adequate fit. However, the RMSEA value was .10, indicating poor fit. Collectively, then, the first hypothesis for the present study was not supported. These fit statistics are included in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Goodness-of-Fit Indices for the Structural Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$X^2$ /df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>391.38</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation.

Further, the first listed indicators for the maternal role modeling, self-efficacy expectations, and outcome expectations constructs were automatically fixed to 1.00 by Mplus software. The first feminist indicator was freed following recommendations from Muthen and Muthen (2012), to assist in the model running normally. Results indicated that the parceled Synthesis indicator did not significantly load on the feminist construct. All five indicators of the maternal role modeling construct were significant. Similarly, all indicators for the self-efficacy expectations construct and outcome expectations construct were significant.
In terms of the paths within the model, three of the four paths within the model indicated significance. Specifically, the paths between feminist identity and self-efficacy expectations, feminist identity and outcome expectations, and self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations were significant. The paths between feminist identity and self-efficacy expectations as well as self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations were in the expected direction. The path between feminist identity and outcome expectations was not in the expected direction. The fourth path between maternal role modeling and self-efficacy expectations was not significant despite demonstrating a coefficient comparable to other path coefficients within the model. A possible explanation for this finding reflects the nature of the maternal role modeling construct. The combination of dichotomous items and Likert items used to measure the construct may not have fully represented the maternal role modeling construct.

Additional model results included a significant correlation between feminist identity and maternal role modeling that was in the expected direction. Although literature specifically assessing the relationship between feminist identity and role modeling of mothers was not identified, the significant relationship between the feminist identity and maternal role modeling constructs was consistent with expectations within the present study. That is, feminist identity and maternal role modeling were expected to serve as contextual influences that relate and collectively contribute to one’s learning experiences. Lastly, consistent with the original SCCT model (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994), the self-efficacy expectations construct was a significant predictor of the outcome expectations construct. The model is displayed in Figure 4 below.
Hypothesis two was subdivided into sections representing various predicted relationships between constructs within the study. The intercorrelations within the dataset that reflect individual relationships included in Hypothesis two are described below.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 2a that feminist identity related to the single item assessing observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management. Earlier stages of feminist identification were predicted to negatively relate to observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management and later stages were
predicted to positively relate to observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management. Results indicated that these relationships were not significant.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 2b that feminist identity related to multiple role management self-efficacy. Earlier stages of feminist identification were expected to negatively relate to multiple role management self-efficacy and later stages were expected to positively relate to multiple role management self-efficacy. Results indicated that these relationships were significant. The early Passive Acceptance stage of feminist identity did not negatively relate to multiple role management self-efficacy ($r = .18$). The later Synthesis stage of feminist identity positively related to multiple role management self-efficacy ($r = .31$) as predicted. Thus, this hypothesis was partially supported.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 2c that the single item assessing observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management positively related to multiple role management self-efficacy. This relationship was not significant.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 2d that feminist identity related to outcome expectations for multiple role management. Earlier stages of feminist identification were expected to negatively relate to outcome expectations for multiple role management and later stages were expected to positively relate to outcome expectations for multiple role management. One of these relationships was significant. Specifically, the early Passive Acceptance stage of feminist identity did not represent a significant, negative relationship with outcome expectations ($r = .07$) as predicted. However, the later Synthesis stage of feminist identity did represent a significant, positive relationship with outcome expectations for multiple role management ($r = .34$) as predicted. Therefore, this hypothesis was partially supported.
Hypothesis 2e proposed an indirect effect of feminist identity on multiple role management outcome expectations through multiple role management self-efficacy expectations. The Synthesis stage of the FIC, representing greater feminist identification within the feminist identity development model, was used as the feminist identity variable within this analysis. The bootstrapping resampling procedure incorporated the generation of 1,000 paths which were multiplied to provide a mean indirect effect of .43 and a standard error of the mean effect of .07. The 95% confidence interval for this proposed indirect effect was .28 for the lower limit and .61 for the upper limit. Shrout and Bolger’s (2002) guidelines suggest that this indirect effect is significant as zero is not included in the confidence interval. Therefore, this hypothesis was supported.

It was predicted in Hypothesis 2f that observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management positively related to outcome expectations for multiple role management. However, this relationship was not significant.

Hypothesis 2g proposed an indirect effect of observation of effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management on outcome expectations for multiple role management through multiple role management self-efficacy expectations. Completion of the bootstrapping procedure resulted in a mean indirect effect of .05 and a standard error of the mean indirect effect of .04. The 95% confidence interval for this proposed indirect effect was -.03 for the lower limit and .14 for the upper limit. This confidence interval included zero, suggesting that the predicted indirect effect was not statistically significant. Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis 2h predicted an indirect effect of observed effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management on multiple role management self-efficacy
expectations through feminist identity. The Synthesis stage of the FIC was used to capture feminist identity. Completion of the bootstrapping procedure resulted in a mean indirect effect of .02 with a standard error of the mean effect of .03. Bootstrapping resulted in a 95% confidence interval of -.03 for the lower limit and .07 for the upper limit. Because this confidence interval included zero, it was determined the indirect effect was not significant.

An indirect effect of observed effective maternal role modeling of multiple role management on outcome expectations for multiple role management through feminist identity was also proposed. The bootstrapping procedure was run with the FIC Synthesis variable representing feminist identification. Bootstrapping analyses resulted in a mean indirect effect of .01 with a standard error of the mean effect of .01. The 95% confidence interval yielded -.02 for the lower limit and .04 for the upper limit, indicating the indirect effect was not significant. Therefore, the two proposed indirect effects within Hypothesis 2h were not supported.

Hypothesis 2i predicted that multiple role management self-efficacy positively related to outcome expectations for multiple role management. Results indicated a large, significant relationship ($r = .76$) between multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations for multiple role management.

Exploratory Analyses

Following primary structural equation model analyses, exploratory analyses were completed. Initially, modification indices were referenced to determine how model fit may be improved with the addition or removal of paths or variables within the model. Within the original model, error terms for the item assessing the degree to which
maternal role models managed multiple roles well and the item assessing the extent to which participants would like to similarly manage multiple roles suggested overlap. Therefore, the item assessing the extent to which participants would like to similarly manage multiple roles was removed from the model. This was the only modification made to the model.

The respecified structural model was run using maximum likelihood estimation procedures within Mplus (7.1) software. Results indicated improved fit with fit indices within the adequate fit range. Specifically, the chi-squared test was significant, $X^2 = 231.73$, $p < .00$. The chi-squared/$df$ ratio for the data was 3.79, indicating that the data suggested adequate fit. The TLI value for the respecified model was .90, and the CFI value for the proposed model was .92. These fit indices suggested adequate fit. The SRMR and RMSEA values were .08, suggesting adequate fit. These fit statistics are included in Table 6 below.

Table 6. Goodness-of-Fit Indices for the Respecified Structural Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$X^2$/df</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>231.73</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CFI= comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR= standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA= root mean square error of approximation.

The first listed indicators for the maternal role modeling, self-efficacy expectations, and outcome expectations constructs were automatically fixed to 1.00 by Mplus software. The first feminist indicator was freed following recommendations from Muthen and Muthen (2012), to assist in the model running normally. Results indicated that the Synthesis indicator did not significantly load on the feminist construct. Four of
the five indicators of the maternal role modeling construct were significant. The indicator assessing the degree to which maternal role models managed multiple roles well was not significant. All indicators for the self-efficacy expectations construct and outcome expectations construct were significant.

Similar to the results of the original structural model, three of the four paths within the model indicated significance. Specifically, the paths between feminist identity and self-efficacy expectations, feminist identity and outcome expectations, and self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations were significant. The paths between feminist identity and self-efficacy expectations as well as self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations were in the expected direction. The path between feminist identity and outcome expectations was not in the expected direction. The fourth path between maternal role modeling and self-efficacy expectations was not significant. Additionally, model results included a significant correlation between feminist identity and maternal role modeling that was in the expected direction. The model is displayed in Figure 5 below.
Figure 5. Respecified Structural Model for Hypothesized Relationships among Constructs

Note. (N=422). *p < .05. **p < .01.

A second respecified model was run to better understand the maternal role modeling construct. Although the five individual indicators significantly loaded on the maternal role modeling construct, correlations run between the item assessing observation of effective maternal role modeling and self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations were not significant. To further understand these relationships, the five maternal role modeling items were regressed on self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Regression analyses indicated the items were not significantly related to self-efficacy expectations.
Similarly, the items were not significant predictors when regressed on outcome expectations. These results can be found in Tables 7 and 8 below.

Table 7. Maternal Role Modeling Items Regressed on Self-Efficacy Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Work Status</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full or Part Time Work</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age When Mom Worked</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Mom Managed Multiple Roles</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Replicate Mom’s Multiple Roles</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $p > .05$ for above results.

Table 8. Maternal Role Modeling Items Regressed on Outcome Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Work Status</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full or Part Time Work</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child’s Age When Mom Worked</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Mom Managed Multiple Roles</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to Replicate Mom’s Multiple Roles</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $p > .05$ for above results.

After considering these results and recognizing the absence of an identified and validated measure used in similar studies to assess maternal role modeling (Barnett et al., 2003; Weer et al., 2006), it was determined that the validated Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions scale (IOACDS) could serve as an alternative indicator to assess maternal role modeling within the structural model. In particular, descriptive statistics indicated modest significant relationships ranging from .15 to .23 between the two subscales of the IOACDS and self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. As such, indicators were created based on the support/guidance and inspiration/modeling
subscales within the measure. Items within these scales were parceled to be consistent with other indicators within the structural model, resulting in two maternal role modeling parcels for the second respecified structural model. There were no additional respecifications made within the structural model.

This second respecified structural model was run using maximum likelihood estimation procedures within Mplus (7.1) software. Results indicated improved fit, particularly with respect to the more conservative CFI and TLI indices. Moreover, all paths within the second respecified structural model were significant. The chi-squared test was significant, \( X^2 = 221.16, p < .00 \). The chi-squared/\( df \) ratio for the data was 5.52, indicating that the data suggested poor fit. The TLI value for the second respecified model was .89, and the CFI value was .92. The TLI value was in the range of poor fit yet was closer to adequate fit than the original structural model. The CFI value was in the adequate fit range. The SRMR value was .09, suggesting adequate fit. However, the RMSEA value was .10, indicating poor fit. These fit statistics are included in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Goodness-of-Fit Indices for the Second Respecified Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( X^2 )</th>
<th>( X^2/df )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>221.16</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CFI= comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; SRMR= standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA= root mean square error of approximation.

Similar to the hypothesized structural model, results indicated that the parceled Synthesis indicator did not significantly load on the feminist construct. However, the other two feminist identity indicators loaded on the feminist construct. All indicators for
the maternal role modeling, self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations constructs were significant. Figure 6 below illustrates the second respecified model.

![Diagram of the second respecified structural model]

**Figure 6. Second Respecified Structural Model for Hypothesized Relationships among Constructs**

**Note.** (N=422). *p < .05. **p < .01.

Initial analyses assessing the measurement model for the present study indicated concerns regarding fit between indicators within the model and latent constructs the indicators were expected to represent. After modification to the measurement model, fit indices used to assess model fit were not in adequate fit range. Therefore, the structural model was cautiously run to assess fit with data. Results of the structural model indicated
poor fit. Although three of the four paths between constructs within the structural model were significant, not all paths were in the expected direction.

Within the structural model, the path between maternal role modeling and self-efficacy expectations was not significant and it was unclear if items assessing maternal role modeling in the structural model adequately represented maternal role modeling of multiple role management. Additionally, modification indices in the structural model indicated potential overlap among two maternal role modeling items. Therefore, exploratory analyses were completed to assess how the constructs in the model related when maternal role modeling was assessed using different items from a psychometrically validated measure included in measures of the present study. Although the first hypothesis predicting fit between the structural model and the data was not supported, the results of both the original structural and subsequently respecified models provide empirical support for many relationships within the model, including the path between maternal role modeling and self-efficacy expectations.

Two final items of the study assessed individuals who participants viewed as role models. For the first item, participants were able to select as many role models as they desired from a list of 14 possible role models. Additionally, participants were given the option to write in an individual. Results indicated that a range of one to 14 role models ($M = 4.55$, $SD = 2.36$) was selected by participants. In particular, 341 (80.8%) of participants indicated mother as a role model, 230 (54.5%) of participants indicated a friend as a role model, 228 (54%) of participants indicated father as a role model, 201 (47.6%) of participants indicated grandmother as a role model, and 170 (40.3%) of
participants indicated aunt as a role model. Additional information about specified role models can be found in Table 10 below.

Table 10. Individuals Selected as Role Models by Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Model</th>
<th>Frequency of Selection</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepparent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Guardian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Participants specified an individual when selecting Other. These individuals included boss, athletic coach, church mentor, cousin, fictional character from movie, historical figure, friend’s parents, partner’s parents, Jesus, nephew, and resident assistant.

Participants were also asked to indicate an individual in their lives who served as a primary role model for them. Results illustrated that majority of participants denoted their mother as serving as a primary role model. Specifically, 193 (45.7%) of participants specified their mother in this item. Other frequently identified primary role models included father, grandmother, and other (e.g., coach, siblings, cousin, partner’s parents). That is, 47 (11.1%) of participants specified father as a primary role model, 44 (10.4%) of participants specified other as a role model, and 23 (5.5%) of participants specified grandmother as a primary role model. Additional information about primary role models can be found in Table 11 below.
Table 11. Individuals Selected as Primary Role Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Role Model</th>
<th>Frequency of Selection</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandmother</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncle</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepparent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Siblings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Participants specified an individual when selecting Other. These individuals included boss, athletic coach, church mentor, cousin, fictional character from movie, historical figure, friend’s parents, partner’s parents, Jesus, nephew, and resident assistant.

Summary of Results

Results did not support the first hypothesis for the present study based on a review of the various fit indices. That is, data demonstrated poor fit with the proposed model.

Among the six correlations hypothesized in the study, one relationship was consistent with hypotheses. Specifically, self-efficacy expectations demonstrated a significant, positive relationship with outcome expectations. Additionally, one relationship was significant yet was not consistent with the hypothesized direction of the relationship. That is, Passive Acceptance demonstrated a significant positive relationship with self-efficacy expectations yet this was predicted to be a negative relationship. Further, Hypotheses 2a, 2b, and 2d each included two predicted relationships, one for Passive Acceptance and a
given variable and one for Synthesis and a given variable. One of the two predicted relationships within Hypotheses 2b and 2d was significant. Specifically, Synthesis positively related to self-efficacy expectations as expected and Synthesis positively related to outcome expectations as expected. Among the three indirect effects proposed, the indirect effect of feminist identity on multiple role management outcome expectations through multiple role management self-efficacy was supported.

Following tests of hypotheses, exploratory analyses were run to better understand relationships within the structural model, particularly with respect to maternal role modeling indicators. Two respecified model analyses were completed. The first respecified model assessed model fit after removing one of the original maternal role modeling items as suggested by modification indices. Results indicated improved fit with all fit indices in adequate fit range. The second respecified model assessed model fit after substituting the original maternal role modeling items with items from the IOACDS. Results of the second respecified model indicated improved fit with two fit indices in adequate fit range.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Women have become increasingly more present in the workforce over the past fifty years in America, and statistics indicate increased participation among women both nationally and internationally (Betz, 2005; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics, 2011). These data suggest women have more consistently added the role of work to the collection of life roles that make up a woman’s identity. The addition of a work role offers the possibility of positive benefits, including increased financial security, increased self-complexity, and a larger social network (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). The addition of a work role may also contribute to less time and energy or resources available for women to meet demands included in their other life roles. For example, research has indicated women are traditionally expected to oversee home and family responsibilities, and the addition of a work role may augment pressure women feel to successfully manage these demands (Amatea et al., 1986; Barnett, 2004; Bennetts, 2006).

Based on these differences in how a work role may impact women, closer consideration of women’s perceptions of multiple life roles and the influence of a work role on women’s ability to manage multiple life roles became an important component of the present study. Work, partner, and parent roles were specifically considered after
identifying these three roles as commonly assessed life roles within literature (Hoffnung, 2004; Kerpelman & Schvaneveldt, 1999; Riggio & Desrochers, 2006; Tingey, Kiger, & Riley, 1996).

The influence of multiple life roles has been studied among researchers, and conflicting perspectives are represented in the multiple role literature. The role strain perspective suggests the presence of multiple life roles may have a negative impact on health and well-being, contributing to feeling overwhelmed and unable to successfully manage demands of life roles (Adelmann, 1994; Goode, 1960; Marks, 1977). The role enhancement perspective, however, highlights the positive, protective nature multiple roles can have for an individual by counterbalancing negative experiences within a single life role. Research also has indicated numerous physical, psychological, and financial benefits of multiple life roles (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Cochran, Brown, & McGregor, 1999; Kikuzawa, 2006; Kopp & Ruzicka, 1993; Thoits, 1986). Although role strain may develop for a woman, additional scholars suggest that the woman’s subjective perception of her ability to manage her multiple roles is critical to the positive or negative influence of multiple roles (Barnett & Hyde, 2001).

Assessment of women’s perceptions regarding their ability to manage multiple life roles has been less frequently evaluated within literature. Previous studies considered differences in self-efficacy to manage individual types of life roles (Lefcourt, 1992; Stickel & Bonnett, 1991) and how well multiple role self-efficacy and gender attitudes predicted career aspirations among college women (Dukstein, 1994). In more recent studies, Gretchen-Doorly (2005) and Tal (2006) evaluated multiple role self-efficacy
expectations within the framework of social cognitive career theory (SCCT; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994).

The present study similarly assessed self-efficacy to manage multiple life roles as well as outcome expectations for management of multiple life roles through the lens of SCCT. SCCT specifically considers social, environment, and personal variables with respect to vocational development. Self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations are two central constructs within the theory, and the theory posits that specific personal and environmental variables influence these constructs through learning experiences. Learning experiences, including personal performance accomplishments, vicarious learning, social persuasion, and physiological and affective states, contribute to self-efficacy and outcome expectations in SCCT. The influence of such learning experiences depends on whether a person attends to such experiences and applies them to her personal situation.

Two types of learning experiences relevant to developing a work role among women were proposed to influence multiple role self-efficacy expectations and multiple role outcome expectations. The role modeling provided by a woman’s working mother or maternal role model was conceptualized as an initial learning experience predicted to influence self-efficacy and outcome expectations for managing work, partner, and parent roles. Research has indicated family members are consistently identified as role models for career decisions (Whiston & Keller, 2004), yet mothers have been indicated as having a particularly large impact on providing career guidance and support (Lavine, 1982; Paa & McWhirter, 2000; Selkow, 1984). Maternal role modeling may be demonstrated through vicarious learning in which a young woman watches a maternal role model
manage multiple life roles. Additionally, a maternal role model may have provided explicit verbal comments regarding developing multiple life roles.

The second learning experience proposed to impact multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations was feminist identity. Feminist identity was operationalized as a personal variable that could contribute to a woman’s learning experiences. Downing and Roush (1985) described feminist identity as a characteristic that influences how a person conceptualizes the world, and these scholars identified five stages of feminist identity development. The inclusion of feminist identity as a variable influencing multiple role self-efficacy and outcome expectations was based on several research areas. Prior research demonstrated feminist identity positively correlated with self-esteem (Moradi & Subich, 2002), and feminist identity predicted performance self-efficacy (Eisele & Stake, 2008). Additionally, outcome expectations within some modern romantic relationships incorporate egalitarianism and beliefs that closely reflect feminist identity as a way to manage demands within multiple life roles (Hoffnung, 2004).

Collectively, then, the overarching purpose of the present study was to further examine the confidence young women have to manage multiple roles and the outcome expectations young women have for management of multiple roles. There were several additional objectives of the present study as well. For example, the present study extended prior literature assessing self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management by simultaneously assessing management of various life roles. Numerous prior studies assessed multiple role self-efficacy with Lefcourt’s (1992) SEERM measure, which separately considered multiple life roles. Although these studies
considered participants’ confidence for managing various life roles, the independent nature of the roles within the measure prevented direct assessment of self-efficacy to manage concurrent life roles. Therefore, the modification of the SEERM measure within the present study allowed for a more comprehensive assessment of self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management.

A third purpose of the present study was to add to literature on outcome expectations within SCCT (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994). SCCT was used as a guiding theory for the present study because self-efficacy and outcome expectations within SCCT were central to understanding the influence multiple roles have for individuals. As described by Barnett and Hyde (2001), a person’s subjective perception of ability to manage multiple roles appears to distinguish a positive or negative influence of multiple roles for that person. Additional rationale for using SCCT as a guiding framework was based on prior research that indicated self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations for multiple role management operate as expected in the SCCT framework (Gretchen-Doorly, 2005; Tal, 2006). Although numerous studies have incorporated SCCT as part of a research question, most studies incorporating SCCT focused specifically or primarily on self-efficacy expectations (Diegelman & Subich, 2001). Thus, the emphasis on outcome expectations within the present study, in addition to self-efficacy expectations, represented an extension to existing literature on outcome expectations.

A fourth purpose of the present study was to extend SCCT by specifically assessing predictors of multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations within the model as opposed to the more commonly studied role of self-
efficacy expectations and outcome expectations as predictors of goals or behaviors. The influence of vicarious learning via maternal role models was a hypothesized predictor of self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Feminist identity was an additional hypothesized predictor of multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. These constructs represented a component of the SCCT model that is less frequently considered.

Data were collected from 422 female participants through an online research website run by the Department of Psychology at a Midwestern University. Participants accessed the study through this website and subsequently transitioned to survey measures after completing informed consent. Inclusion criteria for data to be retained for analyses consisted of: being female, being at least 18 years old, enrollment in a psychology course, and having a mother or maternal role model. Participants completed a series of measures including, a demographic questionnaire, the Feminist Identity Composite (FIC; Fisher et al., 2000), the Feminist Beliefs and Behavior measure (Zucker, 2004), the Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale (IOACDS; Nauta & Kokaly, 2001), a maternal role modeling measure developed based on literature (Weer et al., 2006), a self-efficacy for multiple role management measure (SEEMRM) modeled from an existing measure (Lefcourt, 1995), a multiple roles outcome expectations measure (MRMOE) developed based on literature (Fouad & Guillen, 2006; Lent & Brown, 2006), a checklist to assess participants’ primary role models, and an open-ended item for participants to describe responses or reactions to participation in the study.
Discussion of Results

Prior to tests of hypotheses, analyses were completed to verify the measurement model. Indicators of four constructs were assessed to determine if individual indicators significantly loaded on the specific constructs indicators were expected to represent. Results indicated that many indicators significantly loaded on the latent constructs they were expected to represent yet several feminist identity and outcome expectations indicators were not significant. Additionally, fit indices for the measurement model suggested poor fit. Internal consistency analyses were completed to determine if the nonsignificant indicators should be removed from the model. Based on these analyses, all feminist identity indicators were retained and five outcome expectations indicators were removed prior to tests of hypotheses.

Hypothesis one of the present study predicted that data would demonstrate adequate fit with the operationalization of SCCT within the present study. This operationalization of SCCT specified feminist identity and maternal role modeling would function as predictors of multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and multiple role management outcome expectations. After completing measurement model analyses, structural equation modeling analyses were cautiously run to assess fit between data and the proposed model. The results of structural equation modeling analyses did not support this first hypothesis.

Despite the data’s failure to support the operationalization of SCCT in the study, findings indicated that three of the four predicted paths within the model were significant. Specifically, the paths extending from feminist identity to multiple role management self-efficacy expectations, feminist identity to multiple role management outcome
expectations, and multiple role management self-efficacy expectations to multiple role management outcome expectations were significant. These significant findings suggest that despite inadequate fit between the model and data, some relationships among variables within the model were present. For example, feminist identity appeared to relate to the confidence a woman has for managing multiple roles and the outcome expectations a woman has for managing multiple roles. Self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management also related to outcome expectations for multiple role management. Maternal role modeling, however, did not appear to significantly predict confidence for managing multiple roles.

Given the empirical evidence of several significant paths within the model yet inadequate fit between the model and data, there may be several explanations for the lack of support for the proposed model. For example, the manner in which feminist identity functioned within the model may be explained by how the two stages of feminist identity related to self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. The Synthesis stage of feminist identity was positively related to self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations as hypothesized. Thus, greater feminist identity was related to confidence for multiple role management and outcome expectations of multiple role management. However, the Passive Acceptance stage of the FIC was not related to outcome expectations as hypothesized and had a small, significant positive relationship with self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management. Hypotheses for the present study indicated an expectation that this relationship with self-efficacy expectations would be negative as more traditional beliefs were not anticipated to relate to confidence for multiple role management. A possible explanation for the positive correlation between
self-efficacy expectations and the Passive Acceptance stage of the FIC may reflect structure provided by traditional society expectations. That is, women endorsing Passive Acceptance FIC items may appreciate the structure within a traditional society because it provides norms to follow which may facilitate women feeling happy and confident in their daily lives. Perhaps confidence stems from understanding societal structure and expectations within a traditional lifestyle.

An additional explanation to this latter finding may reflect the types of multiple life roles women considered during the study, some of which may have been more in line with traditional, nonfeminist roles. Perhaps women who endorsed Passive Acceptance feminist identity considered traditionally female life roles, including family and home responsibilities, and gave less thought to the work role that was included in the directions for the SEEMRM. Because no question was included in the study assessing specific life roles women personally expected to develop, it is difficult to understand how much thought participants gave to the traditional home and family roles as compared to the less traditional work role during completion of the self-efficacy and outcome expectation measures. For example, participants may have responded to the following two items without considering a work role, “I expect to defer professional goals in order to devote more time to parenting responsibilities,” and “I expect to cope with my children’s demands on days when I am tired and stressed.” Thus, women endorsing Passive Acceptance may have had confidence to manage multiple life roles if they primarily considered home and family roles while completing measures in the study.

If women did consider a work role, perhaps it was one in line with traditional female work roles (e.g., nurse, teacher) that more easily accommodate family and home
roles. This explanation is consistent with prior findings that indicated women had greater self-efficacy for the combination of home and family responsibilities and traditional careers as compared to nontraditional careers (Stickel & Bonett, 1991). Additional research demonstrated women in female graduate programs had greater self-efficacy for life roles of parent, spouse/partner, self, and combination of both worker and family member roles, providing more evidence for women’s confidence to manage family and home-related multiple life roles (Lefcourt, 1992). In terms of the combination of worker and family roles, women’s confidence in their abilities to manage multiple roles may be a function of the traditionality of those roles.

With respect to the relationship between feminist identity and outcome expectations, the Passive Acceptance stage was not significantly related to outcome expectations while the Synthesis stage demonstrated a significant, positive relationship with outcome expectations as hypothesized. Thus, it seems likely that the significant path between feminist identity and outcome expectations in the model is largely explained by endorsement of feminist beliefs. A possible explanation for differences between the correlations of outcome expectations with these FIC stages may be based on different levels of awareness between women that demonstrated greater endorsement of traditional beliefs as compared to women that demonstrated greater endorsement of feminist beliefs regarding how multiple roles may impact participants’ lives. Women endorsing greater traditional beliefs may have had difficulty considering and understanding how the combination of parent, partner, and work roles may impact their lives due to little planning or interest in incorporating this specific set of life roles into their lives. That is, when thinking about their life trajectory, perhaps those collective roles had not been
considered as likely roles women would combine, making it difficult for women to respond to items assessing outcome expectations. Additionally, women with greater endorsement of traditional beliefs may not have had worries about managing multiple roles as a function of not considering the impact of combining parent, partner, and work roles in their lives.

Alternatively, women endorsing greater feminist beliefs may have had more interest in the combination of family and work roles in general and more readily considered combining family and work roles. Such interest could have potentially resulted in greater thought toward how these women would realistically combine family and work roles and what outcomes to expect as a result of developing family and work roles. Thus, women endorsing greater feminist beliefs may have been aware of worries or concerns about how to manage multiple roles as a function of considering the impact of combining parent, partner, and work roles in their lives. The relationship between the Synthesis stage and multiple role management outcome expectations is consistent with prior literature that indicated feminist identity was a significant predictor of balancing career and family (Weathers et al., 1994) and positive correlations between both feminism and positive outcomes and between feminism and multiple roles (Gerson, 1985).

In general, Passive Acceptance demonstrated a weak pattern of correlations with variables in the study despite demonstrating more robust relationships with psychological constructs in prior research. The strongest relationship demonstrated was a small, negative correlation between Passive Acceptance and Zucker’s (2004) feminist identity label \( r = -.27 \) Additionally, smaller correlations were demonstrated between Passive
Acceptance and the IOACDS inspiration/modeling subscale, the full IOACDS measure, and self-efficacy expectations for multiple role management. However, prior research (Liss & Erchull, 2010; Saunders & Kashubeck-West, 2006; Zucker, 2006) demonstrated relationships ranging from medium to strong between Passive Acceptance and various psychological constructs (e.g., autonomy, personal growth). Thus, it seems unusual that findings did not reflect stronger relationships between Passive Acceptance and other variables in the study.

The final significant path within the model demonstrated that multiple role management self-efficacy expectations served as a significant predictor of multiple role management outcome expectations. Additionally, multiple role management self-efficacy expectations positively correlated with multiple role management outcome expectations as hypothesized. These findings are in line with prior SCCT research that indicated self-efficacy is a good predictor of outcome expectations (Lent et al., 1994) and illustrate the expected influence of self-efficacy expectations on outcome expectations within the original SCCT model (Brown & Lent, 2008; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994).

A fourth path was hypothesized within the model in which maternal role modeling was expected to serve as a predictor of multiple role management self-efficacy expectations. However, findings indicated maternal role modeling was not a significant predictor of multiple role management self-efficacy expectations. A possible explanation for this finding may be the potentially limited nature with which maternal role modeling influences life roles. That is, maternal role modeling may be limited to influencing the specific career role and may not carry over to multiple life roles. Maternal role modeling literature indicated mothers served as a strong influence on career guidance and support
(Lavine, 1982; Paa & McWhirter, 2000; Selkow, 1984), yet did not review how mothers may influence several types of life roles. Additional research illustrating maternal role modeling assessed the specific influence mothers had on daughters’ career self-efficacy (Solon, 1993), and provided broad conclusions that mothers were viewed as a strong source of support and as positive role models. With respect to the sample of the present study, majority of participants reported that they currently had employment and that their maternal role model was employed when participants were growing up. Thus, participants may have had confidence regarding ability to manage employment based on modeling provided by maternal role models as well as having personal work experience. Further, because women have been increasingly more present in the working world, emphasis may be focused on the work role specifically and may overlook or not attend to mothers’ management of multiple life roles.

An additional explanation for this pattern of findings may reflect participants’ perspectives regarding how maternal role models managed multiple roles. That is, the way that maternal role models managed multiple roles may not have been desired by participants or seen as relevant to how participants want to live their adult lives. Two items from the maternal role modeling measure asked participants to consider the degree to which maternal role models managed multiple roles well and the extent to which participants would like to similarly manage multiple roles. Results indicated participants mildly agreed that maternal role models managed multiple roles well, yet desire to similarly manage multiple roles was somewhat neutral. Perhaps some participants concluded that they could manage roles better or that they would like to manage different life roles than those of their maternal role models. Participants may expect differences in
life trajectory (e.g., not developing a work role) as compared to maternal role models. There may be individual differences in perceptions of role management as a function of participants’ personality, and participants’ perception of roles and role management may be fluid over time.

Additionally, the inspiration/modeling subscale of the IOACDS demonstrated a lower mean as compared to the support/guidance subscale of the IOACDS. Thus, maternal role models may have provided support and guidance for participants in general, yet may not serve as role models to the extent that participants want to replicate their life decisions.

A final explanation may be the time elapsed since maternal role modeling impacted participants. Maternal role modeling may be too distal for participants, particularly participants within the college environment, as a function of experiencing many intervening experiences participants may have had since their youth. Perhaps there is a limitation of the impact of maternal role modeling as time extends since participants were growing up when they may have had more direct exposure to maternal role models. For example, many participants identified alternative role models such as a friend or teacher as influencing participants in working toward their goals.

Although the structural equation model indicated maternal role modeling was not a significant predictor of multiple role management self-efficacy, participants frequently reported mothers as a primary role model. Thus, mothers appeared to be important figures for women in the study. Given the consistency with which mothers were identified as role models in the present study, it seemed likely that mothers may have had an influence on vicarious learning of participants. Consistent with the role of learning
experiences as outlined in SCCT (Lent, 2005), it is plausible that maternal role modeling served as a learning experience among participants that influenced self-efficacy expectations among participants. Thus, as opposed to concluding maternal role modeling does not influence multiple role management self-efficacy expectations, an alternative explanation may be relevant. Specifically, the present findings could potentially be explained by the manner in which maternal role modeling was measured in the study.

Therefore, exploratory analyses were run to better understand the relationship between maternal role modeling and self-efficacy expectations. The original maternal role modeling items were replaced with items specifically assessing maternal influence from the validated Influence of Others on Academic and Career Decisions Scale (IOACDS; Nauta & Kokaly, 2001) to see if the IOACDS better captured maternal role modeling. Results from this modified model revealed maternal role modeling operated as a significant predictor of self-efficacy expectations as hypothesized in the original model. However, fit indices indicated model fit improved yet was still poor.

An additional explanation, then, for the collective findings of the present study may be a function of how variables were measured in the study and the specific measurement tools used to evaluate the variables. Given empirical evidence of measurement concerns from the original measurement model and the presence of three significant paths in the model, it is plausible that inadequate model fit was a function of measurement concerns and an inadequate model as opposed to an absence of relationships among variables. Therefore, the combination of measurement concerns and the conceptualization of feminist identity, maternal role modeling, and multiple roles within the model appear to explain the present findings.
Overall, a general pattern of strong scores across measures was identified, yet some scores were not as robust as scores demonstrated in prior research. For example, the support/guidance IOACDS subscale mean was in line with support/guidance IOACDS means across four prior studies. However, the means for the inspiration/modeling IOACDS subscale and full IOACDS were slightly smaller than means demonstrated in prior research (Nauta & Kokaly, 2001). As compared to a study conducted by Liss and Erchull (2010), the FIC Passive Acceptance mean was slightly higher than the mean demonstrated for nonfeminists and much higher than the mean demonstrated for feminists. The FIC Synthesis mean was higher in the present study than the mean demonstrated for both nonfeminists and for feminists. The mean scores for self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations were high, suggesting women expected self-efficacy and positive outcome expectations. However, these scores were not as robust as possible. FIC coefficient alphas were comparable to those demonstrated in prior research (Fisher et al., 2000; Moradi & Subich, 2002). However, the IOACDS full measure and subscale coefficient alphas were slightly smaller than alphas reported in prior research (Nauta & Kokaly, 2001). Alphas for the SEERMRM were strong and slightly more robust than prior research (Lefcourt, 1992), and alphas for the MRMOE were consistent with alphas demonstrated in research used to develop the measure (Sabatelli, 1984; Spring, Larson, Tilley, Grasser, & Quinn, 2001).

Collectively, taking all analyses into consideration, there is some empirical support for the hypothesized relationships within the structural model. The relationships among the four constructs within the model suggest that maternal role modeling and feminist identity learning experiences are relevant predictors of self-efficacy and outcome
expectations to examine further. However, as originally conceptualized, the measurement and structural models did not perform as expected. There were concerns with several indicators within the measurement model, resulting in additional analyses to determine if the model should be modified prior to executing analyses to assess the structural model. These concerns suggested that indicators did not adequately capture the latent constructs they were expected to represent and indicated that the manner in which latent constructs were measured in the model should be further reviewed. The exploratory analyses demonstrated further support that modifying how the indicators are measured within the model would likely yield improved model fit and provide further support for the relationships within the model. Thus, it appears that addressing measurement concerns and modifying the operationalization of constructs within the model is warranted prior to future research examining these constructs and model structure.

Limitations

It is important to delineate limitations within any study to address how these components may be improved upon. Given the presence of some significant relationships within the original and modified models, it seemed likely that inadequate fit between data and the model is partly a function of measurement concerns. The specified measures used to assess the variables in the study may not have adequately captured the variables. For example, results of measurement model analyses run with Mplus (7.1) software indicated that not all indicators loaded on the constructs they were expected to represent. Measurement issues were indicated with respect to the Synthesis stage of the FIC, two of the four Zucker (2004) Feminist Beliefs and Behavior items, and five items within the outcome expectations measure. Aside from the above findings, scholars have also
questioned the validity of the FIC given findings that indicate the measure assesses feminist attitudes as opposed to explicit feminist identity (Eisele & Stake, 2008; Szymanski, 2004). Thus, the feminist identity construct may be better represented by an alternative measure that more closely assesses feminist identification.

Similar to potential measurement issues within the feminist identity construct, the absence of empirical support of maternal role modeling as a predictor of multiple role management self-efficacy expectations in the model may be explained by the manner in which maternal role modeling was measured. That is, the five individual items used to capture maternal role modeling within the present study may not have fully assessed the maternal role modeling construct. Empirical support for this conclusion was provided by nonsignificant regression analyses between the five individual maternal role modeling items and both self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Further, the replacement of the five individual maternal role modeling items with the subscales assessing maternal influence from the Influence of Others on Careers and Academic Decisions Scale (IOACDS) yielded a significant path between maternal role modeling and self-efficacy expectations as predicted. Thus, it appears that, given adequate measurement, maternal role modeling may serve as a predictor of self-efficacy expectations as hypothesized.

There were measurement concerns with the multiple role management outcome expectations measure used in the present study as well. This measure was developed specifically for the present study because a measure assessing outcome expectations for multiple roles was not available. Efforts were taken to develop items consistent with recommendations for developing outcome expectations measures (Bandura, 1969; Fouad
& Guillen, 2006; Lent & Brown, 2006). Additionally, content for the items of the outcome expectations measure were gleaned from literature specific to the three life roles of parent, partner, and worker assessed in the present study. However, measurement model analyses revealed that five items within the measure did not significantly load on the outcome expectations construct. These items were removed after considering both the original theoretical basis for the item development and the statistical rationale for deleting the problematic items. The remaining outcome expectations items significantly loaded on the multiple role management outcome expectations construct in the hypothesized and modified models. Despite these improvements, it is important to note that the outcome expectations measure was not as psychometrically sound as a previously developed and thoroughly validated measure.

Careful consideration was taken to determine the specific sequence of measures that was presented to participants. That is, the research question focused on constructs that predicted self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations, and it was important to present measures assessing self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations at the end of the study to prevent a priming effect. If the self-efficacy and outcome expectations measures had been presented initially, priming of self-efficacy may have influenced how participants completed measures related to the proposed predictors in the study, feminist identity and maternal role modeling. However, a priming effect may still have occurred within the sequence of the measures. Given that multiple measures were used to assess both feminist identity and maternal role modeling, completion of the second measure for these constructs may have been influenced by completion of previous measures assessing the same construct. With respect to feminist identity, participants’ completion of the FIC
may have primed participants to complete the more direct items within Zucker’s (2004) Feminist Beliefs and Behavior measure differently. Similarly, completion of the maternal role model items may have influenced participants’ responses to the IOACDS as well as the concluding items related to identification of role models within one’s life.

The use of a sample of women from psychology courses may have impacted participants’ responses to items incorporated within the present study. Specifically, as a function of studying psychology within psychology classes, participants may have had knowledge related to the impact of family dynamics on one’s life, self-esteem, and confidence. Such knowledge could guide responses to items, particularly items assessing mothers as role models and the influence of mothers on academic and career decision-making. The pattern of findings gleaned in the present study may not be representative of undergraduate women in general, and may more adequately represent women with greater self-awareness regarding the influential role of other people.

Relatedly, the sample used in the present study limits generalizability in several additional ways. The majority of participants within the sample represented heterosexual, middle class, Caucasian women; as such, results may not generalize to other groups of women. Further, the sample represents women within an academic context. These women had internet access and were conscientious enough to access the extra credit website to gain extra credit for their psychology course(s). Alternatively, participants accessing and completing the study immediately prior to their final exams may not have been thoroughly focused and engaged while participating given time constraints. Steps were taken to limit randomly responding (e.g., having attention checks placed within the measures), yet it cannot be guaranteed that responses accurately reflect a participant’s
experience. Those who were pressured for time may have contributed less thought and focus when responding to items in the measures.

An additional limitation relates to the three specific roles of worker, partner, and parent assessed in the present study. Although multiple role research demonstrates these three roles are commonly assessed (Hoffnung, 2004; Kerpelman & Schvaneveldt, 1999; Riggio & Desrochers, 2006; Tingey, Kiger, & Riley, 1996), this specific set of life roles is not universally developed among women. Therefore, focusing specifically on these three roles limits understanding of self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations for additional or alternative life roles. Participants may not have specifically considered worker, partner, and parent roles while completing measures and instead may have focused on different life roles they expect to develop. However, given the specific instructions within these measures to consider worker, parent, and partner roles, findings do not necessarily generalize to other roles participants may have considered.

This study used a sample within a university setting, and many participants were in the early years of the college experience. In fact, majority of participants identified as first year students, and sophomore status was the second most frequently cited year in college among participants. College is a rich time of development and specific studies address a variety of forms of development within the college context, including personality, psychosocial, cognitive, and learning (Chickering, 1969; Constantinople, 1969; Evens et al., 2009). As such, it is plausible that participants will continue to develop throughout their time in college, likely influencing interests and values related to life roles. Thus, expectations for life roles may modify over time. It is important to
remember the potential time-limited nature of these findings as they may not be representative of university women further along in the college experience.

Lastly, this study focused specifically on mothers and maternal figures as role models based on literature highlighting the influence of mothers and maternal role models on development and career decisions (Otto, 2000; Whiston & Keller, 2004). However, as illustrated in the concluding items within the present study, a substantial number of participants identified alternative individuals as serving as role models in their lives. These individuals included additional family members, friends, and a variety of important figures from media, history, religion, and extracurricular activities. Thus, this study did not consider potential alternative individuals that served as role models, limiting the researcher’s understanding of how these alternative role models may have influenced multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations.

Implications for Research

Findings from the present study extend prior multiple role management research and provide initial and tentative empirical support for the relationships of feminist identity and maternal role modeling as predictors of multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Despite demonstrating poor fit with the data and inconsistencies with the direction of some relationships within the model for the FIC, the hypothesized and modified models suggest several relationships among these constructs are present within the operationalization of SCCT in the present study. Replication of these relationships in future research would clarify and extend the generalizability of these findings and provide further support for the relationships among
constructs within the model. Relatedly, future studies targeting replication of these findings would be enhanced by strengthening measurement of feminist identity and outcome expectations.

As noted by Szymanski (2004) and Eisele and Stake (2008), the FIC does not explicitly assess feminist identification and instead evaluates participants’ feminist attitudes. Zucker (2004) extended feminist identity research by differentiating between feminist attitudes and feminist identification, concluding that feminist identification is more likely to facilitate feminist activism and behaviors related to taking on the feminist label within one’s self-concept. Zucker (2004) and Szymanski (2004) began addressing the psychometric concerns within the commonly used FIC by individually developing brief measures that more closely evaluate feminist identification. However, these measures are short and each include only four items, which may limit the degree to which they fully capture components of the feminist identity construct. Further, findings from the present study demonstrated that two of the four total items within Zucker’s (2004) Feminist Beliefs and Behavior Measure did not significantly load on the feminist identity latent construct as one might expect. Further, feminist identity, as evaluated by the Feminist Beliefs and Behavior measure, was not significantly related to the Synthesis stage of the FIC. Thus, additional research evaluating these developed measures and exploring additional items to augment assessment of feminist identification seems necessary. Additionally, perhaps further consideration of what best captures feminism, feminist identity, feminist beliefs or feminist attitudes, is essential to determine how best to measure this construct.
Similarly, further analyses focused on strengthening the outcome expectations measure used in the present study are needed in future research on multiple role management and SCCT in general. As indicated by Betz (2008), development of measures to evaluate components of SCCT is a consistent research consideration among scholars. Yet, the majority of this research is targeted at measures assessing the self-efficacy construct within SCCT, resulting in less comprehensive empirical evaluation of the full model (Betz, 2008). Thus, there is a dearth of research specifically assessing outcome expectations within SCCT and a considerable absence of measures specifically designed to measure outcome expectations of a given construct. As such, researchers are encouraged to develop construct-specific measures in line with the research question (Lent & Brown, 2006). Although the present study provided empirical support for the outcome expectations measure developed for the study, several of the items within the measure did not significantly load on the outcome expectations construct. These items reflected negative outcome expectations across the three multiple roles of parent, partner, and worker. Additionally, internal consistency values for the parent and partner roles were lower than internal consistency for the work role within the measure. Thus, addressing the items that did not significantly load on the outcome expectations construct as well as items within the parent and partner roles would likely improve the measure. Supplementing these items with additional negative outcome expectations gleaned from research on multiple roles may more accurately capture outcome expectations related to these roles.

Addressing calls regarding the limited applicability of feminist identity research to capture various intersecting identities of individuals would further expand the present
research. In particular, Helms (1990) cautioned that current feminist identity theories address experiences of European American, middle class, heterosexual women yet ignore other female groups.

Social class is an additional variable worth considering with respect to multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations among young women. Liu et al. (2004) noted both the importance of recognizing social class as a dimension of cultural diversity and the consistent lack of incorporating social class within counseling psychology research. With respect to the present study, social class may influence the role of and attitude toward work among young women and their mothers. As described by Bennetts (2006), some women of lower socioeconomic statuses yearn to leave the working world because it signifies one has reached economic status in which employment is not a requirement to financially survive. Thus, attitudes toward work may incorporate a negative tone as opposed to acknowledging positive benefits, aside from finances, that one may gain from employment. Moreover, maternal role modeling and verbal persuasion from maternal role models may look different depending on social class. Assessing perspectives of participants specifically representing low socioeconomic status and potentially first generation college students would provide further data to understand an impact of social class on multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations.

Using a sample comprised of female undergraduate students was intentional given the increased presence of women in the workplace (Betz, 2005; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Statistics, 2011) and research that indicates the positive benefits of multiple roles among women (Barnett & Hyde, 2001; Bennetts, 2006), including social
support, increased self-concept, gaining income, personal fulfillment, and greater self-fulfillment. However, Barnett and Hyde (2001) also acknowledged the positive impact of multiple roles on individuals in general. Moreover, role modeling literature reviewed indicated mothers appear to be a consistently identified role model among male and female high school students, particularly with respect to career planning (Li & Kerpelman, 2007; Otto, 2000). Thus, extending the research question to incorporate men and the impact of feminist identification and maternal role modeling on self-efficacy expectations and multiple role management is an additional research consideration.

Lastly, given the pattern of identifying other individuals as role models within the concluding items of the study, extending the present study to specifically assess alternative role models is an additional research recommendation. That is, more closely assessing individuals with which participants identify outside their family constellation, such as peers, individuals representing heros for participants, and teachers, may assist researchers in further understanding role modeling that may occur beyond a familial influence.

Implications for Practice

Results of the present study demonstrate the utility of SCCT in career counseling and counseling in general. The influence of social, environmental, and personal variables within SCCT provides important emphasis on areas of an individual’s life that may influence the process of career exploration. These areas may be overlooked if career counselors strictly assess an individual’s values, interests, and abilities, common factors considered within career counseling. Further, using SCCT as a guiding framework for therapy for mental health concerns would facilitate similar emphasis on social,
environmental, and personal variables that may contribute to symptom management and reduction among clients.

Results of the present study suggest the importance of referencing theory in general to inform practice. Theoretically-based career counseling, focusing on career theory and theories related to factors that may influence career decisions (e.g., feminist identity development, the role of family), seems to be an important strategy to consider. In addition to incorporating specific counseling techniques, the use of theory would likely have value by grounding career discussions with focus on learning experiences, contextual influences, and social persuasion within family. It appears, then, that use of theory would facilitate a more comprehensive career counseling approach.

Relationships identified within the hypothesized and modified models in the present study have important implications for counseling practice. Results indicated that endorsement of Synthesis attitudes is positively related to multiple role management self-efficacy expectations and outcome expectations. Thus, consideration of a given woman’s feminist identification level may be an important topic to incorporate within career discussions and counseling in general. Although potentially a less discussed topic within the realm of career counseling, identifying as a feminist may inform confidence a woman has to incorporate employment as a steady role in her life as well as the type of employment opportunities a woman may consider as realistic options for her to pursue. This is particularly relevant within college academic and career counseling contexts given the career and related academic class selection decisions occurring at that time. In particular, research indicates a pattern of women lowering career aspirations during college despite prestigious career aspirations among high school female students (Etaugh
& Bridges, 2010). Often this pattern results in majoring in female-dominated careers and transitioning into lower-level career fields upon graduation.

Betz (2008) suggested viewing career counseling among women as an opportunity to become an overt option restorer to ensure women consider a more comprehensive range of careers. That is, sexism within society may influence women’s awareness of available career options and foster resistance toward feminist attitudes and identity. Being cognizant of cultural and societal attitudes toward feminism and traditional gender stereotyping may assist counselors in understanding how clients may have been socialized with respect to gender roles, careers options, and expectations for women. This likely includes recognition of null environment experiences a client may have encountered in which women’s educational and career goals have been ignored by others (Betz, 1989). It may be equally important to consider an individual’s feminist identity level against the backdrop of her gender and cultural socialization experiences.

Findings from the present study suggest endorsement of traditional beliefs and feminist beliefs are positively related to multiple role management self-efficacy expectations; thus, providing a client space to expand on individual beliefs that may differ from beliefs one was socialized to practice may further foster self-efficacy. Additionally, these findings may also relate to identifying multiple life role options that are available for women endorsing traditional beliefs or feminist beliefs.

Incorporating a feminist approach to career counseling is a more global suggestion taken from the present results. Findings that indicate identifying as a feminist is a predictor of self-efficacy expectations within the present study are in line with research demonstrating the positive impact of feminist career counseling on career self-
efficacy expectations among women. Juntenen (1996) specifically investigated the impact of feminist career counseling among undergraduate women. Participants were presented with four audiotapes simulating four successive career counseling sessions. Half of participants received tapes that included information about the impact of gender role socialization on women’s career development and verbal encouragement toward considering nontraditional careers. The other half of participants received basic career counseling audiotapes, including exploration of personality and ability. Results indicated the participants in the feminist career counseling condition demonstrated significantly greater career and education self-efficacy for nontraditional careers. Support of feminist counseling has also been demonstrated empirically among samples of undergraduate women (Enns & Hackett, 1990), in which participants indicated interest in incorporating a feminist counseling approach toward career and sexual assault concerns.

Among women endorsing a feminist identity and interest to manage multiple roles of worker, parent, and partner, self-efficacy for managing multiple roles may be enhanced with identification of realistic strategies for balancing work and other life demands. Thus, assisting individuals in identifying specific strategies may be an extension of career planning conversations. Such conversations may also address specific outcome expectations a woman has in general, which may assist in identifying what strategies to consider implementing. Etaugh and Bridges (2010) delineated multiple strategies including, identifying employment with flextime, telecommuting, participating in child-care assistance programs, and participating in elder-care benefit programs. Yoder (1999) noted that some women engage in either personal role redefinition or structural role redefinition, both of which may assist in coping with the demands of multiple roles.
Personal role redefinition incorporates modification of one’s view of expected behavior by adapting oneself (e.g., completing household tasks less frequently) while structural role redefinition focuses on modifying expectations within a given structure (e.g., delegate demands to family members). Thus, consideration of specific options, whether that includes personal modification or seeking employment with flexible expectations, may alleviate concerns about how one would be able to effectively meet the demands of multiple roles.

Lastly, findings from the present study suggest that it is important to talk to women about their role models and what their role models mean to them. Data demonstrating the importance of mothers and other family members support incorporating conversations into career counseling about family members and what women have learned from family members. Further, many participants identified role models outside of their family system, suggesting the importance of being open with clients about the broad spectrum of potential role models.
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APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHICS QUESTIONAIRE

Please respond to the following questions by writing your answer on the provided line or checking the response that describes you best.

1. What is your age? _______

2. What is your gender?  
   ☐ Female  ☐ Male

3. What is your race/ethnicity?
   ___ American Indian or Alaskan Native
   ___ Asian American
   ___ Black or African American
   ___ Hispanic or Latin American
   ___ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   ___ White or European American
   ___ More than one race; describe______________
   ___ Other; describe____________________

4. What is your current year in college:
   Post-Secondary, Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Post-Baccalaureate, Other

   __________________________

5. Which one of the following best describes your social class?
   ___ Lower Class
   ___ Lower Middle Class
   ___ Middle Class
   ___ Upper Class
   ___ Upper Middle Class

6. What is your sexual orientation: Heterosexual, Homosexual, Bisexual

   __________________________
7. What is your relationship status?

___ Single
___ In a relationship
___ Married or Partnered
___ Separated
___ Divorced
___ Widowed

8. Do you have any children? □ Yes □ No

8a. If yes, how many?________

8b. If yes, what are their ages?______________

9. Are you currently employed? □ Yes □ No

9a. If yes, what is your current job? __________

10. Did you grow up with a mother or a maternal role model? □ Yes □ No

10a. If yes, how many siblings lived in your home?

___ 1
___ 2
___ 3
___ 4
___ 5
___ 6 or more

10b. If yes, did your mother or maternal role model have paid employment when you were growing up? (If no, go to item #14).

□ Yes
□ No

10c. If yes, would you say her paid employment was more like a job or like a career? A *job* is employment a person completes for money with little meaning or satisfaction. A *career* is a sequence of several employment positions that involve similar tasks or skills a person has throughout life from school through retirement and that the person views as satisfying.
11. If your mother or maternal role model had paid employment, which response best describes the amount of time she spent in paid employment?

- □ Full-time (40 or more hours a week)
- □ Part-time (less than 40 hours a week)

12. If your mother or maternal role model had paid employment, how old were you when she had paid employment?

- □ Birth to 12 years old
- □ 13 years old to 18 years old
- □ Birth to 18 years old

13. If your mother or maternal role model had paid employment, do you agree she managed paid employment and her other responsibilities well? Please respond by circling one of the response options below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2 Mildly disagree</th>
<th>3 Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly agree</th>
<th>5 Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13a. Based on your response above, to what extent would you like to manage paid employment and your other responsibilities similar to how your mother or maternal role model managed paid employment and her other responsibilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Completely dissimilar</th>
<th>2 Somewhat dissimilar</th>
<th>3 Neither similar nor dissimilar</th>
<th>4 Somewhat similar</th>
<th>5 Completely similar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Below please indicate the percentage of time your mother or maternal role spent participating in paid employment, motherhood and her romantic relationship. Please also indicate the percentage of time you spend or expect to spend participating in paid employment, motherhood and your romantic relationship.

**Mother or Maternal Role Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% time paid employment</th>
<th>% time motherhood</th>
<th>% time romantic relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>% time paid employment</td>
<td>% time motherhood</td>
<td>% time romantic relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

FEMINIST IDENTITY COMPOSITE

Please respond to the following questions using the scale provided.

1. I don’t see much point in questioning the general expectation that men should be masculine and women should be feminine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>MILDLY disagree</td>
<td>NEITHER disagree nor agree</td>
<td>MILDLY agree</td>
<td>STRONGLY agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. One thing I especially like about being a woman is that men will offer me their seat on a crowded bus or open doors for me because I am a woman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>MILDLY disagree</td>
<td>NEITHER disagree nor agree</td>
<td>MILDLY agree</td>
<td>STRONGLY agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. I like being a traditional female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>MILDLY disagree</td>
<td>NEITHER disagree nor agree</td>
<td>MILDLY agree</td>
<td>STRONGLY agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. I think that men and women had it better in the 1950s when married women were housewives and their husbands supported them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>MILDLY disagree</td>
<td>NEITHER disagree nor agree</td>
<td>MILDLY agree</td>
<td>STRONGLY agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If I were married to a man and my husband was offered a job in another state, it would be my obligation to move in support of his career.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>MILDLY disagree</td>
<td>NEITHER disagree nor agree</td>
<td>MILDLY agree</td>
<td>STRONGLY agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I think that most women will feel most fulfilled by being a wife and a mother.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>MILDLY disagree</td>
<td>NEITHER disagree nor agree</td>
<td>MILDLY agree</td>
<td>STRONGLY agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. I think it’s lucky that women aren’t expected to do some of the more dangerous jobs that men are expected to do, like construction work or race car driving.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Mildly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Mildly agree
5. Strongly agree

8. Gradually, I am beginning to see just how sexist society really is.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Mildly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Mildly agree
5. Strongly agree

9. I feel angry when I think about the way I am treated by men and boys.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Mildly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Mildly agree
5. Strongly agree

10. Men receive many advantages in society and because of this are against equality for women.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Mildly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Mildly agree
5. Strongly agree

11. I never realized until recently that I have experienced oppression and discrimination as a woman in this society.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Mildly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Mildly agree
5. Strongly agree

12. I feel like I’ve been duped into believing society’s perceptions of me as a woman.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Mildly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Mildly agree
5. Strongly agree

13. My female friends are like me in that we are all angry at men and the ways we have been treated as women.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Mildly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Mildly agree
5. Strongly agree

14. In my interactions with men, I am always looking for ways I may be discriminated against because I am female.

1. Strongly disagree
2. Mildly disagree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Mildly agree
5. Strongly agree
15. Regretfully, I can see ways in which I have perpetuated sexist attitudes in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. I am very interested in women writers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I am very interested in women musicians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. I am very interested in women artists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I am very interested in women’s studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. I feel like I have blended my female attributes with my unique personal qualities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. I am proud to be a competent woman.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. I have incorporated what is female and feminine into my own unique personality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I enjoy the pride and self-assurance that comes from being a strong female.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. As I have grown in my beliefs I have realized that it is more important to value women as individuals than as members of a larger group of women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. I am very committed to a cause that I believe contributes to a more fair and just world for all people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. I want to work to improve women’s status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. I am willing to make certain sacrifices to effect change in this society in order to create a nonsexist, peaceful place where all people have equal opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. It is very satisfying to me to be able to use my talents and skills in my work in the women’s movement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. I care very deeply about men and women having equal opportunities in all respects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. I choose my “causes” carefully to work for greater equality for all people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. I feel that I am a very powerful and effective spokesperson for the women’s issues I am concerned with right now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. On some level, my motivation for almost every activity I engage in is my desire for an egalitarian world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Mildly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Mildly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. I owe it not only to women but to all people to work for greater opportunity and equality for all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Mildly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Mildly agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

FEMINIST BELIEFS AND BEHAVIOR

Please respond to the following questions by checking the response you agree with most, either yes or no.

34. Girls and women have not been treated as well as boys and men in our society.
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

35. Women and men should be paid equally for the same work.
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

36. Women’s unpaid work should be more socially valued.
   ☐ Yes
   ☐ No

There are two versions of the following series of questions. Both versions are the same in length. Which version you see depends on whether or not you consider yourself to be a feminist.

If you DO consider yourself to be a feminist, please answer the following questions:
(Prompt sending participants to questions)

If you DO NOT consider yourself to be a feminist, please skip to the questions below:
(Prompt sending participants to questions)

Questions participants are sent to will consist of:

How many hours are you enrolled in this semester?________
How many days a week are you on campus? __________
What year do you anticipate you will graduate in?________
APPENDIX D

INFLUENCE OF OTHERS ON ACADEMIC AND CAREER DECISIONS SCALE

Please respond to the following questions using the scale provided.

1. My mother is someone I am trying to be like in my academic and career pursuits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. My mother is someone who supports me in the academic and career choices I make.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. My mother is someone who helps me weigh the pros and cons of the academic and career choices I make.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. My mother is not particularly inspirational to me in the academic or career path I am pursuing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In the academic or career path I am pursuing, my mother is someone I admire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. I am not trying to be like my mother in my academic and career pursuits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. My mother is someone who tells me or shows me general strategies for a successful life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. My mother is someone I can count on to be there if I need support when I make academic and career choices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. My mother is not someone who supports me when I make academic and career decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. My mother is someone who helps me consider my academic and career options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. My mother is a mentor in my academic or career field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. My mother is someone who has a career I would like to pursue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. In the academic or career path I am pursuing, my mother does not inspire me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. My mother is someone who stands by me when I make important academic and career decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. My mother is someone who shows me how to get where I am going with my education and career.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Mildly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Mildly agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

SELF-EFFICACY EXPECTATIONS FOR MULTIPLE ROLE MANAGEMENT

MEASURE

- These statements include situations and events that you may experience now or may be presented with in the future.
- Using the scale below, please consider the amount of confidence you have or expect to have as an employed mother with a romantic partner now or in the future.
- Write the number that best describes your level of confidence on the line next to each question.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
No Confidence Some Confidence Complete Confidence

As an employed mother with a romantic partner now or in the future, I EXPECT THAT I WILL:

1. Spend time with and meet my romantic partner’s needs after a hard day at work ______

2. Defer professional goals in order to devote more time to parenting responsibilities ______

3. Deal with conflicts caused by different values, customs, lifestyles, and goals between my romantic partner and myself ______

4. Be a good listener in times of conflict with my children ______
As an employed mother with a romantic partner now or in the future, I EXPECT THAT I WILL:

5. Deal with my children competing for attention, talking at the same time, competing for help, or disagreeing on family activities or meals ______

6. Manage time spent working on tasks within my work role ________

7. Enjoy time at home with my romantic partner, even though I have work to do __________

8. Be nurturing and available to my children when they need me ________

9. Fulfill goals I set and personal expectations at work ________

10. Find a way to get my kids ready for school or day care and get ready for work at roughly the same time ________

11. Cope with my children’s demands on days when I am tired and stressed ________

12. Maintain a good relationship with my romantic partner ________

13. Get work tasks done at home, but give my full attention to my children when they need it ______

14. Get my romantic partner to understand and accept my job demands ________

15. Foster my children’s hobbies, activities, and social life ________

16. Focus attention and effort on work related tasks, rather than home related tasks and problems while I am at work ________

17. Shift from my occupational role to my role of parent when my child calls me at work ______

18. Raise my children to live successful lives ________
As an employed mother with a romantic partner now or in the future, I EXPECT THAT I WILL:

19. Meet my romantic partner’s emotional needs ______

20. Find time to have date nights with my romantic partner ______

21. Be successful in my career ______

22. Have a plan if my babysitter is sick on a day that both my romantic partner and I have to work late ______

23. Discuss feelings of competition I might have with my romantic partner over career prestige, position, or salary ______

24. Set realistic goals concerning the amount and kind of tasks to be completed at work each day ______

25. Discuss the importance of my career with my romantic partner ______
APPENDIX F

MULTIPLE ROLES OUTCOME EXPECTATIONS MEASURE

- We are interested in the extent to which you agree with certain situations or events.
- These statements include situations and events that you may experience now or may be presented with in the future.
- Using the scale below, please consider how much you agree with or would agree with each statement as an employed mother with a romantic partner now or in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an employed mother with a romantic partner now or in the future, I EXPECT THAT I WILL:

1. have less freedom _____
2. have a good relationship with my child _____
3. be happy about my life____
4. have more social stimulation _____
5. have less privacy _____
6. feel fulfilled _____
7. be successful at my job _____
8. be incapable of helping my child _____
As an employed mother with a romantic partner now or in the future, I EXPECT THAT I WILL:

9. have support from my partner _____
10. be respected _____
11. have feelings of guilt _____
12. have someone to listen to my problems _____
13. be criticized _____
14. feel loved _____
15. be able to take care of my child _____
16. argue with my romantic partner _____
17. make use of my abilities _____
18. do more housework _____
19. feel accomplished _____
20. feel overloaded _____
21. make mistakes _____
22. fight with my romantic partner because I work _____
23. have low self-esteem _____
24. not have time for my family _____
APPENDIX G

CONCLUDING ITEMS

1. Please check the responses below that best describe the people that represent role models that you look up to and want to be like when it comes to balancing work, family, and other things in life. Please also circle the primary person you look up to as a role model:

☐ Mother
☐ Father
☐ Grandmother
☐ Grandfather
☐ Brother
☐ Sister
☐ Aunt
☐ Uncle
☐ Step-Parent
☐ Friend
☐ Teacher
☐ Legal Guardian
☐ Partner or Spouse
☐ Other (please list):_______________

2. Please provide any thoughts you would like to share about what you saw and learned from watching your mother or maternal role model manage multiple roles. For example, you may have been amazed by how they were able to do it all, or saddened or angered by the amount of time they gave to work at the expense of family time.
APPENDIX H

FEMINIST IDENTITY INDICATOR FACTOR ANALYSIS RESULTS TABLE

Table 12. Factor Analysis Results for Feminist Identity Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance Item 1</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance Item 2</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance Item 3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance Item 4</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance Item 5</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance Item 6</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Acceptance Item 7</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Item 1</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Item 2</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Item 3</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Item 4</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis Item 5</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zucker Cardinal Belief 1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zucker Cardinal Belief 2</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zucker Cardinal Belief 3</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zucker Feminist Label</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue                   | 3.12     | 2.72     | 1.24     |
% of Total Variance          | 19.48    | 17.02    | 7.72     |
Total Variance 44.22%
### Table 13. Factor Analysis Results for Outcome Expectations Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>have less freedom</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have a good relationship with my child</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be happy about my life</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have more social stimulation</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have less privacy</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel fulfilled</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be successful at my job</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be incapable of helping my child</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have support from my partner</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be respected</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have feelings of guilt</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have someone to listen to my problems</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be criticized</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel loved</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be able to take care of my child</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argue with my romantic partner</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make use of my abilities</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do more housework</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel accomplished</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel overloaded</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make mistakes</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fight with my romantic partner because I work</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have low self-esteem</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not have time for my family</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eigenvalue**  
9.12  
3.41  
1.29

**% of Total Variance**  
38.00  
14.20  
5.36

**Total Variance 57.55%**
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