

Measurement of Commitment to Role Identities

Susan E. Jackson
University of California, Berkeley

Commitment to social identities has been postulated as a central organizing feature of the self-system, yet the only widely used instrument for assessing identities is the Twenty Statements Test. Wylie has criticized the use of the test as a measure of self because of its failure to provide reliable and valid results. An alternative method of assessing commitments is described in the present article, and the validity of this new method is tested. Study 1 demonstrates that a 23-item index can be used to assess commitment to a number of diverse identities. Commitment scores based on the index correspond to the placement of identities in a hierarchy of importance based on subjective rank orderings. In Study 2, a multitrait-multimethod matrix is created to establish the convergent and discriminant validity of the 23-item index for the identities of peer, religious participant, romantic partner, and family member. The correlations between commitment to each of these four identities and related attitude measures are also reported.

That people are differentially concerned about their relationships with particular groups has long been recognized by social psychologists and postulated as an important determinant of behavior. In the language of field theory, the groups with which one interacts are characterized by different valences. Strong positive valences are associated with a person's motivation to be accepted as a member of the group and represent the power of the group to influence the person.

Differences in the power of groups to motivate individuals to adhere to norms and values served as the basis for Kelley's (1952) definition of a normative reference group. Kelley (1955; Kelley & Volkart, 1952) argued that highly valued groups are more likely to provide standards and perspectives against which opinions and behavior are evaluated. To the extent that a group anchors a person's cognitions and behaviors, choosing alternative perspectives from which

to view the world becomes increasingly difficult. Instead, the perspective of the group is automatically invoked, because the individual is "ego-involved" (Sherif & Sherif, 1956). These and similar theories of the socialized actor assert that it is through the process of internalization that groups influence the behavior of the individual.

Group membership brings with it the opportunity and responsibility to act in accord with the prescriptions that define one's position in the group (role enactment). Out of the valuations others place on one's role enactments, self-conceptions are formed that are linked to specific roles (Gordon, 1968). Those self-conceptions related to a particular role constitute a role identity (McCall & Simmons, 1966). Social identity theories assert that groups derive their power to influence behavior through their ability to approve role enactments (Sarbin & Allen, 1968), thereby validating preferred identities. When, in meeting the role demands of the group, an individual also feels that his or her true self is being expressed, the individual can be described as committed to the role and its concomitant values. When the self is embodied in the role enactment, self and role are congruent (Sarbin & Allen, 1968), and validation of a role enactment becomes synonymous with validation of self. Thus, group norms need not be internalized

The author thanks Richard T. Santee, Sheldon Ze-deck, and Christina Maslach for their support and encouragement throughout all stages of this research. The comments of anonymous reviewers were especially helpful for improving earlier drafts. This article is based on the author's master's thesis, submitted to the Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Susan E. Jackson, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

to affect behavior if the actor is committed to an identity that the group has power to validate or invalidate through its approval or disapproval of role enactments (Cancian, 1975). Through experiences in both achieved and ascribed roles, a person develops many role identities, some of which are prepotent in their effects on the individual.

Stryker (1968, 1977) has argued that one's commitment to an identity determines the power of that identity to influence behavior; that is, identities to which one is committed have a higher probability of being invoked as guides to situated behavior (identity salience). Stryker's distinction between identity commitment and identity salience is critical: Commitment refers to the strength of one's affective response vis-a-vis an identity, whereas salience refers to the probability of behavioral responses.

At the most general level, identity theories predict that cognition, behavior, and affect will be functions of one's motivation to create and carry out exemplary role enactments for the purpose of validating identities to which one is committed. Before hypotheses generated by such models can be tested fairly, an adequate measure of commitment to role identities is needed. The Twenty Statements Test (TST; Kuhn & McPartland, 1954), an unstructured questionnaire in which the respondent answers the question "Who am I?" has been used for this purpose. Unfortunately, the TST presents a number of methodological problems, many of which stem from its open-ended format. This has made the task of developing useful scoring procedures extremely difficult, the result being a test with unknown reliability and validity (Wylie, 1974).

Idiographic Assessment

What is needed if the role-identity model is to be tested adequately is a psychometrically sound measure of commitment that has been specifically developed to fit the requirements of the model. To be useful for idiographic studies of the self-system, a method of measuring commitment must meet two psychometric requirements. First, it must reliably assess the importance of many different identities encompassed by

the self. It must yield scores for whichever identities are of interest to the researcher, and these scores must be comparable to each other. Second, a method of measuring commitment must be capable of assessing the hierarchical structure of a given respondent's self-identifications. Placement in the hierarchy of any identity must not be restricted by the placements of other identities in the hierarchy; that is, one's commitment scores for identities in the hierarchy should be methodologically independent of each other.

The flexibility of a 23-item index for assessing an individual's commitment to multiple identities is demonstrated in Study 1. Study 1 also demonstrates that responses to the index are unrelated to other states of the self-system (self-esteem and desire for social approval), thus providing evidence for the discriminant validity of the measure.

Nomothetic Assessment

In dealing with the concept of commitment, identity theorists have focused on the hierarchical ordering of an individual's multiple commitments, thus emphasizing the importance of within-subject comparisons. This approach contrasts with more frequently made between-subjects comparisons. For example, one might wish to compare the influence of [commitment to](#) peer identities on social interactions with peers (cf. Toder & Marcia, 1973), or one might ask how commitments to occupational roles affect the amount of stress experienced by dual-career couples (cf. Hall & Hall, 1980). Besides making nomothetic comparisons among subjects within a population, researchers often wish to make comparisons between populations. For example, one might compare the identities to which adolescents are committed with the identities valued by their parents as an aid to analyzing intergenerational conflicts. Before using a measure of commitment to study such problems, that measure must be validated independently for the particular identity of interest. Study 2 demonstrates the convergent and discriminant validity of the index for religious, romantic, kinship, and peer identities.

Study 1

Method

The Social Identities Questionnaire' was constructed to measure commitment to each of several role identities using three methods of self-report and was completed by 309 college students. Instructions first introduce the respondent to the concept of role identities. The respondent then estimates the subjective importance of his or her identities by (a) rank ordering them according to their overall importance, forming an identity hierarchy, and (b) assigning an importance rating to each identity using a 0-100 scale. The respondent then completes the 23-item index of commitment for each of a subset of identities. The details of each of these three steps follow.

The Identity Hierarchy

On the first page of the questionnaire, respondents were given the following instructions:

Throughout this questionnaire, you will be asked about your "social identities." Identities are labels that people can use to describe themselves. For example, some people identify themselves as skiers; others identify themselves as hunters or chess players. Skier, hunter, and chess player are all identities that could be grouped into a category labeled "recreational" identities.

On the following page are listed seven category labels and a brief description of the kinds of identities that can be included within the categories. For each category, several examples of relevant identities are also given. Please read these category descriptions carefully and look at the examples given. For each category, think of *one* identity that describes *you* and write this identity in the blank to the right of the examples. *Do not put the same identity in more than one blank.*

The seven categories of role identities and their definitions were (a) associational: labels for membership in those clubs, groups, and organizations in which you formally or informally participate; (b) kinship: labels that describe your relationships to family members; (c) occupational: labels that describe the work you do for money, including part-time and summer work; (d) peer: labels that describe acquaintanceships with people your own age; (e) recreational: labels that describe what you do during your leisure time; (f) religious: labels that describe your religious orientation; and (g) romantic: labels that describe close, personal relationships.

For each of these seven categories, examples were given of specific identities within the category. To illustrate, the identities of parent, sister, cousin, uncle, daughter, nephew, and grandparent were given as specific identities for the kinship category. For each category, the respondent chose one specific identity that described a personally relevant role.

Respondents were then asked to "rank order your identities in the order of their importance to you." After they had rank ordered their identities, respondents were

instructed to reconsider their rankings and ask themselves, "If, for some reason, I *had* to give up one of these identities, would I do so in this order, giving up the one at the bottom first, then the next one, and so on up the line?" If the answer to this question was no, they were to correct the ordering.

Importance Ratings

Next, respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of the seven identities, using a scale of 0 ("of no importance to me") through 50 ("moderately important") to 100 ("as important as I can imagine").

The Commitment Index

Finally, all ($n = 309$) respondents completed a 23-item commitment index for their most important (first ranked) and least important (last ranked) identities. Seventy respondents also completed the index for an identity of moderate (fourth ranked) importance. About half of the items ask about the impact of the identity on activities such as reading, conversations, decision making, and self-presentation. The remaining items ask for subjective evaluations of the importance of the identity. Ordering is such that mildly worded items appear near the beginning of the form, and more strongly worded items appear near the end. For approximately one half of the statements, agreement reflects commitment. For the remaining items, disagreement reflects commitment. A total score is obtained by summing across all responses after they have been scored in the direction of commitment. Thus, commitment scores can range from 0 (uncommitted) to 23 (strongly committed).

According to identity theory, the position of an identity in one's identity hierarchy should correspond to one's commitment to the identity. Thus, the construct validity of the commitment index would be demonstrated if each of the items were answered in the direction of commitment for identities high in the hierarchy and answered in the opposite direction for identities at the bottom of the hierarchy. To test whether this was true, all respondents completed the commitment index for their most important (first ranked) and least important (last ranked) identities. Seventy of the respondents also completed the index for a moderately important (fourth ranked) identity.

When completing the index for one's most important identity, the instructions were as follows:

For this section of the questionnaire, you are to refer to your MOST IMPORTANT IDENTITY as you listed it on page 3 of this booklet. Please turn back to page 3 to see what specific identity you listed in blank number 1. Write this identity in the blank at the top of this page.

For each of the items below, read the statement through using the identity you have written at the top of this page to *mentally* fill in the blank. After reading each item, decide whether the statement is MOSTLY

Copies of this questionnaire are available from the author on request.

TRUE or MOSTLY FALSE. Use a T to indicate TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE and use an F to indicate FALSE or MOSTLY FALSE.

These instructions were modified appropriately to refer to least important and moderately important identities. The first item of the index illustrates the format of the self-report statements:

T F 1. When people are discussing being a(n) _____, I make an effort to listen to and/or join the conversation.

Researchers of self have traditionally been sensitive to the potentially contaminating effects of response bias on self-report measures. The tendency of respondents to bias their self-reports was assessed using the Crowne and Marlowe (1964) Social Desirability Scale. Theories of identity assume no direct relationship between commitment and self-esteem, although continual failure to receive validation for preferred identities may result in lower self-esteem. To test the assumption that global self-esteem would not be directly related to commitment to a particular identity, Rosenberg's (1965) Self-Esteem Scale was administered.

Results and Discussion

Because the purpose of this first study was to examine the acceptability of a commitment index for measuring the abstract concept of commitment to an identity, the analyses did not distinguish among responses for different identity contents. For example, for first-ranked identities, one subject's responses about commitment to her identity of "sister" were considered comparable to another's responses about his "Catholic" identity. Preserving this heterogeneity of identity contents within each level of importance ensured an appropriate but stringent test of the usefulness of the 23-item commitment index as a flexible tool for assessing an individual's commitment to each of several identities.

Construct Validity

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of commitment scores and importance ratings for three levels of the identity hierarchy. If scores on the 23-item commitment index reflect the position of the identity in the identity hierarchy, the rank position of an identity in the identity hierarchy and the commitment score for that identity should be closely related. For first-ranked identities, the mean commitment score was 17.81; for last-ranked identities, the mean commitment

Table 1
Summary of Commitment Scores and Importance Ratings for Each of Three Levels in the Identity Hierarchy

| Identity rank | Importance rating | Commitment score |
|---------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1 | | |
| | <i>M</i> | 17.81 |
| | <i>Mdn</i> | 94.33 |
| | <i>SD</i> | 99.64 |
| | | 9.40 |
| 4 | | 3.34 |
| | <i>M</i> | 14.39 |
| | <i>Mdn</i> | 70.14 |
| | <i>SD</i> | 74.59 |
| | | 16.66 |
| | | 4.00 |
| 7 | | |
| | <i>M</i> | 6.11 |
| | <i>Mdn</i> | 23.00 |
| | <i>SD</i> | 20.38 |
| | | 21.27 |
| | | 4.49 |

Note. *n* = 309 for all groups except Rank 4/commitment score, for which *n* = 70. For identity rank, 1 = most important, 7 = least important.

score was 6.11, paired $t(308) = 35.22, p < .001$. Scores for first-ranked ($M = 17.93$) and fourth-ranked ($M = 14.30$) identities were also significantly different, paired $t(69) = 6.66, p < .001$, as were scores for fourth-ranked and seventh-ranked identities ($M = 6.90$), paired $t(69) = 10.82, p < .001$.

Discriminant Validity

Responses to the commitment index for first-ranked identities were slightly correlated with self-esteem, $r(133) = .14, p < .05$, and uncorrelated with social desirability, $r(65) = .10, ns$. For seventh-ranked identities, commitment was uncorrelated with both self-esteem, $r(138) = .01, ns$, and social desirability, $r(59) = .14, ns$.

Reliability

The internal consistency of the 23-item index is reflected in Kuder-Richardson 20 coefficients of .74 and .85 for first- and seventh-ranked identities, respectively.

When completed for a heterogeneous sample of identities, the items in the 23-item commitment index are sufficiently homogeneous to be internally reliable. As predicted, commitment scores corresponded to the ranked positions of identities in the hierarchy and were unrelated to desire for ap-

proval. For both low-ranked and high-ranked identities, there was essentially no relationship between self-esteem and commitment. Thus, the 23-item commitment index appears to be useful for idiographic measurement, but psychological research commonly requires that a scale provide valid and reliable estimates of differences among subjects rather than within subjects. Study 2 demonstrates the usefulness of the 23-item commitment index for use in nomothetic research designs.

Study 2

The data from Study 1 were examined to determine the identities most frequently placed high in the identity hierarchy. On the basis of this information, kinship, peer, and romantic identities were chosen for inclusion in Study 2. In addition, religious identity was included, since many measures of religious orientation have been developed, and any new measure of commitment should correlate with these. Unfortunately, existing measures of attitudes toward families, romantic relationships, and friends do not focus on the notion of commitment. Thus, validity evidence for these identities must depend on correlations between commitment scores and measures of constructs that might be related to, but are not direct measures of, commitment.

Four of-Scott's (1965) Personal Values scales were selected to test the validity of religious and peer commitment scores. The religiousness scale recognizes both internal and external elements of religious behavior and was predicted to correlate with commitment to religious identity. Since the notion of commitment implies internal motivation, commitment to religious identity should be more strongly related to internal than external religious orientation. The social skills scale measures concern with the opinion of others and should be related to peer commitment. The status and independence scales reflect a preference to stand out from one's peers and should be unrelated to commitment. Religious commitment should also correlate with the Allport and Ross (1967) measures of internal and external religious orientation. Responses to Rubin's

(1970) measure of romantic love were expected to correlate with commitment to one's romantic identity, and the Elias (1952) Family Adjustment Test was chosen as an index of family attitudes that should correspond to commitment to kinship identities.

The development of psychological tests should include a search for potential bias due to the method of assessment used (Campbell & Fiske, 1959). In developing a method for measuring commitment to role identities, an explicit goal was to produce indices of commitment to different identities that are methodologically identical. This approach maximizes the potential for response tendencies and method bias to affect commitment scores. To assess the impact of method bias, a multitrait-multimethod (MTMM) matrix was generated. The four traits included in the matrix were commitment to each of four identities. The two methods of assessing commitment were the 23-item commitment index and the importance ratings.

Method

Student participants ($N = 288$) completed the Social Identities Questionnaire, which had been modified to focus on four specific identities and included the commitment hierarchy for the identities of family member, peer, religious participant, and romantic partner. Approximately 2 weeks later, subsamples of participants were retested and asked to complete (a) the Personal Values scales and the Religious Orientation Measure or (b) the Family Adjustment Test (Elias, 1952) and Rubin's (1970) love and liking scales.

Results

Table 2 summarizes responses to the Social Identities Questionnaire for participants in Study 2: Commitment scores were highest for peer identity ($M = 18.35$), followed by family identity ($M = 15.70$), romantic identity ($M = 14.48$), and religious identity ($M = 7.89$). The hierarchical ordering of commitments was identical for males and females, although commitment scores for females were 1-2 points higher than the corresponding scores for males. These sex differences in commitment scores were statistically significant for peer identity ($M_s = 19.19$ and 17.09 , respectively), $t(201) = 4.49$, $p < .001$; family identity ($M_s = 16.78$

and 14.05), $t(198) = 4.54, p < .001$; and romantic identity ($M_s = 15.01$ and 13.68), $t(145) = 2.33, p < .05$; but not for religious identity ($M_s = 8.31$ and $7.43, ns$). Corresponding sex differences were found in mean importance ratings. These differences did not affect the pattern of relationships among the variables in Study 2, however. Therefore, all analyses reported below combine the male and female subsamples.

Correlations Between Commitment Scores and Other Attitudinal Measures

Commitment scores for religious identity were strongly correlated with Scott's religiousness scale, $r(56) = .79, p < .001$, and the Allport and Ross scale of intrinsic religious orientation, $r(56) = .74, p < .001$, but were only slightly correlated with extrinsic religious orientation, $r(56) = .28, p < .05$, as predicted. Commitment to peer identity was uncorrelated with Scott's independence scale, $r(63) = .10, ns$, and the status scale, $r(63) = .17, ns$, but was correlated with his social skills scale, $r(63) = .35, p < .02$. Commitment to the role of romantic partner was significantly correlated with Rubin's love scale, $r(63) = .26, p < .02$, but not with the liking scale, $r(63) = .01, ns$. The Family Adjustment Test was uncorrelated with the commitment index for family, $r(63) = .01, ns$.

The Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix

Responses to the Social Identities Questionnaire were analyzed to produce the multitrait-multimethod matrix presented in Table 3, which summarizes the relationships among the importance ratings and commitment scores for family, peer, religious, and romantic identities.

Convergent validity. Campbell and Fiske (1959) specify as the criterion for convergent validity that the values along the validity diagonal be both statistically significant and psychologically meaningful. The validity diagonal is found in the lower left (heterotrait-heteromethod) triangle and consists of the correlations between two methods of assessing commitment to each of four identities—the importance ratings and commit-

Table 2
Strength of Commitment to Four Social Role Identities in a College Population

| Identity | Rank | Importance rating | Commitment index |
|-----------------------|------|-------------------|------------------|
| Peer | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 2.41 | 81.07 | 18.35 |
| <i>SD</i> | | 16.02 | 3.38 |
| Family member | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 1.70 | 85.90 | 15.70 |
| <i>SD</i> | | 16.27 | 4.38 |
| Romantic partner | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 2.60 | 77.41 | 14.48 |
| <i>SD</i> | | 19.08 | 3.87 |
| Religious participant | | | |
| <i>M</i> | 3.28 | 50.12 | 7.89 |
| <i>SD</i> | | 33.69 | 6.67 |

Note. $N = 288$.

ment scores. Because the two methods used in the present study are self-reports taken at the same time, they do not represent the ideal state of two maximally independent methods. Nevertheless, Campbell and Fiske argue that "some evaluation of validity can take place even if the two methods are not entirely independent" (1959, pp. 83-84) by comparing values along the validity diagonal with values within the heteromethod block. In Table 3, the validity correlations (.57 for family, .40 for peer, .86 for religious participant, and .40 for romantic partner) are all significant ($p < .001$) and well elevated above the values within the heteromethod block (range = $-.07$ to $.11$), thus providing evidence for convergent validity.

Discriminant validity. Three criteria are offered by Campbell and Fiske for assessing discriminant validity. First, a comparison of the values on the validity diagonal in the heterotrait-heteromethod triangle with the off-diagonal values in the same triangle should demonstrate that correlations between two measures of commitment to the same identity are greater than the correlations obtained for commitment scores that share neither method nor identity content. This criterion is clearly met in Table 3. Second, values on the validity diagonal should be greater than the off-diagonal values in

Table 3
Convergent and Discriminant Validation of the Commitment Index for Four Identities

| Identity | Importance rating | | | | Commitment index | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|---------|-----------|----------|------------------|---------|-----------|----------|
| | Family | Peer | Religious | Romantic | Family | Peer | Religious | Romantic |
| Rating | | | | | | | | |
| Family | (.80)** | | | | | | | |
| Peer | .29** | (.72)** | | | | | | |
| Religious | .17** | .02 | (.95)** | | | | | |
| Romantic | .20** | .20** | .07 | (.66)** | | | | |
| Index | | | | | | | | |
| Family | .57** | | | | (.89)** | | | |
| Peer | .11 | .40** | | | .37** | (.84)** | | |
| Religious | .07 | -.06 | .86** | | .16* | -.11 | (.95)** | |
| Romantic | -.07 | .09 | .08 | .40** | .12* | .34** | .03 | (.88)** |

Note. *N* = 288. Values in parentheses are test-retest reliabilities.
p* < .05. *p* < .001.

the two heterotrait-monomethod triangles. This criterion is also met, although commitment to peer identity was moderately correlated with commitment to family and romantic identities in both heterotrait-monomethod triangles. The third requirement for discriminant validity is that the pattern of off-diagonal values be similar for all three triangles. This requirement is met fairly well.

Reliability. Test-retest coefficients can be found along the main diagonal of the matrix. Also, Kuder-Richardson 20 coefficients for the commitment index were calculated for each of the identities; the values obtained were .83 for family, .77 for peer, .94 for religious, and .78 for romantic.

Visual inspection of the MTMM matrix provides evidence for the construct validity of the commitment index, although the Campbell and Fiske (1959) criteria for evaluating the matrix are open to subjective interpretation. Using the formulae developed

Table 4
Variance Components for the Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix

| Source | Variance component |
|----------------|--------------------|
| Respondent (R) | .226 |
| R X Identity | .521 |
| R X Method | .118 |
| Error | .324 |

Note. Based on formulae given by Kavanagh, MacKinney, and Wolins, 1971.

by Kavanagh, MacKinney, and Wolins (1971), variance components were calculated to quantify the relative contributions to obtained scores of respondents, identity content, method bias, and error. This analysis is summarized in Table 4. The first row in the table reflects the influence of respondents on the overall commitment score. According to Kavanagh et al., departure of this component from zero implies an effect of undesired response tendencies. This interpretation assumes that the four "true" commitment scores for each subject are unrelated. However, there are no clear theoretical or empirical reasons to assume that commitments to various identities are totally independent. Thus, the nonzero value of the variance component for respondents may reflect a combination of undesired respondent effects and the "true" state of nature.

The largest value in Table 4, the variance component for identity content (row 2), provides strong evidence of the measure's ability to discriminate among identity contents. The effects of assessment methods (ratings vs. scores on the 23-item index) are seen in row 3, where a small variance component indicates that there is no substantial method bias. In row 4 is the variance component for unexplained error, which is larger than an ideal value but is acceptable. nonetheless.

Discussion

Based on the results of Study 2, the commitment index appears to be a reliable and

valid assessment method. The identity content most effectively validated was religious identity. Commitment scores and importance ratings were strongly correlated ($r = .86$) for religious identity. As predicted, religious commitment was strongly correlated with Scott's index of religiousness and the Allport and Ross measure of intrinsic religious orientation and was slightly correlated with extrinsic religious orientation.

In the MTMM matrix, commitment to family received the next highest validity value, a correlation of .57 between commitment scores and importance ratings. Yet commitment to family was uncorrelated with beliefs about family life as measured by the Family Adjustment Test. Since the Family Adjustment Test has not been well researched, and thus its validity has not been demonstrated, it may be premature to conclude that the commitment index is invalid as a measure of family importance. The failure of the two measures to correlate could result from the invalidity of either test.

The correlations between commitment scores and importance ratings for peer and romantic identities were somewhat lower than for religious and family identities but were highly significant. As predicted, Scott's social skills scale correlated more strongly with peer commitment than did the independence and status scales, which were not significantly correlated with peer commitment. Finally, commitment to the identity of romantic partner was correlated with Rubin's love scale, as predicted. Overall, the results of Study 2 suggest that the commitment index adequately assesses commitment to role identities.

Summary and Conclusions

Although the nearly complete fusion of the concept of self with the notion of self-esteem has resulted in an empirical literature in which 90% of the studies of self are studies of self-esteem (McGuire, McGuire, Child, & Fujioka, 1978), a few researchers have viewed the self as a set of self-conceptions that are differentially important to the individual. This line of research assumes that self-conceptions are closely linked to specific

identities to which the person is more or less committed. The research reported in this article describes the development of a 23-item index that can be used to assess commitment to a role identity. For a variety of identities, scores on this index were associated with (a) the position of an identity in one's identity hierarchy, (b) subjective importance ratings of the identity, and (c) scores on other psychological measures predicted to be related to commitment scores. Evidence of discriminant validity was also presented: Neither self-esteem nor social desirability was related to commitment to particular identities, and as demonstrated by the variance components for the MTMM matrix, commitment scores were relatively unaffected by method bias. Responses to the index were shown to be both internally consistent and stable over time. These results recommend the commitment index as a suitable research tool for further tests of the role-identity model of self.

Numerous hypotheses have been advanced about both the antecedents of identity commitment and its effects on behavior, cognition, and affect. For example, commitment implies a concern for the convincingness of relevant role enactments and has been hypothesized to be related to self-role congruence (Sarbin & Allen, 1968). Commitment has also been hypothesized to be directly related to intensity of expectations held for others important to the identity (Santee & Jackson, 1979) and to decisions in conflict situations (Stryker, 1977). Commitment may serve as a moderator of the impact of the evaluations made by others, and it may have different implications for ascribed versus achieved statuses (Wood, 1978). Relatively little research has been conducted to test these and related formulations of identity theory. Most studies that have been completed have relied on the Twenty Statements Test as a measure of the importance of identities. The use of the TST, for which there is little evidence of validity (Wylie, 1974), has made the studies that have been conducted difficult to interpret. It is hoped that the availability of an alternative instrument for assessing commitment will stimulate empirical research on theories

References

- Allport, G. W., & Ross, J. M. Personal religious orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1967, 5, 432-443.
- Campbell, D. T., & Fiske, D. W. Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1959, 56, 81-105.
- Cancian, F. M. *What are norms? A study of beliefs and action in a Maya community*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. *The approval motive*. New York: Wiley, 1964.
- Elias, G. *The Family Adjustment Test*. Munster, Ind.: Psychometric Affiliates, 1952.
- Gordon, C. Self-conceptions: Configurations of content. In C. Gordon & K. J. Gergen (Eds.), *The self in social interaction*. New York: Wiley, 1968.
- Hall, D. T., & Hall, F. S. Stress and the two-career couple. In C. L. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.), *Current concerns in occupational stress*. Chichester, England: Wiley, 1980.
- Kavanagh, M. J., MacKinney, A. C., & Wolins, L. Issues in managerial performance: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of ratings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 1971, 75, 34-49.
- Kelley, H. H. Two functions of reference groups. In G. E. Swanson, T. M. Newcomb, & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), *Readings in social psychology*. New York: Holt, 1952.
- Kelley, H. H. Salience of group membership and resistance to change of group-anchored attitudes. *Human Relations*, 1955, 8, 275-289.
- Kelley, H. H., & Volkart, E. H. The resistance to change of group-anchored attitudes. *American Sociological Review*, 1952, 1, 433-465.
- Kuhn, M. H., & McPartland, T. S. An experimental investigation of self-attitudes. *American Sociological Review*, 1954, 3, 68-76.
- McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. *Identities and interactions*. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- McGuire, W. J., McGuire, C. V., Child, P., & Fujioka, T. Salience of ethnicity in the spontaneous self-concept as a function of one's ethnic distinction in the social environment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1978, 36, 511-520.
- Rosenberg, M. *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Rubin, Z. Measurement of romantic love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1970, 16, 265-273.
- Santee, R. T., & Jackson, S. E. Commitment to self-identifications: A sociopsychological approach to personality. *Human Relations*, 1979, 41, 141-158.
- Sarbin, T. R., & Allen, V. L. Role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- Scott, W. A. *Values and organizations: A study of fraternities and sororities*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.
- Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. *An outline of social psychology*. New York: Harper, 1956.
- Stryker, S. Identity salience and role performance. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1968, 30, 558-564.
- Stryker, S. Developments in "Two social psychologies": Toward an appreciation of mutual relevance. *Sociometry*, 1977, 40, 145-160.
- Toder, N. L., & Marcia, J. E. Ego identity, status, and response to conformity pressure in college women. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1973, 26, 287-294.
- Wood, L. A. Loneliness, social identity, and social structure. *Essence*, 1978, 2, 259-270.
- Wylie, R. C. *The self-concept: A review of methodological considerations and measuring instruments* (Vol. 1). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1974.

Received December 20, 1979

Revision received June 5, 1980 ~