

\ A STUDY OF THE STATUS DILEMMAS AND CONTRADICTIONS
IN CERTAIN OCCUPATIONS:
THE MARGINAL WOMAN /

by

Deborah C. Clopton //

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Sociology

APPROVED:

E. Gordon Ericksen, Chairman

William E. Snizek

Ellsworth R. Fuhrman

May, 1977
Blacksburg, Virginia

W

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to formally thank the members of my thesis committee. I am grateful for their time and consideration in the preparation of this thesis. The supporting members of the committee, _____ and _____, have provided valuable insights. I especially appreciate _____ help in operationalizing this problem, and _____ help theoretically. _____ deserves special appreciation in that he has taken the time and effort to lend guidance and encouragement as Chairman of the thesis committee. I sincerely appreciate all of the help that has gone into this thesis.

I would like to thank _____ and _____ for help in the operational aspects of this thesis. I also thank my typist,

Finally, I thank my parents and my husband for their support and love.

LM/MRJ 6/1/77

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables.....	v
CHAPTER I THE PROBLEM.....	1
CHAPTER II DILEMMAS AND CONTRADICTIONS OF STATUS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	5
Origin of the Problem.....	5
Theoretical Underpinnings.....	11
Status Dilemmas.....	11
Status Contradictions.....	13
Summary.....	15
Contemporary Studies.....	16
Status Dilemmas.....	17
Professional Women.....	18
Socialization.....	28
Status Contradictions.....	33
Stratification.....	33
Status Inconsistency.....	35
Summary and Conclusion.....	38
CHAPTER III SUBJECTIVE DIMENSION.....	41
Introduction.....	41
Operationalization.....	42
The Technique.....	42
The Sample.....	43
Analysis of Findings.....	44
Male Professors.....	44
Female Professors.....	49
Synthesis.....	53
Summary and Conclusion.....	58
CHAPTER IV OBJECTIVE DIMENSION.....	61
Introduction.....	61
Operationalization.....	62
The Technique.....	62
The Variables.....	63
The Data.....	64
Analysis of Findings.....	65
Ranking of Occupations.....	65
Original Relationship Between Variables.....	65

	Page
Control Variables.....	67
Sex of Respondent.....	67
Religion.....	70
Mother's Occupation.....	70
Father's Occupation.....	77
Summary.....	80
Comparison of Means.....	80
Original Relationship Between	
Variables.....	81
Control Variables.....	83
Sex of Respondent.....	83
Female Respondents.....	83
Male Respondents.....	85
Comparison of Male and	
Female Respondents.....	87
Religion.....	89
Mother's Occupation.....	89
Father's Occupation.....	93
Summary.....	93
Summary and Conclusion.....	97
 CHAPTER V	
CONCLUSION.....	100
Restatement of the Problem.....	100
Overview of Study.....	101
Relationship of Survey Data to	
Interview Data.....	104
Conclusion.....	106
 REFERENCES.....	109
 APPENDIX.....	112
 VITA.....	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, With the Sex of the Role Occupant Specified	66
2a Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for the Sex of the Respondent (Female Respondents)	68
2b Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for the Sex of the Respondent (Male Respondent)	69
3a Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for Religion (Catholic Respondents).....	71
3b Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for Religion (Protestant Respondents).....	72
4a Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for Mother's Occupation (Professional-Executive)	74
4b Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for Mother's Occupation (Non-Professional).....	75
4c Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for Mother's Occupation (Housewives).....	76
5a Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for Father's Occupation (Professional-Executive)	78
5b Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations, Controlling for Father's Occupation (Non-Professional).....	79
6 Mean Ratings of Occupations, With the Sex of the Role Occupant Specified.....	82
7a Mean Ratings of Occupations, Controlling for the Sex of the Respondent (Female Respondents).....	84
7b Mean Ratings of Occupations, Controlling for the Sex of the Respondent (Male Respondents).....	86
8 Mean Ratings of Occupations, Comparing Male and Female Respondents.....	88
9 Mean Ratings of Occupations, Controlling for Religion.....	90

Table	Page
10a Mean Ratings of Occupations, Controlling for Mother's Occupation (Professional-Executive and Non-Professional).....	91
10b Mean Ratings of Occupations, Controlling for Mother's Occupation (Professional-Executive and Housewife).....	92
10c Mean Ratings of Occupations, Controlling for Mother's Occupation (Non-Professional and Housewife).....	94
11 Mean Ratings of Occupations, Controlling for Father's Occupation (Professional-Executive and Non-Professional).....	95

CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

The problem under consideration within this thesis pertains to females in the occupational realm of American society. This problem is undertaken to explore the dilemmas and contradictions of status that arise when females are encountered in male dominated occupations, and to some extent, when males are encountered in female dominated occupations. Through role theory and socialization studies, it is learned that changes in the status quo bring about problems in the occupational arena. As Rosenberg expresses it:

Role expectancy points to conduct suitable for a specific status. Status refers to the individuals position within a social order. And that position is determined by the existing division of labor. Given an inconstant division of labor and shifting positions within it, status and role are surrounded by uncertainty. (1972:68-69)

As more females are entering male dominated occupations, the dilemmas that they face and the dilemmas that they create for others, as a result of their sexual status, need to be defined and delineated. This thesis seeks to answer questions concerning the dilemmas of status faced by males and females in certain occupations. For instance, under what circumstances do dilemmas and contradictions of status occur most frequently? Which sex is affected the most, the dominant sex or the invading sex; and who is the first to accept this invading sex, colleagues or clients? When can an individual become simply a colleague or employee rather than a female or male colleague or employee? These and other questions are explored so that social scientists as well as

lay-persons will come to recognize the problem, and make reference to it in studies on status as well as in everyday affairs.

The idea for this thesis originated from an article by Everett C. Hughes entitled, "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status". (1945) Professor Hughes defines status as a social position with specifically defined rights, duties, and limitations. In addition, statuses tend to develop certain auxiliary characteristics which come to be associated with it's incumbents. It is when these auxiliary characteristics are not met that dilemmas and contradictions occur. The auxiliary characteristic of gender, expected from the incumbent, giving rise to status dilemmas and contradictions in certain occupations, is the focus of this thesis.

This thesis will attempt to explore the implications of Hughes' article, theoretically and operationally. In so doing, this thesis will go beyond the original article, narrowing the analysis and penetrating more deeply into the dilemmas and contradictions of status that result, and the inferences to be drawn from these dilemmas and contradictions.

The implications of Hughes article are explored theoretically through a review of the supportive literature. This review begins by discussing Hughes' conceptual catalyst for the study. The historical development of the two concepts is explored as are the supporting contemporary studies.

In operationalizing this problem a distinction must be made between status dilemmas and status contradictions. Bernard Rosenberg actualizes this distinction when he states: "Human society is itself necessarily split into two uneven parts, one visible and concrete, the

other invisible and intersubjective." (1972:48) Contradictions are phenomena of the social system and dilemmas are phenomena of the individual. Dilemmas are subjective; they occur within individuals. They represent the intersubjective, qualitative aspect of society. Contradictions are objective; they are rooted in the social structure. They represent the concrete, quantitative aspect of society. Structural functionalism lends itself to the study of status contradictions - the concrete quantitative aspect. Symbolic interactionism lends itself to the study of status dilemmas - the intersubjective qualitative aspect. Both methods are utilized necessarily to obtain a wholistic image of the problem, the rational being: human beings are neither purely social beings imbedded in collective structures, norms, symbols and beliefs: nor are they wholly internally privatized individuals. Human beings are social in that they internalize group norms and attitudes and act accordingly. But human beings are also individual in that they are creators in their own right. Any study of human society must take into account these two aspects of human behavior. For these reasons, the paradigm of this thesis is as follows.

First, the subjective, qualitative data are analysed from the perspective of the self. This portion of the thesis is pursued under the symbolic interactionist approach; and the data are obtained by the cultural soliloquy field technique. Individuals, although parts of a collectivity, act, in some measure, on their own initiative. It is the individual who experiences the dilemma; and personal subjective accounts add validity to the objective results.

The assumption here is simple enough: we must honor the initiative of the self on the grounds that, technically speaking, only the person thinks, imagines and recalls experiences. And with everyday experiences being distinctive and unique in character (non-duplicative), the person is an acknowledged interpreter of his relationships with the environment. Of course, he is a socialized self, indirectly constrained by the norms of his affiliations. Only in a qualifying sense, therefore, does he stand above his groups. He acts primarily (and I use this word advisedly) out of the dictates of his life organization.*

Second, the objective, quantitative, measureable data are analysed, using the collective perspective. The assumption here is that societies have pre-determined attitudes concerning statuses attributed to certain occupations, and these attitudes can be objectively measured through the collective structure. This portion of the thesis is pursued within the logical positivistic approach of structural functionalism, with the data obtained through the survey technique.

An interface between these two perspectives and concepts is discussed through the notion of the socialized self. The implications from the literature review and the results of the field work are analysed and conclusions drawn. A synthesis of the theoretical and operational implications is attempted with a view toward a general conclusion to the dilemmas and contradictions of status for women in the occupational arena of American society.

*From the fourth chapter of Professor E. G. Erickson's forthcoming book: The Friction of Space: Human Ecology as Symbolic Interaction.

CHAPTER II

DILEMMAS AND CONTRADICTIONS OF STATUS:

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Within American society there are a great variety of status determinants ranging from technical training to personal characteristics. The determinants may be separate entities or so closely associated that they seem connected. Societal change and individual mobility occur at such a rate that elaboration of status determinants, for certain positions, is inhibited; and personal traits tend to protrude as status determining characteristics. Often these personal traits occur in unusual combinations which eventuate in dilemmas and contradictions of status.

ORIGIN OF THE PROBLEM

The above paragraph introduces the premise from which Everett C. Hughes fashioned his article, "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status". His purpose was to "elaborate the notion of contradictions and dilemmas of status." (1945:353)

Referring to status, Hughes states that it is "a defined social position for whose incumbents there are defined rights, limitations of rights, and duties." (1945:353) Statuses develop expected patterns of personal attributes and characteristics. There may be formal or legal determining characteristics as well as technical requirements for given statuses. For some statuses, however, there may be no formal

characteristics or technical qualifications required. As Hughes expresses it, statuses may be "ill-defined both as to the characteristics which determine identification with them and as to their duties and rights." (1945:353)

Before presenting his main proposition, Hughes states a qualifying proposition: "there tends to grow up about a status, in addition to its specifically determining traits, a complex of auxiliary characteristics which come to be expected of its incumbents." (1945:353)

These expected, auxiliary characteristics are incorporated in stereotypes and facilitated through conversation and the media. When individuals enter into established positions they are expected to display the characteristics normally associated with the position; otherwise, they may encounter status dilemmas. American society is highly mobile as well as achievement oriented. New types of persons entering into established positions are becoming more frequent. With regard "to the consequences of the appearance of new kinds of people in established positions," Hughes states his main proposition: "every such occurrence produces in some measure, a status contradiction. It may also create a status dilemma for the individual concerned and for other people who have to deal with him." (1945:357)

In American society, gender may be considered a major status-determining characteristic. An individual's sexual status tends to outweigh many other status determinants. Professional status, however, is also a major status determinant. When an individual displays two clashing status characteristics, such as the two just mentioned, a dilemma may arise. Consider the female physician. The patients and

lay persons coming into contact with her may experience the dilemma of having to choose whether to treat her as a woman or as a physician. These two status determining characteristics imply differing modes of behavior, thereby creating a dilemma as to which mode to ascribe.

Parade magazine published an article on females in the medical specialty of urology. (February 20, 1977) Of approximately 6500 urologists in the United States, four are female. One particular female urologist, Dr. Larrian Gillespie, was interviewed concerning dilemmas that she has encountered throughout her career. Some of these dilemmas involved male patients -- two of whom actually refused to be examined by her. For the most part, however, male patients are initially "unsettled". They do not know whether to treat her as a woman or as a doctor. Soon they come to accept her as a physician. She assures them that her interests in them are purely professional and that she is a physician first and foremost.

Although many dilemmas stem from her relations with patients, Dr. Gillespie feels that most of the dilemmas she encounters stem from her relationships with her colleagues. She states:

A girl who sets out to specialize in urology finds she gets more trouble from other doctors than from the patients. They seem to treat us as if we were storming some male bastion, and they resent it. They've always regarded urology as a field exclusively for men. (1977:4)

Hughes recognizes the colleague-group as being a major determinant of the appropriate characteristics for certain occupations. He states that "it is in the colleague-group or fellow-worker group that the expectations concerning appropriate auxiliary characteristics are worked

most intricately into sentiment and conduct." (1945:355) The expectations come to define the groups' common interests and informal code of behavior as well as the selection of its members and inner fraternity.

Status determining characteristics become incorporated in the status structure by repeated associations with a particular position. Individuals facilitate this incorporation by building up expectations concerning the various positions and characteristics. Hughes qualifies these expectations by stating:

I do not maintain that any considerable proportion of people do consciously put together in a systematic way their expectation of persons of given positions. I suggest, rather, that people carry in their minds a set of expectations concerning the auxiliary traits properly associated with many of the specific positions available in our society. These expectations appear as advantages or disadvantages to persons who, in keeping with American social belief and practice, aspire to positions new to persons of their kind. (1945:354-355)

Contradictions are imbedded in the social structure. As expectations become established concerning the status characteristics of certain positions, these status characteristics become integral components of the occupational structure. Contradictions arise when new status determining characteristics appear in established positions.

Dilemmas, on the other hand, originate within the self. When problems occur because new status determining characteristics appear in established positions, it is because individuals recognize a contradiction in the occupational structure and act with uncertainty.

Contradictions are thought of, in the Durkheimian perspective, as being external, social facts that have been incorporated into the social structure, and govern the individuals' behavior within society.

Contradictions become dilemmas when individuals internalize the status structure and recognize status discrepancies in themselves or their colleagues. In the Meadian perspective, the individual is the ultimate assessor of reality and only when an individual internalizes the status structure and recognizes a discrepancy, does a dilemma exist.

Thus, contradictions exist in the social structure and dilemmas exist in the self. Dilemmas arise because, as Hughes expresses it, "the human individual does not always passively accept society's answer to the question: 'Who am I?' with all its implications of present and future conduct." (1949:223)

It is the perspective of the present thesis that reality resides in an interface of the two concepts - dilemmas and contradictions of status. The components of society and the self are not mutually exclusive, but rather two complementary forms; and both must be considered when the study of human society is undertaken.

The concept of the socialized self serves as a buffer for the societal perspective and the individual perspective. The socialized self represents an interface of social structure and individuality.

According to George Herbert Mead:

Every individual self within a given society or social community reflects in its organized structure the whole relational pattern of organized social behavior which that society or community exhibits or is carrying on, and its organized structure is constituted by this pattern; but since each of these individual selves reflects a uniquely different aspect or perspective of this pattern in its structure, from its own particular and unique place or standpoint within the whole process of organized social behavior which exhibits this pattern -- since, that is, each is differently or uniquely related to that whole process, and occupies its own essentially unique focus of

relations therein -- the structure of each is differently constituted by this pattern from the way in which the structure of any other is so constituted.

The individual is a self and acts out of his/her own life organization but this self becomes socialized and acts in part out of his/her social organization. Thus individuals act in part out of the social organization to which he/she is indoctrinated and in part out of his/her own life organization.

The distinction between status dilemmas and status contradictions is such that the remainder of the chapter is divided into discussions on the dilemmas and on the contradictions of status. First, the theoretical underpinnings of both concepts are perused. Georg Simmel and Robert E. Park provide the theoretical framework for status dilemmas. Park expands his analysis to include status contradictions as well. Thus, Robert E. Park, Everett Stonequist, and Robert Merton and Elinor Barber provide the theoretical framework for status contradictions. Second, the contemporary studies relating to the concepts are perused. Key authors include Cynthia F. Epstein, Jessie Bernard, Mirra Komarovsky, Gerhard Lenski, and David Knoke.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS

Status Dilemmas

The concept, status dilemma, and the notions surrounding this concept evolved from the works of several noted Sociologists. Georg Simmel initiated the process in his article entitled "The Stranger". (1908) Simmel conceptualized the stranger in terms of interaction within a group. The stranger is considered a "potential wanderer"; one who comes into a group and remains, but his/her position within the group is not definite. Referring to the stranger, Simmel states:

He is fixed within a certain spatial circle - or within a group whose boundaries are analogous to spatial boundaries - but his position within it is fundamentally affected by the fact that he does not belong in it initially and that he brings qualities into it that are not, and cannot be indigenous to it. (1908:143)

The stranger is presented in the form of a synthesis of attachment and detachment from the group - a synthesis of closeness and remoteness. The stranger's relationship to the group is abstract in that he/she shares only very general qualities with the other group members. According to Simmel:

The stranger is close to us insofar as we feel between him and ourselves similarities of nationality or social position, of occupation or of general human nature. He is far from us insofar as these similarities extend beyond him and us, and connect us only because they connect a great many people. (1908:147)

Simmel's stranger is seen as a marginal member of the group. That is, he/she is a member of the group but he/she does not entirely "belong" to the group. The stranger is, emotionally, both far from and close to the group.

From Simmel's conception of the stranger, Robert E. Park developed the notion of "the marginal man" in several articles; "Human Migration and The Marginal Man" (1928); "Mentality of Racial Hybrids" (1929); "Personality and Cultural Conflict" (1930); and "Cultural Conflict and the Marginal Man" (written as an introduction to Everett Stonequist's book, The Marginal Man 1937). Park defined the marginal man as, "the individual who finds himself on the margins of two cultures and not fully or permanently accommodated to either." (1930:370)

The marginal man is conceived as the racial or cultural hybrid.

According to Park he is:

A man living and sharing intimately in the cultural life and traditions of two distinct peoples; never quite willing to break, even if he were permitted to do so, with his past and his traditions, and not quite accepted, because of racial prejudice, in the new society in which he now sought to find a place. He was a man on the margin of two cultures and two societies, which never completely interpenetrated and fused. (1928:354)

Being on the margins of two cultures, the marginal man experiences inner conflict in trying to identify with one culture or the other. This is the dilemma of the marginal man.

Simmel's analysis is very broad. The stranger is conceived with no particular type of person in mind, and no particular facet of the social system. The only requirement for being labeled a stranger, is membership in a group, but not entirely "belonging" to that group. On the other hand, Park's analysis is narrowed to certain specifics. The marginal man is conceived with definite types in mind; namely, racial and ethnic groups. Park conceptualized racial, ethnic and cultural hybrids in the social system; thus, contracting the notion of "not

entirely belonging to a group" to, "persons on the margins of two or more groups."

Status Contradictions

Thusfar, Park has limited his discussion on marginality to the individualistic perspective. However, he expands the notion of marginality to include the societal perspective; and hence status contradictions.

Park states that an individual's self-conception arises from his/her role in society; from other's attitude toward the individual; from what Park terms, one's social status. "The individual's conception of himself is, in this sense, not an individual but a social product." (1937:375) Thus, the personality of the marginal man is derived from the conflict between races and cultures.

Everett Stonequist amplified Park's concept in his book entitled, The Marginal Man. (1937) Stonequist states that the conflict within the individual is a result of conflict between two or more social groups with which the individual identifies. That is, the conflict between groups or cultures is expressed as conflict within the individual, belonging to the groups. As a summary quote on the marginal man and the conflict he experiences, Stonequist states:

The core traits which characterize the marginal personality springs from the conflict of cultures, and not from the specific content of any culture . . .

Membership within a social group is more vital to the individual than sharing any particular culture; the first is a prerequisite to the second. Accordingly, when his social status is endangered, the psychological consequences are fundamental. It is because the marginal individual

has an uncertain status in two or more groups that he becomes a distinct type of personality irrespective of the particular content of the cultures. (1937:214)

Stonequist brings up the fact that acculturation into two or more different groups may bring about a conflict for the individual as well as the group:

Wherever there are cultural transitions and cultural conflicts there are marginal personalities. If the cultural differences are of major importance, if they include sharp contrasts in race, and if the social attitudes are hostile, the problem of the individual whose sentiments and career are bound up with both societies may well be acute. His dual social connections will then be reflected in the type of life he leads, the nature of his achievements or failures, his conception of himself, and many of his social attitudes and aspirations. He will, in fact, be a kind of dual personality. (1937:3-4)

When the standards of two or more social groups come into active contrast or conflict, the individual who is identified with both groups experiences the conflict as an acute personal difficulty or mental tension. He may be compelled to choose between two national loyalties, or only between two minor groups: in either case the situation is the same: the external conflict of the groups finds an echo in the mind of the individual concerned. (1937:4)

Stonequist conceives of the individual, in the Durkheimian perspective, as being a puppet to his/her groups. When two or more groups, to which an individual belongs, are in conflict, they impose a conflict upon the individual. The problem arises, "because the marginal individual has an uncertain status in two or more groups." (1937:214) It is not because of the content of the cultures or individual personalities. It is because of the contradictions of status, within the group, that marginal individuals experience and generate conflict.

Finally, the concept, sociological ambivalence, by Robert K. Merton and Elinor Barber, demands attention. Merton and Barber begin their

article discussing the psychological aspects of ambivalence, because the term was originally coined by a psychologist, and it has mainly been studied in the psychological vein. Merton and Barber wish to set forth a sociological orientation to ambivalence. In so doing, the authors define the sociological orientation to ambivalence as focusing "on the ways in which ambivalence comes to be built into the structure of social statuses and roles." (1963:93) The authors state:

In its most extended sense, sociological ambivalence refers to incompatible normative expectations of attitudes, beliefs, and behavior assigned to a status or to a set of statuses in society. In its most restricted sense, sociological ambivalence refers to incompatible normative expectations incorporated in a single role of a single social status . . . (1963:94-95)

The sources of ambivalence are cited; one is "found in the structural context of a particular status" and the other "in the multiple types of functions assigned to a status." (1963:95) People are exposed to ambivalence through the social positions which they hold and not through their experiences or personality. As stated by Merton and Barber people are exposed to ambivalence "not because of their idiosyncratic history or their distinctive personality but because the ambivalence is inherent in the social positions they occupy. This is what we mean by saying that sociological ambivalence is a concept dealing with social structure." (1963:96)

Summary

In sum, this discussion has run full circle; from Simmel's individualistic perspective to Merton and Barber's societal perspective. Simmel's analysis is anti-Durkheimian. According to Simmel, groups and

social facts do not totally rule the individual. The individual is dignified by having the initiative to rule him/herself. Dilemmas of status are individualistic in that they occur within individuals in an interaction situation.

Park allows for both the individualistic perspective and the societal perspective. He recognizes the group's influence over the individual, as well as the individual's prerogative to ignore the group's influence. Park's ideas on marginality include both status dilemmas and contradictions. Stonequist's analysis follows the Durkheimian perspective, that external social facts govern individuals. Stonequist focuses solely on contradictions of status.

Merton and Barber's concept, sociological ambivalence, is deeply rooted in the Durkheimian tradition. According to Merton and Barber, sociological ambivalence is found in the status structure and is synonymous with status contradictions.

CONTEMPORARY STUDIES

Everett C. Hughes' article, "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status", was written not only to discuss the theoretical underpinnings of status dilemmas and contradictions, but as an impetus to further research. The research that has come out of the initial article has been scant, however. Much of this research has varied quite a bit from the original effort. An attempt to systematically present the related research follows. The studies corresponding to status dilemmas are presented first, and the studies corresponding to status contradictions second. In concluding, an article related to both concepts will be discussed.

Status Dilemmas

In an article by Andrzej Malewski entitled, "Degree of Status Incongruence and Its Effects", exchange theory is utilized to explicate status dilemmas. Malewski's definition of status includes "everything which distinguishes an individual from others." (1966:303) This definition includes individual characteristics, the characteristics of an individual's relationship to others, groups and institutions, and the attitudes of others toward individuals. As stated by Malewski:

The idea of status as a complex set of different factors involves the problem of relationships between those factors. As a result of experience people learn that certain status factors appear linked to others and respond with normative expectations. (1966:303)

If these expectations are not met, the person will experience some incongruence. Malewski's main proposition is:

Generally speaking, the greater the divergence between the complex of status factors presented by a given individual and the normative expectations which have been formed in those whom that individual is in contact, the more incongruent is the status of that individual. (1966:303-304)

From the above quotes, Malewski would use status incongruence synonymously with status dilemma. Individuals internalize the status system, forming "normative expectations", which give rise to status discrepancies when these expectations are not met. Malewski utilizes the remainder of his article to state propositions concerning status incongruence in the exchange perspective. These propositions are concerned with reward and punishment associated with status incongruence.

Professional Women

The following three studies differ from those above in that they focus directly on women, and the problems that they encounter in the professions. The previous studies focus directly on dilemmas and contradictions of status; whereas, the following studies focus indirectly on status dilemmas. The authors recognize the contradictions within the status system which give rise to status dilemmas of women in the occupational arena. These studies coincide with the subjective data of the present thesis, and are referred to in analysing this data.

Cynthia F. Epstein's article, "Encountering the Male Establishment: Sex-Status Limits on Women's Careers in the Professions", begins quantitatively by presenting data on the proportions of men and women in the top professions. She finds that "for all occupations in all societies, as one approaches the top, the proportion of men increases and the proportion of women decreases." (1971:54-55) These unequal proportions are linked to status contradictions. Epstein goes on to state:

It is evident that the dynamics of recruitment and involvement at the higher echelons of professions are different than they are at the lower levels and that they militate against the participation of women. Further, these processes are integral to the "culture" of the professions as we know them and may not be intentionally exclusionary. Of course, cultural attitudes tied to women's roles and women's biologically linked characteristics interweave with these processes in making the woman professional's sex-status salient in the course of her career. (1971:55)

In setting the background for individual status dilemmas, Epstein first discusses status contradictions. The cultural attitudes and processes which cause sex-status to be salient in a woman's career are

analogous to status contradictions. They are rooted in the social and occupational structure.

Epstein then describes some characteristics of the occupational structure, and in particular of professions. She compares the professions to communities. Professions are homogenous and share norms and attitudes; a great deal of mutual understanding and behavior are at work within the professions. (1971:55) Epstein quotes Everett Hughes, from an article entitled, "What Other", as saying that professionalism "indicates a strong solidarity of those in an occupation . . . The very word 'profession' implies a certain social and moral solidarity, a strong dependence of one colleague upon the opinions and judgments of others." (Hughes, 1962:124-45) Epstein feels that such a subtle system makes it difficult for persons outside the system to be included, she states:

Thus, it is difficult for someone not equipped with a status-set of appropriate statuses to enter the exclusive society, to participate in its informal interactions, to understand the unstated norms, and to be included in the casual exchanges. (1971:55)

Epstein goes on to state that status dilemmas, or what she terms "role-confusion" are common within the professional structure when women are included. "Male colleagues typically are unable to engage in the normal collegial relationship with them and instead fall back on traditional norms governing male-female interaction." (1971:63)

In discussing the problems encountered by women because of role confusion, and dilemmas of status Epstein states:

Status discrepancies make continuous role definition necessary during interactions which should be routine. Thus, all group members are sensitized to problems of

ambiguity and are forced to form new ground rules [i.e., establish norms] for the situation. When the inappropriate status of the person's status set is activated in the professional context, refocusing of the interaction to the appropriate status must occur so that the professional task may be accomplished. (1971:64)

Having established the existence of status dilemmas, Epstein interviews successful women in various professions on how to alleviate these dilemmas. The responses are categorized as follows:

"Formality in the professional context." It is felt that specific rules which define behavior help to alleviate some status dilemmas. (1971:64-65)

"Defined standards of performance." Where the performance can easily be evaluated by certain criteria, the relationship between colleagues is usually less problematic. Also, when a mutual dependency exists between professionals the role problems are less severe. (1971:65)

"Flexibility of role-playing." This typology includes switching from formal to informal roles easily and unobtrusively; from a professional role to "one of the boys". However, women who demand to be treated like men often cause greater problems than those who accept their sex-status and behave accordingly. (1971:65)

"Supervision of the professional interaction." It is felt that third party supervision over the professional interaction causes less problems for the professional woman. (1971:66)

"Length of career and length of professional relationships." This category seems to be very important to status dilemmas because over a certain period of time men and women become accustomed to each

other and working with each other in the same profession. They "learn" how to interact effectively with each other. As Epstein states:

In time, men and women in professional relationships usually establish ground rules to govern behavior and eliminate awkwardness which flows from being unsure of whether to focus on the norms governing interaction between men and women or those which govern the relationship between colleagues . . . Of course, age itself gives the woman a certain amount of authority and if she has gained eminence, problems are further reduced. Not only do many of the feminine role components attached to the female sex status become less intrusive in professional interactions as the woman grows older (it is probably safe to say that in most cases as the woman ages, her sexual appeal becomes less an object of focus), but her position is bolstered by the rank derived from her experience and her age. (1971:66)

"High rank of institution." The higher in rank and reputation an institution or organization is the more likely that women are treated fairly and openly. (1971:66)

Epstein concludes the article with the following paragraph.

Women, like others with statuses which do not conform to cultural preferences, must learn the dynamics of handling inappropriate responses to them as well as the skills of their trade. Some are protected by social structure more than others; some have greater personal skill in handling people and ambiguities. The more a woman can depend on the environment filtering out responses to her sex status which intrude on accomplishing the professional task, and the more she has perfected techniques for handling responses, the more likely she is to continue at her work and proceed along a "normal" career sequence. (1971:66-67)

Thus women face the twofold difficulty of learning their trade as well as learning how to handle problems that arise as a result of their sexually ascribed status.

In another article entitled "Women Lawyers and Their Profession: Inconsistency of Social Controls and Their Consequences for Professional Performance", Cynthia F. Epstein explores status dilemmas of female attorneys. To this purpose Epstein interviews 50 women attorneys. In

general, it is found that female lawyers are exposed to a different set of expectations concerning roles and behavior than are their male colleagues; and furthermore the expectations of the appropriate female sex-role behavior are in conflict with the norms governing occupational role behavior. (1969:667) Epstein concludes by stating:

Thus, the women lawyers studied experienced simultaneously the expectations linked to the status of lawyer, those linked to the hybrid status of woman lawyer, and those associated with their status as women. Since these expectations were apt to be contradictory, considerable ambivalence occurred. These women lawyers not only had trouble meeting certain professional norms because of the inconsistency with which they were expected to adhere to them, but also because the punishments and rewards attached to these expectations were inconsistently applied.

In Academic Women, Jessie Bernard discusses many aspects of women in academia. Her analysis is both quantitative and qualitative. Her study is important to the present thesis in that Academic Women discusses the problems encountered by women in academia. The subjective data for the present study utilizes interview data obtained from professors, and Jessie Bernard's study lends insight to the interview data.

By way of an introduction into the problem of status dilemmas for the female professor, Bernard states:

There is a special category among the elite who are particularly vulnerable to prejudiced discrimination, namely the academic women who are in traditionally "masculine" areas. Again, sociological mechanisms are operating against these women. When the informal group structure in any work setting is institutionalized on a one-sex -- in this case male sex -- basis, the introduction of women upsets established patterns and creates difficulties. To avoid them, women are less likely to be hired. Such, to them irrelevant, considerations are especially bitter for women to take. (1964:50)

Like Epstein, Bernard recognizes the status contradictions that are built into the status system. She refers to these contradictions as "sociological mechanisms" in the above quote. These sociological mechanisms give rise to status dilemmas when women enter male dominated fields.

In discussing the problems encountered by the academic woman, Bernard, first distinguishes between two status categories of academic women. The professional status and the "fringe benefit" status, the distinction is ultimately based on tenure. (1964:100) The fringe benefit status group does not have tenure (and not necessarily because they do not want it). This group "is on the fringe of the profession" but they are "of great benefit to the institution", hence the term fringe benefit status. The majority of persons occupying this status are women, although some are men. They represent "an elastic labor pool, hired and furloughed as needed." (1964:100)

Bernard points out that the distinction between these two status groups is very important and should not be overlooked in studies dealing with the status of academic women. (1964:101) Ignoring this distinction would distort the true representation of statuses for female academicians. Bernard also points out the problems of assigning these statuses to academic women, she states: "it is, however, by no means clear how to assign women to one or the other of these status categories. The same women may pass from one to the other, in either direction, that is, from professional to fringe benefit status or, conversely, from fringe benefit to professional status." (1964:101)

In discussing the role of academic women in professional and fringe benefit statuses. Bernard states that certain considerations must be made regarding one's "effect on others" and "looking the part", rather than just the intellectual qualifications. Bernard believes that women possessing professional degrees have already proved their intellectual ability, to a certain extent, and the problems that they encounter stem from other factors. (1964:47) Consider the following quotes by a dean regarding the placement of women in certain positions:

When I plan faculty, I have no prejudice against women. But I do have to keep in mind the requirements for the specific job. I have no qualms about hiring a woman for plant pathology; the classes in that course are always small and even intimate and there are no technical difficulties with respect to acoustics. But for the course in European History I would never hire a woman. The classes are enormous, the acoustics of our lecture halls are not the best, and the general set-up would militate against a woman teacher. In Ancient History, on the other hand, where, again, the classes are small, I would not hesitate to hire a woman. (in Bernard, 1964:46)

This dean expresses a dilemma concerning female professors because of some physical handicap which could easily be overcome with a technical device. This same dean again expresses a dilemma concerning female professors, using non-academic persons as a scapegoat. The dean states:

For introductory economics I would be very glad to hire a woman. But for tax economics, no. The tax economist has to go to tax assessors, to tax collectors, to all kinds of record-keepers throughout the state and make contacts with men on a business-like basis. I would hesitate to put a woman in that position in my state. I am sure that she would be as competent as a man in tax theory, in research design; but she would not be as likely as a man to make the practical connections with the layman in our county offices who are very parochial in their perspective. (in Bernard, 1964:47)

In focusing on the pedagogic role in academia, Bernard discusses an experiment based on the teaching ability of males and females. This experiment is carried out in, what Bernard calls, the "masculine" field of sociology. (1964:129) She begins by first acquainting the reader with role theory. "Role theory states that roles are always reciprocal, that their performance always involves a mutual response: roles cannot be performed alone, in isolation." (1964:130) She continues by stating:

Success in role performance rests on the responses made by those in complementary roles. People in any role have to "look the part" or "fit the part" in order to perform it well . . . Appearance, accent, and mannerisms all contribute to role performance. This aspect of ability is a purely social phenomenon; it resides not in the individual himself but in the "field" or in the relationship between him and others. This kind of ability is less likely to be present in persons performing in unconventional or nontraditional roles. A woman in the role of professor is in a position usually assigned to men. It is more difficult, therefore, for her to perform well, not because she has less intellectual ability but because it is harder for others to respond to her in the appropriate manner. (1964:255)

The experiment proceeded as follows: two speech students, a male and a female, of equal competence, were given two lectures, one on a masculine topic, the other on a feminine topic, and they each delivered one lecture (using identical interpretations) to introductory sociology classes and one week later they each delivered the other lecture to the classes.

The questions under consideration were: "Do students learn more from one sex than another, holding contents and, hopefully, communication skills constant? Does the sex of the learner make a difference?" (1964:256) It was found that the retention rates of the students were

relatively equal with both lecturers; with neither the sex of the student nor the nature of the material making any significant difference. However, a serendipitous finding, dealing with the impact of the lecturers, proved interesting. The male lecturer had a greater impact on the students than the female lecturer did. As to the findings, Bernard states:

The young woman had less impact than the young man. Many more of her listeners gave neutral or impersonal resumes of the talk when tested. The young man evoked much more reaction. About one-fourth of his listeners accused him of prejudice or bias or made other hostile comments; only two percent of the young woman's listeners reacted in this way. There was little if any sex difference among those who gave hostile responses. A tentative conclusion was that whether or not the students learned more from the young man they were at least more emotionally involved in his presentation. (1964:256)

Another interesting finding was that, in reporting the contents of the lectures, the students were more non-committal with regard to the female lecturer. That is, in reporting on the females lecture, the students used "she said" more often than for the male lecturer, implying that, that was what the lecturer reported, but it is not necessarily the truth. (1964:257) The students reported what "she said" thus refusing to commit themselves.

Bernard concludes the study by stating: "The implication is that material presented by a man is more likely to be accepted at face value than material presented by a woman; it seems to have more authority; it is more impressive." (1964:257)

Although Bernard feels that the principle role of women in academics is teaching, she also considers the research role which is based on publications. Publications are very difficult to evaluate since so

many criteria enter into the evaluation process, including the evaluator. Bernard concludes this section dealing with role performance with a quote from Caplow and McGee as follows:

With respect to the criteria used, whatever their nature, according to Caplow and McGee, "women scholars are not taken seriously and cannot look forward to a normal professional career." When they are hired, they are hired as teachers. It is not that they have low prestige, but that "they are outside the prestige system entirely and for this reason are of no use to a department in future recruitment." The presence of a woman in a department will not serve as a lure to attract either good students or outstanding personnel. (1964:139)

In discussing role conflict Bernard says that it is a very common concept with regard to women in modern society. Studies have been conducted concerning this conflict for women, but men also experience role conflict in interacting with women. Bernard states that it is often easier for men "to treat all women as women rather than have to discriminate between women in different roles." (1964:198)

Bernard goes on to distinguish four roles a woman may assume. These roles are neuter, sexy, feminine and womanly. In describing these roles she states:

The attempt to perform in the neuter mode often results in an imitation of male role performance, with anomalous results. Men respond to women in the role of sex object. In the game of pursuit and capture, of dueling, of the bargain, they understand and feel comfortable. They also understand women performing roles in the feminine manner, defined as weak, capricious, dainty, frivolous, coquettish, appealing; they feel comfortable in the complementary masculine role. They understand also the womanly mode, though they may feel less comfortable in the complementary role since the womanly mode implies a good deal of strength.

Whatever the mode of performance, men must always decide how they must respond. In an academic setting this may become confusing. (1964:198)

Bernard goes on to relate the following experience of an academic man.

There she stands. A beautiful woman. Above her neck she is talking about the most abstruse subject. From the neck down her body is saying something altogether different. She wears good clothes. They show her body off to good advantage. And yet she acts as though she were completely unconscious of it. She acts as though she were a man, like the dog who thinks he is a human being. Sometimes it strikes me almost as freakish, this split between the way she talks and the way she looks. The two don't go together. Which message am I suppose to be getting? (1964:198)

Bernard also brings up the fact that men can more easily deal with married women in a professional role because marital status implies a certain set of standards and boundaries which are absent for single women. The relationship between married women and their male colleagues is more clearly defined than it is for single women. As Bernard puts it: "The existence of a husband establishes a role pattern that is familiar and comfortable." (1964:199)

In conclusion, it is noted that status dilemmas are problematic for women as well as men. "It would be much easier for men if they did not have to think of professional colleagues as women; having to take the sex of a colleague into account complicates any relationship." (1964:199)

Socialization

The following studies corresponding to status dilemmas are actually studies on socialization. It is hypothesized that, through the socialization process, young males and females are presented with conflicting notions about their adult roles. And, though the studies do not deal directly with status dilemmas in the occupational realm of

society, they do deal with the conflicting attitudes of individuals expecting to enter the occupational world. These socialization studies aid the present thesis by lending insight to the origin of individual status dilemmas.

The socialization process is an important influence in occupational choice and the problems encountered as a result of this choice. Mirra Komarovsky wrote two articles dealing with conflicting attitudes, incurred through socialization. The first article, entitled "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles", concerns female college students.

Komarovsky begins with the premise that the rapidly changing society has produced great changes in women's role and these changes often cause dilemmas and inconsistencies in behavior. New situations also arise in which behavior has not been culturally defined and may thus cause dilemmas. Finally, incompatible cultural definitions may apply for the same situation. (1946:184) Komarovsky states:

The problems raised by these discrepancies are social problems in the sense that they engender mental conflict or social conflict or otherwise frustrate some basic interest of large segments of the population. (1946:184)

The purpose of the article is to explicate some of the above problems. In so doing "incompatible sex roles imposed by society upon the college woman" are explored. (1946:184) The data were collected in 1942-43, from undergraduate students enrolled in a course on the family. Over two successive years the students wrote autobiographies on the subject. Social Psychology students were interviewed extensively on the subject. In all, 73 papers and 80 interviews were obtained. (1946:184) In discussing the papers submitted by the students, Komarovsky states:

The generalization emerging from these documents is the existence of serious contradictions between two roles present in the social environment of the college woman. The goals set by each role are mutually exclusive, and the fundamental personality traits each evokes are at points diametrically opposed, so that what are assets for one become liabilities for the other, and the full realization of one role threatens defeat in the other. (1946:184)

Komarovsky then goes on to explain these roles. One she terms the "feminine" role, which represents the typical feminine role as being non-aggressive, highly emotional, sympathetic etc. (1946:185) The other role is termed the "modern" role, or the "no sex" role because it does not differentiate the sexes. This role applies the same type of behavior to both men and women. (1946:185)

The women in this study experienced a conflict over these two roles, and this conflict centered around "academic work, social life, vocational plans, excellence in specific fields of endeavor and a number of personality traits." (1946:185)

The problem manifests itself in several ways, through inconsistent goals set by the family, boyfriends and girl friends. Komarovsky devotes the rest of the article to quotes from the respondents expressing anxiety over the inconsistent behaviors that they are forced to express. She concludes by stating:

Society confronts the girl with powerful challenges and strong pressure to excel in certain competitive lines of endeavor and to develop certain techniques of adaptations very similar to those expected of her brothers. But, then, quite suddenly as it appears to these girls, the very success in meeting these challenges begins to cause anxiety. It is precisely those most successful in the earlier role who are now penalized. (1946:188)

The author believes that the problems outlined in the article will continue, "until the adult sex roles of women are redefined in greater

harmony with the socioeconomic and ideological character of modern society." (1946:189)

From this brief outline of Komarovsky's study it can be seen that the author takes into account status contradictions which give rise to status dilemmas. Peer groups and family groups internalize the contradiction and pass it on to the individual who internalizes it, thus creating the dilemma for the individual.

A repeat of this study was conducted by Paul Wallin in 1949 at a western university. The two studies were carried out in different parts of the country and the sample differed. Wallin canvased the entire unmarried, undergraduate female population for a ten per cent random sample and the questionnaires were anonymous; whereas, Komarovsky's questionnaires were not.

When comparing the findings of the two studies, the questionnaire data of both agree. The interview data of Wallin's study shows that the respondents felt less strongly about the inconsistency than the respondents in Komarovsky's study. Wallin's respondents, for the most part, either did not view the inconsistency of views as serious, or felt that the problem could be readily resolved. (1950:292) Thus the author concludes:

This congruence of findings from studies employing different methods and using samples from two institutions in opposite regions of the country argues for the presumption that the condition to which the findings refer is rather widespread. (1950:292)

Acting on the premise that "men are also confronted with contradictory expectations", Komarovsky conducted another study, "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles: The Masculine Case". (1973:873) The

sample was drawn randomly from college seniors at an Ivy League male college. The 62 respondents selected were interviewed three times and given the California Personality Inventory and the Gough Adjective Check List.

The results show that one-third of the respondents felt concern over their perceived inability "to live up to the norm of masculine intellectual superiority." (1973:884) Komarovsky explains the majority reaction through changing role definitions; namely, the norm of male superiority is being overcome by the "ideal of intellectual companionship between equals." (1973:884) When asked about the role of their wives in the future, many inconsistencies showed up. The author feels that the traditional sex roles are weakening but they still have a strong emotional hold. The inconsistencies that showed up did not, however, present a great deal of stress and the author contends that this is due to the fact that "future roles do not require an immediate realistic confrontation." (1973:884) She concludes by stating:

In addition, there is no gainsaying the conclusion that human beings can tolerate a high degree of inconsistency as long as it does not conflict with their self-interest. (1973:884)

A similar article deserves a brief discussion at this point, by Kenneth Kammeyer entitled, "The Feminine Role: An Analysis of Attitude Consistency". Using Komarovsky's article describing alternative sex roles for college women, feminine and modern, Kammeyer developed two ordinal attitudinal scales. It was hypothesized that these two scales, measuring the feminine sex role, would be significantly related. Using a sample of 204 college women, it was found that the two scales are related but not as highly as was expected. (1964:304) Approximately

one-third of the respondents expressed traditional feminine sex roles on one scale as well as modern sex roles on the other. (1964:304)

Status dilemmas have a variety of sources, one of which is socialization. The socialization process of many young males and females presents conflicting attitudes concerning their future adult roles. When growing up, a child is exposed to many views concerning behavior. Many of these views are conflicting; when an individual internalizes two conflicting views, he/she may experience a dilemma. The above studies aid in bringing out one of the sources of status dilemmas.

Status Contradictions

Stratification

In the same way that socialization is a source of status dilemmas, stratification and the status system are a source of status contradictions. Studies on stratification point out an objective problem concerning the status of males and females.

According to Joan Acker in "Women and Social Stratification: A Case of Intellectual Sexism", the variable, sex, has seldom been analysed in social stratification studies. (1973:936) Acker goes on to accuse sociologists, in general, of constructing "a sociology that tends to deal with only the male half of humanity" with the exception of studies on the family. (1973:936) The purpose of Acker's article is to discuss the problems of including women in the stratification system, she feels that such an inclusion would create a more accurate idea of social structure, but she also realizes the many problems this inclusion would cause. Acker states, "it is not adequate or useful to

assume that females have no relevant role in stratification processes independent of their family roles and their ties to particular men. If this conclusion is reasonable, a reconsideration of sex status and stratification is indicated." (1973:940)

In examining sex status and the stratification system when women are included, Marie Haug developed an article entitled, "Sex Role Variations In Occupational Prestige Ratings". In this article she explores the National Opinion Research Center's (NORC) occupational rating system of 90 occupations to find that of these 90 occupations only two are typically female dominated: public school teacher and welfare worker. (1975:48) Upon further examination it is found that when the occupations are presented to respondents to be ranked, it is implied that the ratings are to be for male occupants. (1975:48)

Haug concludes:

Thus an overall assessment of previous attempts to determine occupational prestige is that the American publics' evaluation of work largely performed by women is essentially unknown; in that the basic study in the US focused on male-dominated occupations, with data collected in a context suggesting masculine incumbents, and with generalizations to other occupations based on data for males. (1975:48)

To compensate for this sexually one-sided stratification index, the author conducted a study using three female dominated occupations, three mixed occupations (not dominated by either sex) and four male dominated occupations. Male and female respondents were asked to rank these occupations and it was found that "females rate the female-dominated occupations higher than the males rate these occupations, but that both sexes evaluate the male-dominated occupations almost identically." (1975:49) Haug concludes her study with the following paragraph.

The sexual segregation of labor is a world-wide phenomenon, albeit in differing degrees (Johnstone, 1968). It may be that social, cultural and political changes will wipe out these male/female differences in occupational distributions at some point in the future, rendering the sexually-determined status variable obsolete in the analysis of occupational prestige and other issues in the sociology of work. Until that time, however, researchers in these areas need to take sex-role variation into account if their findings are to be valid for the society as a whole and not merely for the male minority. (1975:56)

Sex is an important status determining characteristic and should be considered in studies dealing with status and stratification.

The above studies are very objective in their analyses. They are concerned with the status system of rank and prestige; whereas, the present study is concerned with the status system and the contradictions that arise from it. The two studies do coincide in that the relative exclusion of women from stratification facilitates contradictions when women are included in the status structure. If women were incorporated into the status structure, their positions in it would be better defined and fewer contradictions would occur.

Status Inconsistency

The above studies on women, socialization and stratification did not originate from the Hughes article. These articles are helpful to the present study, however. They deal directly with the problems of women.

Much of the research that generated from Hughes' article is concerned with racial and cultural characteristics, and sexual characteristics have been virtually ignored. Rather than focusing on status contradictions as a result of ill-defined positions in groups, these

studies have focused on status inconsistencies as a result of divergent objective measures of status. For example, Gerhard Lenski, in a study entitled, "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status" (1953), uses income, occupation, education and ethnic characteristics to determine status. In his study, an individual's status consistency (i.e. one's income, occupation, education, and ethnic standing are consistent with each other or inconsistent) is used to explain his political preference. It was found that individuals with low status consistency preferred liberal political orientations and they tended to vote for parties advocating social change; whereas, individuals with high status consistency preferred conservative political orientations and parties advocating social stability.

Irwin W. Goffman, in a study entitled, "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution", hypothesized that, "the degree of status consistency is inversely related to preference for extensive change of the distribution of power in society." (1957:278) Using the variables, income, occupation, and education to determine status consistency, it was found that individuals with low status consistency prefer more distribution of power changes than those with high status consistency.

"Status, Status Types and Status Interrelationships", (1944) by Benoit-Smullyan, using three dimensions of status - economic, political and prestige - assumes that individuals with status discrepancies create strain and that these individuals act in order to eliminate this strain and bring their status dimensions into equilibrium. Other studies operate under the Cognitive Consistency theory (cf. Gerschwender,

"Continuities in Theories of Status Consistency and Cognitive Dissonance" and Sampson, "Status Congruence and Cognitive Consistency").

Although status inconsistency and status contradiction are similar, they do represent different ideas. Status, as it has come to be used by Lenski and the others, refers to all the positions in a hierarchy that determine a person's role, position and prestige in life, at any given moment. If all of these positions are relatively equal, then the status is consistent, if, however, the positions are not equal, and differ considerably, the status is inconsistent. From this it is evident that status inconsistency is an individual phenomenon, as mentioned above.

Status contradiction differs from status inconsistency in that status contradiction is determined not by objective measures specifically set up to measure status, but by members in a group. If the members in a group perceive another group members' status as not being consistent with the rest of the members, then a problem may arise; Hughes termed this problem a status dilemma.

The various status inconsistency studies treat status as an objective measure rather than a subjective measure. Lenski and the other authors treat status as categories, or kinds of persons, rather than as a collection of duties and rights. David Knoke states that for Gerhard Lenski, status "stands for a social label which attaches to a person and not the bundle of particular rights and duties accruing to an interaction situation." (1972:24) The authors reviewed above, view status as a phenomenon which is imposed upon individuals. These authors do not account for interaction. In interaction, an individual's

status depends on his own self conception as well as the other's concept of social identity. But for Lenski, "the total configuration of ranks was thought to exert an independent effect upon the individual." (1972:24)

In trying to account for interaction, Knoke suggests the use of the symbolic interactionist approach. "The theory suggests that alter's evaluation of ego's status will become internalized into ego's self through the objective 'we'." (Mead, 1934 in Knoke, 1972:26) This represents the perspective of the present thesis. The key to contradictions of status may be found in the social structure by the use of objective measures and the logical positivist approach. The key to dilemmas of status may be found in interaction situations by the use of subjective measures and the symbolic interactionist approach. And the key to studying dilemmas and contradictions of status lies in an interface of the two concepts. Dilemmas represent individual problems encountered through the interaction process. Contradictions represent societal problems established in the status structure. An interface of the two concepts represents a wholistic view of the problem - a societal perspective, as well as, an individual perspective. This interface is demonstrated in the concept of the socialized self.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This chapter has attempted to acquaint the reader with the supportive literature, concerning status dilemmas and contradictions. The Hughes article was discussed in detail to familiarize the reader with the

problem at hand. The theoretical underpinnings were then discussed to further delineate the problem, and it's origins.

The articles dealing with females in the occupational arena relate indirectly to status dilemmas and contradictions. These articles were discussed because they coincide with the research carried out within this thesis. The articles by Epstein and Bernard make use of interview data, as does this thesis. The Bernard book also deals directly with the problems of academic women and it is felt that the discussion of her book will be helpful in understanding the soliloquies of academic men and women in chapter three of this thesis.

Socialization enters into the process by which dilemmas and contradictions of status arise. The discussion of the various socialization studies aids in providing background information on these dilemmas and contradictions. It is through socialization that people incorporate the status structure and the contradictions within it.

Since status contradictions are rooted in the social structure, the study by Marie Haug yields valuable background information on the formation of status contradictions. Her article coincides with the objective data utilized within this thesis. Haug's study points out the status contradictions within the status structure. The present study attempts to further delineate these contradictions and dilemmas; and to measure them.

The status inconsistency studies were discussed briefly because they originated from the Hughes article. They have no further value to this thesis except, in distinguishing the status inconsistency studies, status dilemmas and contradictions are more clearly defined.

This concludes the literature review. The following chapters discuss the methods utilized for this study and the data that was obtained. Chapter three discusses the subjective data on status dilemmas. Chapter four discusses the objective data on status contradictions.

CHAPTER III
SUBJECTIVE DIMENSION

INTRODUCTION

The present chapter is concerned with status dilemmas - the invisible, intersubjective aspects of society. Status dilemmas are manifested within individuals, but they only occur in interaction situations. The emphasis for this chapter, is placed on the interpretive capacity of the individual. Individuals internalize objective reality and interpret it into subjective meaning. The status contradictions that reside in the social structure cannot be defined or delineated until they are internalized and interpreted by individuals. Once the contradiction is internalized by the individual and interpreted to be a contradiction, then dilemmas may arise, as a result of the contradiction.

Interpretation of any situation can only be made by the actors involved. The dilemmas of status that occur in interaction situations are only revealed through the interpretive capacity of the individuals that experience these dilemmas. Bernard Rosenberg recognizes the importance of interpretation, as well as, the problems caused by interpretation, when he states:

Men will go on understanding each other up to a point, and they will go on misunderstanding each other beyond that point. Up to that point, no man is an island, and beyond that point every man is an island. No sociological explanation is worth much unless it incorporates this circumstance: that we are no less out of touch with our fellows and ourselves than we are in touch with them. Men communicate among themselves just as George Herbert Mead said they do.

One of us makes a gesture, usually verbal; the other interprets that gesture -- and whether he does so without delay or after prolonged consideration does not matter -- and then, on that basis, he responds; and his gesture is in turn interpreted, but how fast or how accurately will depend upon countless variables. Symbols, above all words, give the genus humanum his humanity. (1972:166-67)

The purpose of this chapter is to acquaint the reader with the data obtained through the subjective dimension. The chapter is divided into two parts; the operationalization and the analysis of findings. The data are presented categorically as much as possible. However, individual quotes are utilized for illustration. "In the empirical world of day-to-day affairs, we have no substitute for natural language with all its inherent fussiness, vagueness, imprecision, and inexactitude." (Rosenberg, 1972:167)

OPERATIONALIZATION

The subjective approach, pursued under the symbolic interactionist model, is concerned with the unfolding of individual status dilemmas. The supporting behavior within this symbolic interactionist framework is the cultural soliloquy. The cultural soliloquy places emphasis on obtaining personal narratives by individuals in their own vernacular. The individual's character and personality are revealed in the account that he/she gives.

The Technique

The cultural soliloquy is a device by which individuals reveal their inner thoughts and feelings as a consequence of their personal and cultural experiences. Cultural soliloquies may be rendered in

several fashions which may include discussions or written accounts. Whichever mode of delivery that is utilized, the cultural soliloquy remains unstructured by the researcher. There may be no preformulated questions to be answered, but a list of topics may be utilized to guide the soliloquies in the appropriate direction. The cultural soliloquies for the present thesis were obtained through a guided conversation, which was taped. The researcher guided the discussion to obtain relevant data; however, the subjects were encouraged to speak freely, using their own expressions and phrases.

The Sample

The sample was drawn from professors at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. This sample of professors includes both males and females. A random sample was drawn from the faculty telephone directory to obtain the names of ten professors. Of these ten professors, four are males and six are females. Five departments within the university are represented, these are: Political Science, Chemistry, Business Administration, Math and Home Economics. The sample is heterogeneous in that assistant, associate, and full professors are included. Various age groups are also represented. The sample includes a department head and a professor in a fringe benefit status.

The professors were contacted personally and introduced to the study. They each received a letter further introducing the study and a synopsis explaining the nature of the study. (See appendix) All of the professors were willing to be interviewed and most were quite

enthusiastic about the study. With the exception of one, the interviews were taped.

The data obtained through the cultural soliloquies have been categorized and are presented below. Extensive use has been made of individual quotes so that little meaning is lost in the translation.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The findings of the symbolic interactionist approach are presented below. The data are analysed, first, according to the cultural soliloquies of the male professors. Second, the data are analysed according to the cultural soliloquies of the female professors. An attempt will then be made to synthesize the soliloquies of male and female professors. In concluding the chapter, a brief summary of the findings will be presented and the implications from these findings will be discussed.

Male Professors

In interviewing the male professors, the general opinion emerged that there are no perceived differences in interaction between male and female colleagues. One professor stated that he reacts more to personalities than to gender. From this opinion, one tends to conclude that there are no status dilemmas for these male professors in interacting with their female colleagues. However, as the interviews progressed, most of the professors cited examples of differential treatment between male and female colleagues, in the form of status dilemmas. For example, one male professor said:

I would go up to a male professor, that I know, that is a friend of mine and say, hey, did you hear the joke about such and such and feel free to tell him the joke. Whereas, if the joke was a little bit off color I wouldn't feel as free to tell it to a female.

The socialization process and the standard code of etiquette establish rules of behavior between men and women. It is usually considered in poor taste to tell "off color" jokes in the presence of women. The professor quoted above is probably acting according to the established standards, in not telling women "off color" jokes. He is, nonetheless, expressing an example of differential treatment between men and women. A dilemma may arise in a situation of this nature.

One male professor interviewed, said he very definitely perceives a difference in interaction with female colleagues. In explaining this difference, he points out the dilemmas of perceiving of females as not full and equal partners. He states:

I guess I have some of the characteristics of a male chauvinist pig, and I therefore exhibit some of these things in interpersonal interactions, not overtly, I don't think, at least not very often, but I have a very definite image of women as being something other than full partners, and full colleagues and I don't think there is any doubt that this comes across in some of our contacts. For instance, when we were interested in hiring a new chairman for the department, I was opposed to hiring a woman and I still am . . . I feel more comfortable with a male chairman.

This same professor said that he preferred working with his male colleagues because of the dilemmas that arise from working with female colleagues. It is easier for him to cope with the relationship between his male colleagues. The rules of behavior are more apparent in working with other males. He does work with his female colleagues quite willingly; but, he prefers to work with males. He explains this preference through socialization.

There are a number of kinds of things that I learned as a kid that erect certain barriers that I have difficulty dealing with.

I have a certain set of reactions that are still there and it would be rather foolish to say that they have no effect on me . . . My early training was such that there were separate roles for men and women, separate behavior codes, separate styles of behavior and all that sort of thing and my expectations are still based at least in part on that set of training so when I find that women don't act in the way that I expect them to, I am startled on occasion and it takes me a moment to recover from that -- you go on.

The majority of the male professors expressed no preference in working with male or female colleagues. They felt that the basis for choosing partners was common interests and had nothing to do with gender. This notion represents the official morality; however, an individual's gender often interrupts interaction situations, as the professor quoted above points out.

Throughout the interviews, the male professors gave examples of status dilemmas. Some of these dilemmas directly affected the professors; and some were indirect dilemmas, that the professors had only observed. Whether direct or indirect, these dilemmas did not cause any great problems. For the most part, the dilemmas were just a nuisance that had to be dealt with. There were no severe consequences as a result of these dilemmas.

The following two quotes represent indirect dilemmas. The first quote deals with a single female professor and the dilemma of inviting her to social functions.

The problem that comes up is that she is not married and so in social affairs, there is some hesitation in some cases I think, maybe, to invite her because they feel that she may be (how should I say it) a little hesitant because everybody

else is going to be there as a couple and she would very likely come as a single individual.

This dilemma seems to arise more from the professor's marital status than her gender. Her colleagues do not want her to feel awkward at social functions without a spouse or date and therefore they experience the dilemma of whether to invite her or not. It is reasonable to question whether the same type of dilemma is encountered when a single male professor is involved. It is hypothesized that the answer is no. Males are free to choose dates, women are not as free as men. A woman is expected to wait and be asked for a date. A male may invite a date or go single; whichever he chooses. A woman, on the other hand, has little choice. This is perceived by her colleagues and causes a dilemma when the situation arises.

The second quote involving an indirect dilemma, deals with female role identification. This dilemma is actually encountered by females and only observed by this male professor. He states:

I remember when I first came on the faculty and we would have our first departmental meeting each fall, if there was a girl on the faculty she would be automatically made the secretary; which I think is an obvious role identification. No man was ever picked, it was always a woman and some of the women were very unhappy with that.

The role of secretary is usually associated with the female sex. For a female professor such a role identification could cause a dilemma.

The above quotes from male professors really deal with problems that women encounter and are only secondarily related to men. The next two quotes deal directly with problems encountered by male professors. These are not serious problems but they may cause slight anxiety.

In discussing the present situation between men and women and the problems of changing titles and many standard forms of address, one professor states:

It's a very awkward transition period when neither person knows quite what to do and that by the way is a standard complaint of mine; this crack about changing all of the titles from chairman to chairperson and it's down right confusing -- it's an assault on the English language. I don't like it. For instance there is no good way to start a letter to someone you don't know; you can't say Dear Sir; you can't say Dear Ma'am; and people get upset if you say Dear It, or Dear Person, or whatever. There is no good way to start a letter; so what I'm doing is simply not starting them with a salutation -- just begin with whatever -- starting the message and no salutation at all. I can't think of any other way to avoid making somebody mad or doing things that upset my sense of how the language ought to be used.

Another problem is in the area of traditional mannerisms, consider the following quote.

There is the question of opening doors; men open doors for each other, they also open doors for women, traditionally according to the old standards, men always opened doors for women and very often they didn't say thank you. Now there is the problem, you see, if you open the door for your male colleague and he opens it for you -- no problem; but, if you open the door for a woman you're likely to get chewed out for being a male chauvanist pig. If you don't open the door for a woman, you're likely to get a sniff indicating you're some sort of uncultured barbarian. So you're damned whichever you do and this creates some role strain for men -- now what should I do with this broad here, should I treat her like one of the guys, or should I handle her with kid gloves and put her back on a pedastal -- and it's a difficult thing.

Women have the same problem, they don't know whether to accept the door being opened for them as colleague to colleague or man to woman.

There are role strains in this business for men as well as women and I guess that's in part why I prefer the older pattern. Perhaps I'm getting conservative in my old age, but it seems to me that one of the nicest things about the old pattern is that there was an understood code of behavior.

The above problems are not serious ones, but they do demonstrate status dilemmas for males as well as females. The changing standards of behavior and the changing roles for men and women create problems in the occupational arena, as elsewhere. These dilemmas are not restricted to collegial relationships, however, and may occur in many types of interaction situations.

The quotes from the male professors above, reveal universal dilemmas. These dilemmas are not restricted to the collegial relationship or to the professional role of males and females. The male professors ignored the professional role of their colleagues and focused on typical male-female problems.

Women are often not thought of in their professional capacity, but rather in other capacities. The soliloquies of the male professors presented above, demonstrate this phenomenon. One of the female professors also expressed this view. In discussing the hiring practices of her department, she states:

If a woman is interviewing, one of the first things they (male colleagues) say is, "What does she look like?", they don't ask, "Well, is she doing good research?; Is she a good teacher?". They're interested in what she looks like, and, again, they don't ask that about a man.

These male professors, referred to in the quote, are not as concerned about a females professional capabilities as about her appearance.

Female Professors

The female professors expressed dilemmas that are more closely related to the colleague relationship and to their position as female professors. A discussion of these dilemmas follows.

Most of the female professors feel that there is little difference in the interaction between male and female colleagues, just as the male professors felt. However, a few female professors feel that there is a difference. One female professor felt that her male colleagues were patronizing towards her and the other females in the department. She expresses this view in the following quote and offers an explanation for her colleagues patronizing attitude.

Some of the older faculty members, they really are patronizing and the chairman of the department, he is particularly that way. I think the reason is that they don't know how to treat you in a normal manner, because they're not use to seeing women in a professional situation.

That males are not accustomed to interacting with women in professional situations might also be utilized as an explanation for males not relating dilemmas caused by women in professional situations. That is, males do not know how to react to females in a professional relationship so they try to ignore this professional relationship and focus on other relationships with women.

Some of the more established female professors expressed the idea that they had more sexually related dilemmas in graduate school than in their professional career. One professor said that her professors in graduate school were constantly reminding her that she did not belong, that she did not fit in because of her gender. She felt that she was given the worst work load and all of the undesirable courses. This pattern continued for a while in her professional career, but ceased after she gained notoriety.

Another professor had problems with the other male graduate students. She described a pattern in her graduate school career; first she said

the other students were aloof. They more or less ignored her. Later as they got to know her, they wanted to help her, assuming she was a typical female and needed help. After the first exams were returned, and she did very well, they wanted her to help them. In the fourth phase she says that she became one-of-the-boys, and there were no longer any problems for her in graduate school.

One young professor also felt that she encountered more problems in graduate school. This is her first year on the faculty, however, and she has had more experiences in graduate school. As a graduate student, she felt excluded from the informal clique of male graduate students. As a result, she was denied a great deal of information and knowledge. She also expressed problems with her professors. They were more inclined to socialize with her when she wanted to discuss intellectual topics. But with male students, the professors readily engaged in academic discussions and projects. This is another example of males ignoring females' professional capacities and focusing on their other capacities. In the above case, the fact that males ignored her professional role, actually caused a dilemma for the female, in that she was excluded from the intellectual sphere to which she aspired.

One female professor felt that the students in her classes presented more status dilemmas than her colleagues. Her colleagues accepted her as a professor, but her students did not. Invariably, on the first day of class she would hear whistles and snide comments from the students. This bothers her but she is learning to cope with it. This professor is just beginning her professional career. Several factors may be at work here; one is that she is young and close to the age of the students.

The older female professors probably command more authority; they "look the part" more so than young female professors. Also, the notion of sensitivity is probably at work -- the more established professors may have become insensitive to student reactions; whereas, the younger professors have not.

Some of the male professors expressed problems related to socialization and role identification in the previous discussion. Some of the female professors also express problems in this area. Consider the following quotes from female professors.

I'll still be at a party and meet somebody from another college and they'll basically be asking questions about who's wife are you? With an assumption, of course, that I'm not an independent person with any independent role of my own, but I've got to be a spouse, and spouses stay home and take care of the children.

In many gatherings of professional persons, women are taken for wives, rather than professionals, as this professor has demonstrated. The following professor relates a similar experience, in a professional setting in which she was identified as a secretary rather than a professor.

One day this guy comes by and he is a plumber or an electrician or, I don't know, but a workman of some type and Dr. _____ (female professor) and I were sitting in here (her office) having some coffee, and he comes along and says something like "Boy, I really don't think its fair that these secretaries are getting all this space". Well, I didn't know what he was talking about. He just went on talking about this and finally it dawned on me that he thought we were both secretaries because we were in the _____ building and were women, then by definition we had to be secretaries.

Synthesis

These quotes represent problems encountered by female professors because of other's socialization and role identification. The male professors interviewed related problems that they experienced in dealing with women because of their own socialization. Whereas, the female professors interviewed, related problems that they experienced in dealing with others and in particular with males because of the males' socialization.

The cultural soliloquies have exposed hidden dilemmas for females in the professional role of university professor. Through the socialization process individuals learn to associate certain roles for men and certain roles for women. These roles are generally thought to be mutually exclusive. Men are often thought of in their professional roles. Women are often thought of in their non-professional roles. They are thought of as wives, mothers, sex objects, etc. When women are thought of in professional roles, they are usually associated with female dominated jobs (e.g. secretary, nurse). For females in male dominated occupations, this phenomenon creates a dilemma. The female professors interviewed, expressed a desire to be recognized as full colleagues. They want to be recognized in their professional role. The rules of etiquette between men and women are very minor considerations for most women. Forms of address, opening doors, telling jokes, these dilemmas do not mean very much to a woman when she is excluded from professional matters; or when her male colleagues will not discuss professional problems with her. One female professor sums up this perspective in the following quote.

I think the role between men and women is nice. I like the politeness between men and women. I like men, I really do. Men probably wouldn't tell their male colleagues, "that's a sharp suit", but when they say to a female "you have on a pretty dress" -- I like that.

Many of the younger women are pretty strident women's libbers and kind of bitter about the role between men and women. But, the give and take between men and women, the polite things in society -- I don't mind. But I do think you have to draw the line somewhere. The crunch comes when they (males) don't take you seriously; when you're not asked to serve on committees or asked your opinion. When there is serious business in the department and you are not asked for your opinion, or not listened to -- that's serious.

In gathering the cultural soliloquies, a classic example of a status dilemma emerged. One of the female professors, interviewed, had actually switched from a "masculine" department to a "feminine" department. The switch was made because of the dilemmas that she had encountered in the masculine department, as a result of her sex status. Her problems began when she applied for the job as assistant professor in the masculine field. The hiring committee was concerned over her ability to handle a class full of male students. Her references were contacted about this matter. After much deliberation and after many assurances of her ability as a professor, she was hired. Although she was successful in being hired, she felt that one of the main reasons for being hired was her sexual status. The practice of hiring women was being encouraged by the university and particular stress was being placed on this "masculine" department to hire a female. She felt that she was hired because of her sex, and she greatly resented it.

Her career at this university began by creating a dilemma for her, and the dilemmas continued. After working in the department for a period of time, she continued to be observed and tested on her abilities

as a professor. Her male colleagues were not given the same treatment. She was never left alone in the laboratory with students. Her professional role was in constant doubt by her male colleagues. She encountered many problems of this nature while working in the masculine department -- problems as a result of her gender. And although she was quite capable and well qualified, her professional abilities suffered as a result of this treatment from her male colleagues. She was unable to devote her full attention to her professional duties because of the problems she was having with her male colleagues.

This female professor felt so strongly about these dilemmas of status that she moved into a "feminine" department. She switched departments in order to get away from problems involving gender and to get into some meaningful research, and problems involving her profession. After working in the feminine department for a period of time, she said that she much preferred it over the masculine department. The ratio of males to females is more balanced than it was in the masculine department. Consequently, fewer problems occur as a result of her sex status. She is better able to perform her professional duties, as she is confronted with very few dilemmas of status.

It is regretted that none of her male colleagues, in the "masculine" department, were interviewed. It is hypothesized that they too experienced dilemmas in interacting with this female professor. Her male colleagues were forced to interact with her when she was hired. And, it is obvious, from her soliloquy, that they did not know how to react to her. Just as she experienced a dilemma in interacting with her male

colleagues; they also must have experienced a dilemma in interacting with her.

The above example represents an unfortunate situation encountered by a female professor, as well as, her male colleagues. The dilemma resulted from her sex status. Fortunately, the situation appears to be the exception rather than the norm. Most female professors learn to cope with the problems that arise as a result of their sex status. Individuals learn to handle their status dilemmas in various ways. Although these dilemmas are brought about through social contacts and manifest themselves in groups, it is up to the individual to deal with his or her specific problem. Most of the female professors have learned how to cope with status dilemmas, or have learned how to handle them. One female professor found it necessary to remove herself from the group in which the dilemma originated. Fortunately, she did not have to sacrifice her career, and was able to move to a different department. Other female professors, especially the younger ones, are still searching for the form of adaptation or escape which best suits them.

This phenomenon lends credence to the quote by Cynthia F. Epstein presented earlier in the literature review chapter concerning the dual problems of women in professional careers. Not only must women learn their trade, but they must also learn how to cope with the problems that they encounter in their careers, resulting from their sex status.

Many factors may enter into a woman's choice of adaptation to status dilemmas. Of course, the kinds of dilemmas and the seriousness of the dilemmas are among the major factors that affect a woman's

choice. Another factor includes the length of the woman's career. The type of relationship she has with her colleagues and the institution where she works are minor factors involved in the adaptation process. These minor factors were discussed earlier by Epstein in a straightforward manner and need no further explanation. The length of a woman's career; however, was a factor brought out in the cultural soliloquies. Therefore it is discussed briefly.

The length of a woman's career affects the way a woman reacts to status dilemmas, in that, usually, the longer one is exposed to these dilemmas, the more adept one becomes in handling them. After a certain length of time, women usually learn to effectively manage dilemmas of status, or they may ignore the dilemmas, or they may remove themselves from the situation, causing the dilemma. One of the professors chose to ignore the dilemmas. The dilemmas were not too serious and she found that by desensitizing herself to the dilemmas, she was better able to interact with her colleagues. Most of the professors interviewed, had learned or were learning how to manage status dilemmas. These professors feel the seriousness of status dilemmas, and the need to successfully deal with them. Referring to status dilemmas, one female professor states:

There is a maturity in me that's enabled me to cope with it and to win. You learn to handle these situations a little bit better. Things aren't the same as they were when I first started working; things are better. But, more importantly, I've learned how to survive.

Male professors must also learn how to cope with the problems that arise from interaction situations with female colleagues. The cultural soliloquies seem to indicate that the common form of adaptation for

males is simply to ignore females in their professional roles. The males that were interviewed, focused on sexually related dilemmas but not on professionally related sexual dilemmas. The male professors recognized status dilemmas that seem to be universally related to females and not status dilemmas directly related to the colleague relationship. The problems between men and women that have been popularized by the women's liberation movement are rather standard complaints of males and females. The phenomenon of males failing to recognize females in their professional role has caused status dilemmas for females. The dilemma arises when males do not recognize females in their professional capacities; when females are not considered full and equal partners with males, sharing the burden of professional responsibility.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In sum, there are dilemmas of status for male professors and for female professors. These dilemmas stem from many factors. Among the more common factors are socialization and role identification. The socialization process provides individuals with a certain set of expectations concerning male and female roles. When these expected roles are breached, then status dilemmas may occur.

Male professors experience dilemmas when they encounter females in the role of professor. These dilemmas are rather lighthearted, and cause no serious problems for the male professors. The dilemmas seem to stem solely from the sex of the female professor, and have very little to do with her professional role. These dilemmas may occur when

the male professor encounters any female -- she does not necessarily have to be a colleague. Males tend to ignore females in their professional capacity. The reason for this could be that the males experience a status dilemma when they come into contact with female colleagues. Rather than admit this dilemma and try to deal with it, the male professors may choose simply to ignore the dilemma and focus solely on general male-female problems. These male professors do not know whether to treat their female colleagues as women or as colleagues. Since the roles between males and females are more apparent and familiar than the roles between male and female colleagues, the males tend to focus on the general problems between men and women and the woman's role as a colleague is ignored. Several authors, discussed within the literature review, develop this notion, that males face the dilemma of having to choose whether to treat females as colleagues or as women. Hughes brings up this point as do Epstein and Bernard.

Females experience dilemmas of status when they interact with their male colleagues. These dilemmas often represent serious problems for the female. The dilemmas often stem from the fact that males do not take the females' professional role seriously. Males act according to the usual standards of behavior between males and females, and they often ignore females in their professional role. This phenomenon causes dilemmas for women and they must learn to handle these dilemmas. As Epstein points out, a woman must face the dual task of learning her profession as well as learning to cope with the problems in her profession, as a result of her sex status.

In conclusion, the symbolic interactionist approach and the cultural soliloquy technique have allowed individual status dilemmas to be espoused. Through interpretation, in interaction situations, individuals come to experience status dilemmas. The symbolic interactionist approach recognizes the importance of the interpretation process for actors. This approach focuses on the individual actor and his/her interpretation of interaction situations. The cultural soliloquy technique permits individual actors to express their experiences in interaction situations, using their own interpretation of the situation. Through the use of this method and technique, status dilemmas are actualized.

CHAPTER IV
OBJECTIVE DIMENSION

INTRODUCTION

The present chapter is concerned with status contradictions -- the visible, concrete aspects of society. Status contradictions are rooted in the status structure. Structural functionalism is the approach utilized to penetrate the status structure, and the survey technique is utilized to determine whether status contradictions exist, for women, in male dominated occupations. Hughes states that people tend to form a certain set of expectations concerning the characteristics of persons in various occupations. The expectations are imbedded in the social structure and internalized by individuals. It is felt that by surveying individuals, concerning their expectations of the characteristics of persons in various occupations, that contradictions within the status structure will become apparent.

The purpose of this chapter is to familiarize the reader with the data obtained through the objective dimension, and to analyse the results of this data. To this purpose, the chapter is divided into two parts; the operationalization of the variables, and the analysis of the results. The analysis of results is further broken down. The first part concerns the ranking of certain male dominated and female dominated occupations. The second part concerns the difference in mean ratings of males and females in certain occupations.

OPERATIONALIZATION

The Technique

The survey was distributed among 407 students from three introductory sociology classes at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. These students were asked to rank six different occupations hierarchically on the basis of prestige and status. The occupations were then assigned female and male sex role occupants, and the respondents were asked to rate the twelve occupations, on a scale of 7-1, according to the status and prestige that each commands. (See Appendix)

The occupations were chosen from the United States 1960 Census Socioeconomic Status Scores Index and they represent high, medium, and low status occupations. Of the six occupations chosen, three are typically female dominated -- fashion designer, nurse, and elementary school teacher; and three are typically male dominated -- professor, plumber, and custodian. The occupation of professor was chosen purposely to correspond with the interview data; so that comparisons may be drawn between the two approaches utilized within this thesis. The remainder of the occupations were chosen solely on the basis of their position in the status hierarchy and their usual sex-role connotation. The researcher purposely selected sex-biased occupations* from differing

*Several colleagues were polled to confirm the sex-bias of the occupations involved.

positions on the status hierarchy to control for interaction between variables in measuring status contradictions.

The instrument assesses the amount of prestige that the respondents ascribe to individuals on the basis of occupation and sex. The hierarchical ranking of the occupations determines how the respondents rank each occupation. It is used as a base for comparison when the added dimension of sex is included. In the ranking of sex and occupation, a discrepancy between male and female role occupants exhibits status contradictions.

The Variables

The variables included in the study are categorized as follows. The independent variable is the sex of the role occupant; the dependent variable is the score assigned to an occupation based on the sex of the role occupant and the occupation itself; and the control variables include the hierarchical ranking of the occupations with no sex specified, the respondent's sex, religion, fathers' occupation, and mothers' occupation. As noted from the actual survey, race, age and area of residence were also included as control variables. After coding these variables, it was found that the sample was rather homogeneous. The entire sample was composed of the Anglo-Saxon race; 80 per cent of the respondents were between the ages of 18 and 19 years old; 85 per cent of the respondents were from urban and metropolitan areas. Since the sample is homogeneous with regard to these three variables, they are not discussed further in the analysis. The control variable, religion,

provided two categories: Catholic and Protestant.* The control variable, mother's occupation provided three categories: professional-executive, non-professional and housewife. The professional-executive category includes higher executives and managers of large businesses; it also includes all of the professions. The occupation of nurse is included in the professional executive category. The non-professional category includes administrative personnel, clerical and sales workers, as well as, skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled laborers. The housewife category is composed solely of housewives. The control variable, father's occupation, provided two categories: professional-executive and non-professional. The distinction between the professional-executive and the non-professional categories is the same as for the previous variable, mother's occupation.

The Data

After collecting the data, the overall rankings of the occupations are analysed in order to get an idea of how the occupations are ranked. The data are then divided by the sex of the respondents, to determine how female respondents ranked the occupations as compared to how male respondents ranked them. The remainder of the control variables are introduced and analysed.

Comparison of mean ratings is also carried out for each occupation. The comparison is between the male and female specified role occupants of each occupation. The comparison is mainly descriptive, because

*There were no Jewish respondents.

there are no significance tests appropriate for comparing two means within one sample. However, when the control variables are introduced, and the sample is divided, significance tests are utilized to compare the means of the two samples.

Since this is an exploratory study, null hypotheses are utilized and they appear in the form of questions. The results follow.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Ranking of Occupations

Original Relationship Between Variables

Based upon responses gathered from the entire sample of 407 respondents surveyed, the hierarchical ranking of the occupations studied is: Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian. Does this hierarchical ranking change when the sex of the role occupant is specified? When the female sex role is specified, the hierarchical ranking does not differ from the overall ranking. When the male sex role is specified, the ranking, again, does not differ from the overall. Therefore, specifying the sex of the role occupant does not affect the initial ranking of the occupations. It may be concluded from Table 1 that there are no status contradictions within this aspect of the study because there is no discrepancy in the rank order of the occupations when the sex of the role occupant is specified.

TABLE 1

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations with
the Sex of the Role Occupant Specified

ENTIRE SAMPLE

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		
	Overall	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	5.60	6.26	5.84
Fashion Designer	4.33	4.70	5.34
Nurse	4.18	4.03	5.10
Elementary School Teacher	3.40	3.98	4.55
Plumber	2.40	3.81	3.33
Custodian	1.09	2.33	2.10

Control Variables

Sex of Respondent

Does the hierarchical ranking change when the sex of the respondent is controlled?

When isolating the female respondents, it is found that they rank the occupations the same as the entire sample -- Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian. According to Table 2a, when the sex of the role occupant is specified, the rankings remain the same for male and female role occupants.

When isolating the male respondents, it is found that they rank the occupations the same as the entire sample -- Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber and Custodian. When the female sex role occupant is specified, the ranking remains the same. However, when the male sex role occupant is specified, the ranking differs. The male respondents ranked the male specified plumber higher and the male specified nurse lower. Male respondents ranked the occupations with male sex role occupants specified as: Professor, Fashion Designer, Plumber, Elementary School Teacher, Nurse, and Custodian. Thus, Table 2b reveals that the sex of the respondent does affect the hierarchical ranking of the occupations; and, a status contradiction may be said to exist for male respondents when they encounter a male nurse or a male plumber in that males rank male nurses lower than female nurses, and male plumbers higher than female plumbers. The contradiction is demonstrated by the fact that male nurses and male plumbers are not ranked identically by male and female respondents.

TABLE 2a

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for the Sex of the Respondent

Female Respondents

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		
	Overall	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	5.54	6.23	6.04
Fashion Designer	4.47	5.19	5.69
Nurse	4.40	4.35	5.31
Elementary School Teacher	3.26	4.12	4.64
Plumber	2.22	3.71	3.57
Custodian	1.04	2.26	2.17

TABLE 2b

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for the Sex of the Respondent

Male Respondents

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		
	Overall	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	5.65	6.28	5.68
Fashion Designer	4.21	4.32	5.07
Nurse	4.00	3.79	4.78
Elementary School Teacher	3.47	3.87	4.48
Plumber	1.67	3.88	3.14
Custodian	1.12	2.39	2.04

Religion

Does the hierarchical ranking change when the religion of the respondent is controlled?

Catholic respondents rank the occupations identically, when the male sex role is specified and when the female sex role is specified. As noted in Table 3a, the order is: Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian.

Protestant respondents rank the occupations differently when the male sex role is specified, than when the female sex role is specified. When the female sex role is specified, Protestant respondents rank the occupations: Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian. When the male sex role is specified, Protestant respondents rank the occupations: Professor, Fashion Designer, Elementary School Teacher, Nurse, Plumber, and Custodian. In short, Protestant respondents reverse the occupations of elementary school teacher, and nurse when the male sex role occupant is specified. According to Table 3b the religion of the respondent does, therefore, affect the hierarchal ranking of the occupations. A status contradiction may be said to exist for Protestant respondents when they encounter a male elementary school teacher or a male nurse in that Protestants rank male nurses lower than female nurses.

Mother's occupation

Does the hierarchical ranking change when the respondent's mother's occupation is controlled?

Respondents whose mother's occupation falls into the professional-executive category rank the occupations differently when the sex of the

TABLE 3a

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for Religion

Catholic Respondents

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.26	6.0
Fashion Designer	4.95	5.46
Nurse	4.07	5.00
Elementary School Teacher	3.94	4.61
Plumber	3.71	3.32
Custodian	2.34	2.21

TABLE 3b

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for Religion

Protestant Respondents

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.25	5.71
Fashion Designer	4.69	5.47
Nurse	3.97	5.20
Elementary School Teacher	4.01	4.54
Plumber	3.90	3.26
Custodian	2.36	2.09

role occupant is specified, as Table 4a demonstrates. When the female sex role is specified, the ranking is: Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian. When the male sex role is specified, the ranking is: Professor, Fashion Designer, Elementary School Teacher, Nurse, Plumber, and Custodian. The elementary school teacher and the nurse are reversed when the male sex role is specified.

Respondents whose mother's occupation falls into the non-professional category rank the occupations the same when the male sex role is specified, as when the female sex role is specified. As noted in Table 4b the rank is: Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian.

Respondents whose mothers are housewives, rank the occupations identically when both sex role occupants are specified. As noted in Table 4c the rank is: Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian.

The hierarchical ranking of the occupations does change when the respondent's mother's occupation is controlled. The discrepancy in rank is found in the professional-executive category, when the male sex role is specified. Therefore, a status contradiction may be said to exist for respondents whose mother's occupations fall into the professional-executive category, when they encounter a male elementary school teacher or a male nurse because the male nurse is ranked lower than the female nurse.

TABLE 4a

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for Mother's Occupation

Professional - Executives

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.28	5.95
Fashion Designer	4.79	5.43
Nurse	3.92	4.97
Elementary School Teacher	4.02	4.68
Plumber	3.75	3.15
Custodian	2.35	1.95

TABLE 4b

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for Mother's Occupation

Non-Professional

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.31	5.86
Fashion Designer	4.73	5.34
Nurse	4.13	5.18
Elementary School Teacher	4.06	4.58
Plumber	3.78	3.22
Custodian	2.38	2.13

TABLE 4c

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for Mother's Occupation

Housewives

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.25	5.78
Fashion Designer	4.66	5.30
Nurse	4.07	4.92
Elementary School Teacher	3.94	4.47
Plumber	3.90	3.53
Custodian	2.29	2.10

Father's occupation

Does the hierarchical ranking change when the respondent's father's occupation is controlled?

Respondents whose father's occupation falls into the executive category rank the occupations the same when both sex role occupants are specified. Table 5a reveals the rank as: Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian.

Respondents whose father's occupation falls into the non-professional category rank the occupations differently when the sex of the role occupant is specified. When the female sex role is specified the rank is: Professor, Fashion Designer, Nurse, Elementary School Teacher, Plumber, and Custodian. When the male sex role is specified, the rank is: Professor, Fashion Designer, Plumber, Elementary School Teacher, Nurse, and Custodian. Thus, the hierarchical ranking does change when the respondent's father's occupation is controlled. The respondents whose father's occupation falls into the non-professional category, rank the occupations of plumber and nurse differently, when the male sex role is specified, as noted in Table 5b. A status contradiction may be said to exist for respondents whose father's occupations fall into the non-professional category, when they encounter a male nurse or a male plumber in that respondents whose father's occupations are of a non-professional nature rate the male nurse lower than the female nurse and the male plumber higher than the female plumber.

TABLE 5a

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for Father's Occupation

Professional - Executive

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.29	5.81
Fashion Designer	4.75	5.32
Nurse	4.07	5.04
Elementary School Teacher	3.96	4.51
Plumber	3.67	3.3
Custodian	2.24	2.03

TABLE 5b

Hierarchical Ranking of Occupations,
Controlling for Father's Occupation

Non-Professional

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.19	5.90
Fashion Designer	4.53	5.31
Nurse	3.93	5.16
Elementary School Teacher	4.00	4.62
Plumber	4.1	3.52
Custodian	2.48	2.19

Summary

This concludes the analysis of findings regarding the ranking of occupations. Following is a brief summary of the results.

For the entire sample of respondents, in comparing the overall ranking of the occupations to the ranking when the sex role occupant is specified, there is no discrepancy. Only when the control variables are introduced, does a discrepancy occur. Further, this discrepancy occurs only for the male specified role occupant in the occupations of nurse, elementary school teacher and plumber. It may be concluded, therefore, that the major independent variable, the specified sex role, does not affect the dependent variable, the ranking of the occupations. Rather, it is the control variables, the sex of the respondent, the respondent's religion, the respondent's mother's occupation and the respondent's father's occupation, that affect the ranking of the occupations with specified sex role occupants. Thus the status contradiction is not inherent in the occupation and the sex of the role occupant; but, rather the status contradiction is located within the other factors, used as control variables. The control variables with the greatest impact seem to be the sex of the respondent and the respondent's father's occupation. These two variables had the greatest effect on the different rankings of the occupations when the male sex role was specified.

Comparison of Means

The previous analysis focused on the rank order of the occupations. The analysis now focuses on the mean scores assigned to the occupations with specific sex role occupants.

Original Relationship Between Variables

For the entire sample, is there a difference in the mean ratings of male and female role occupants in each occupation?

Table 6 reveals the relationship between the variables. For the male professor the overall mean rating is 6.26; and for the female professor it is 5.84. An appreciable difference, with the male professor scoring higher. For the male fashion designer, the mean is 4.71, which is a lower rating than the female fashion designer at 5.34. The male nurse is rated lower than the female nurse, 4.04 to 5.10, respectively. The occupation of nurse displays the greatest difference between male and female role occupants. The male elementary school teacher averages 3.98, and the female 4.55. The plumber and custodian follow a similar pattern with the male role occupant for both rating higher than the female role occupant. Male plumbers are assigned a score of 3.82, and females 3.33. Male custodians are rated 2.33, while female custodians are rated 2.10. Thus there is a difference in the ratings of male and female role occupants in the same occupation. An examination of the means reveals a definite pattern, the sample as a whole, rated females in the typically female dominated occupations -- fashion designer, nurse, and elementary school teacher -- higher than they rated males in these occupations. The sample rated males in the typically male dominated occupations -- professor, plumber, and custodian -- higher than they rated females in these occupations. There is a definite sex bias in each occupation. A status contradiction may be said to exist in occupations having the "wrong" sex role occupant.

TABLE 6

Mean Ratings of Occupations, with the
Sex of the Role Occupant Specified

ENTIRE SAMPLE

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.26	5.84
Fashion Designer	4.71	5.34
Nurse	4.04	5.10
Elementary School Teacher	3.98	4.55
Plumber	3.82	3.33
Custodian	2.33	2.10

Control Variables

Sex of Respondent

Female Respondents

Using only the female respondents, is there a difference in the ratings of male and female role occupants in each occupation?

Table 7a reveals that for the male professor, the overall mean rating is 6.23, and for the female professor, the mean rating is 6.04. The male professor is rated .19 units higher than the female professor. The male fashion designer is rated lower (5.47) than the female fashion designer (5.69). The male nurse is rated much lower than the female nurse, 4.35 to 5.30. The male elementary school teacher is rated 4.12, compared to the female elementary school teacher rated 4.64. The differences between male and female role occupants for the occupations of plumber and custodian are slight. For the male plumber, the average rate is 3.70, compared to 3.57 for the female plumber. The male custodian is rated 2.26 and the female custodian is rated 2.17.

For the female respondents, there are differences in the ratings of males and females in each occupation. In general, the female respondents rated female role occupants, in female dominated occupations higher than they rated male role occupants in these occupations. Likewise, female respondents rated male role occupants in male dominated occupations higher than they rated female role occupants in these occupations. It may be concluded that for female respondents there are status contradictions for females in male dominated occupations, and for males in female dominated occupations. This conclusion is

TABLE 7a

Mean Ratings of Occupations,
Controlling for the Sex of the Respondent

Female Respondents

<u>OCCUPATIONS</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.23	6.04
Fashion Designer	5.47	5.69
Nurse	4.35	5.30
Elementary School Teacher	4.12	4.64
Plumber	3.70	3.57
Custodian	2.26	2.17

reached because there is a definite discrepancy in rating male and female role occupants in the same occupation. If male and female role occupants were rated identically within each occupation, then no status contradiction would be present.

Male Respondents

Using only the male respondents, is there a difference in the ratings of male and female role occupants in each occupation?

Table 7b reveals that for male professors the overall mean rating is 6.28, and for female professors the rating is 5.68. The male fashion designer is rated lower (4.32) than the female (5.07). The male nurse is rated 3.79 and the female nurse is rated 4.77. There is almost a one unit difference between the rating of male and female nurses. Male elementary school teachers are rated 3.87. Female elementary school teachers are rated 4.48. For the occupation of plumber, males are rated 3.88, and females 3.14. The male custodian is rated 2.39, and the female custodian 2.04.

Males are rated higher than females in the male dominated occupations and females are rated higher than males in female dominated occupations. It may be concluded that for male respondents, there are status contradictions for females in male dominated occupations, and for males in female dominated occupations. The same pattern, in rating males and females in each occupation, is noted for male respondents, as it was previously for female respondents.

The remainder of the questions involve the use of two samples; actually the original sample is divided according to the control variables. In order to answer the following questions, a comparison

TABLE 7b

Mean Ratings of Occupations,
Controlling for the Sex of the Respondent

Male Respondents

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>	
	Male Specified	Female Specified
Professor	6.28	5.68
Fashion Designer	4.32	5.07
Nurse	3.79	4.77
Elementary School Teacher	3.87	4.48
Plumber	3.88	3.14
Custodian	2.39	2.04

of means test is utilized. The standard t-test was chosen for this purpose. The means from both samples are obtained and the difference between them is divided by the variance of both samples. The resulting score is compared to scores assigned a significance level, using a two-tailed test.*

Comparison of Male and Female Respondents

Is there a significant difference between the mean ratings of male and female respondents, for each occupation and sex role occupant?

In answering this question, the mean rating for each occupation and each specified sex role occupant, is compared, between male and female respondents. Table 8 reveals the results of this comparison and the significance levels. In general, all of the differences in means are significant beyond the .05 level, except for the male professor, the male plumber and the male and female custodian. The three male dominated occupations show no significant differences in ratings for male and female respondents, when the male role occupant is specified. Therefore, it may be stated that status contradictions exist for females in all of the occupations, except custodian. Status contradictions exist for males in the female dominated occupations of fashion designer, nurse, and elementary school teacher; but, status contradictions do not exist for males in the male dominated occupations of professor, plumber, and custodian.

*The paired t-test is not utilized since matched data on each respondent is not available.

TABLE 8

Mean Ratings of Occupations,
Comparing Male and Female Respondents

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		Significance Level
Role Occupant	Male Respondent	Female Respondent	
Professor			
Male	6.28	6.23	not sign.
Female	5.68	6.04	.0005
Fashion Designer			
Male	4.32	5.47	.0005
Female	5.07	5.69	.0005
Nurse			
Male	3.79	4.35	.0005
Female	4.77	5.30	.0005
Elementary School Teacher			
Male	3.87	4.12	.01
Female	4.48	4.64	.05
Plumber			
Male	3.88	3.70	.1
Female	3.14	3.57	.005
Custodian			
Male	2.39	2.26	not sign.
Female	2.04	2.17	not sign.

Religion

Is there a significant difference between the mean ratings of Catholic and Protestant respondents for each occupation and sex role occupant?

The data in Table 9 reveal no significant differences at the .05 level, between Catholics and Protestants, except in the occupation of professor. For female professors, there is a significant difference in the mean rating of Catholic and Protestant respondents. It is concluded that the control variable, religion, has little effect on the original relationship between sex role occupant and the rating of the occupation. However, the variable, religion, may have an effect on the status contradictions for female professors.

Mother's Occupation

Is there a significant difference between the mean ratings for each occupation and sex role occupant, using the respondent's mother's occupation as a control?

Table 10a shows the relationships between the respondents whose mother's occupations are in the professional-executive category and the non-professional category. There are no significant differences at the .05 level or beyond.

Table 10b shows the relationship between the respondents whose mother's occupations are in the professional-executive category and housewives. With the exception of the female plumber, there are no significant differences at the .05 level. The only status contradictions within this category are for the female plumber.

TABLE 9

Mean Ratings of Occupations,
Controlling for Religion

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	Role Occupant	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		Significance Level
		Protestant Respondent	Catholic Respondent	
Professor				
	Male	6.25	6.26	not sign.
	Female	5.71	6.0	.025
Fashion Designer				
	Male	4.69	4.95	.1
	Female	5.47	5.46	not sign.
Nurse				
	Male	3.97	4.07	not sign.
	Female	5.20	5.0	.1
Elementary School Teacher				
	Male	4.01	3.94	not sign.
	Female	4.54	4.61	not sign.
Plumber				
	Male	3.90	3.71	not sign.
	Female	3.26	3.32	not sign.
Custodian				
	Male	2.36	2.34	not sign.
	Female	2.09	2.21	not sign.

TABLE 10a

Mean Ratings of Occupations,
Controlling for Mother's Occupation

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	Role Occupant	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		Significance Level
		Professional- Executive	Non-Professional	
Professor				
	Male	6.28	6.31	not sign.
	Female	5.95	5.86	not sign.
Fashion Designer				
	Male	4.79	4.73	not sign.
	Female	5.43	5.34	not sign.
Nurse				
	Male	3.92	4.13	not sign.
	Female	4.97	5.18	.1
Elementary School Teacher				
	Male	4.02	4.06	not sign.
	Female	4.68	4.58	not sign.
Plumber				
	Male	3.75	3.78	not sign.
	Female	3.15	3.22	not sign.
Custodian				
	Male	2.35	2.38	not sign.
	Female	1.95	2.13	not sign.

TABLE 10b

Mean Ratings of Occupations,
Controlling for Mother's Occupation

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	Role Occupant	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		Significance Level
		Professional- Executive	Housewife	
Professor				
	Male	6.31	6.25	not sign.
	Female	5.86	5.78	not sign.
Fashion Designer				
	Male	4.79	4.66	not sign.
	Female	5.43	5.30	not sign.
Nurse				
	Male	3.92	4.07	not sign.
	Female	4.97	4.92	not sign.
Elementary School Teacher				
	Male	4.02	3.94	not sign.
	Female	4.68	4.47	.1
Plumber				
	Male	3.75	3.9	not sign.
	Female	3.15	3.53	.025
Custodian				
	Male	2.35	2.29	not sign.
	Female	1.95	2.1	not sign.

Table 10c shows the relationship between the respondents whose mother's occupations are in the non-professional category and housewives. The occupation of nurse, with the female role occupant specified, and the occupation of plumber with the female role occupant specified, are rated significantly different between the two categories. The remainder of the occupations and sex role occupants are not rated significantly different.

Regarding the control variable, mother's occupation, it may be concluded that this variable may have had an effect on the original relationship between female plumbers and female nurses. The variable did not affect the relationship between the other occupations and sex roles, however.

Father's Occupation

Is there a significant difference between the mean ratings for each occupation and sex role occupant, using the respondent's father's occupation as a control?

Table 11 reveals a significant difference between the mean rating of male plumbers for father's occupations in the professional-executive category and the non-professional category. There are no other significant differences. The control variable, father's occupation probably did not have any effect on the original relationship between the rating of the occupation and sex role occupant.

Summary

This concludes the analysis of findings regarding the comparison of means. Following is a brief summary of the results. For the entire sample of respondents, in comparing the mean ratings of the different

TABLE 10c

Mean Ratings of Occupations,
Controlling for Mother's Occupation

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	Role Occupant	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		Significance Level
		Non-Professional	Housewife	
Professor				
	Male	6.31	6.25	not sign.
	Female	5.86	5.78	not sign.
Fashion Designer				
	Male	4.73	4.66	not sign.
	Female	5.34	5.30	not sign.
Nurse				
	Male	4.13	4.07	not sign.
	Female	5.18	4.92	.025
Elementary School Teacher				
	Male	4.06	3.94	not sign.
	Female	4.58	4.47	not sign.
Plumber				
	Male	3.78	3.90	not sign.
	Female	3.22	3.53	.05
Custodian				
	Male	2.38	2.29	not sign.
	Female	2.13	2.1	not sign.

TABLE 11

Mean Ratings of Occupations,
Controlling for Father's Occupation

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	Role Occupant	<u>MEAN RATINGS</u>		Significance Level
		Professional- Executive	Non-Professional	
Professor				
	Male	6.29	6.19	not sign.
	Female	5.81	5.9	not sign.
Fashion Designer				
	Male	4.75	4.53	.1
	Female	5.32	5.31	not sign.
Nurse				
	Male	4.07	3.93	not sign.
	Female	5.04	5.16	not sign.
Elementary School Teacher				
	Male	3.96	4.0	not sign.
	Female	4.51	4.62	not sign.
Plumber				
	Male	3.67	4.1	.005
	Female	3.3	3.52	.1
Custodian				
	Male	2.24	2.48	.1
	Female	2.03	2.19	.1

occupations and specified sex role occupants, no conclusive evidence is obtained. Since no significance tests can be conducted with these data, the results remain descriptive. In general, the female sex role is rated higher when associated with a female dominated occupation than when associated with a male dominated occupation. The male sex role is rated higher when associated with a male dominated occupation and much lower when associated with a female dominated occupation. Ideally, the occupations should have been given the same rating regardless of the sex of the role occupant. Since the ratings differ according to the sex of the role occupant, it may be stated that status contradictions exist within the occupational structure when the sex of the role occupant is specified.

When the control variables are introduced, tests are utilized to determine the significance of the differences in the ratings. When controlling for the sex of the respondent, the three male dominated occupations show no significant differences in ratings for the male sex role occupant; but, there are significant differences for female role occupants. When controlling for religion, there are no significant differences, except for female professors. Mother's and father's occupation had little affect on the differences in ratings.

In general, the analysis of findings, concerning comparison of mean ratings, has exposed status contradictions within the status structure. These status contradictions result from the specified sex role of the occupant, primarily. The control variables utilized within the study have little affect on the relationship between the specified sex role occupant and the occupation.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter has been to familiarize the reader with the objective data, obtained through the structural functionalist approach and the survey technique; and, to analyse the results. Status contradictions, the concrete aspect of society, have been explored operationally. It was found that status contradictions do exist in the status structure when the sex of the role occupant is specified, and a comparison is carried out within each occupation. Status contradictions are not found in the ranking of occupations, when the original relationship between variables is examined.

In ranking occupations, the independent variable, sex of the role occupant, had little affect on the dependent variable, rank of occupation. The control variables had the greatest affect on this relationship; especially the sex of the respondent. The pattern that appears when controlling for the sex of the respondent is that male respondents rank male dominated occupations higher when the male sex role occupant is specified. Female respondents rank the occupations and sex role occupants the same as the overall sample. Thus, the male respondents and the male sex role prove to have the greatest affect on status contradictions when the ranking of occupations is utilized.

A possible explanation for this could be the socialization process in American society. Young males and females learn appropriate sex roles; these sex roles include occupations. Some occupations may be more sex biased than others. From the above data, it appears that the occupations of nurse and plumber within this study carry the strongest

sex connotation. It is plausible for females to occupy male dominated occupations. Status contradictions are not as great for females in male dominated occupations than for males in female dominated occupations. According to the ranked data, males experience more status contradictions in female dominated occupations, and especially the occupation of nurse, than females in male dominated occupations.

When comparing the ratings of the occupations, the initial relationship between the sex of the role occupant and the rating of the occupation have the greatest effect. The control variables have little affect on this initial relationship. Descriptively, there are differences in the mean ratings of male and female role occupants in the same occupations. This means that status contradictions are present within the status structure. For the occupations utilized, when the different sex role occupants are specified, different ratings are given. If there were no status contradictions, the mean ratings of male and female sex role occupants occupations would be relatively equal within each occupation.

The data concerned with the rating of occupations reveal more status contradictions than the ranked data. In comparing the ratings of male and female role occupants in each occupation, discrepancies between the sex role occupants are more apparent. The ranked data only reveal status contradictions for males in female dominated occupations, attributable to the control variables. The mean ratings between each sex role occupant in each occupation reveal a status contradiction for males in female dominated occupations as well as for females in male dominated occupations. These status contradictions are attributable

to the sex of the role occupant and the occupation itself. The control variables have little affect on this relationship.

It may be recalled from the literature review, Marie Haug conducted a study concerning females in the status structure. She found that females have been excluded from the status structure in many stratification studies. Males have dominated the occupational status structure. The present study has demonstrated that when females are introduced into this status structure, status contradictions become apparent.

In conclusion to this chapter, the objective data reveal status contradictions. These status contradictions apply to female role occupants in traditionally male dominated occupations and to male role occupants in traditionally female dominated occupations. As Hughes stated in his article on the dilemmas and contradictions of status, certain positions within our society tend to build up certain expectations concerning the characteristics of persons occupying these positions. Gender is an outstanding characteristic and as a result has built up expectations that have become attached to certain positions in the occupational structure. From the findings of the objective data, it is concluded that status contradictions exist within the status structure and persons not conforming in gender to the expectations of others, obviate these status contradictions.

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Everett C. Hughes first conceptualized the problem for this thesis in, "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status". Professor Hughes maintained that statuses tend to develop auxiliary characteristics which come to be expected of it's incumbents. When these auxiliary characteristics are not exhibited, dilemmas and contradictions of status may occur. Professor Hughes focused on the auxiliary characteristics of race, ethnicity and gender. The present study focuses solely on gender.

Professor Hughes distinguished dilemmas and contradictions of status in a manner which also distinguishes two aspects of society. Society is split into two parts, the intersubjective and the concrete. Status contradictions represent the concrete, measureable aspects of society -- they reside in the status structure. Status dilemmas represent the intersubjective, internal aspects of society -- they reside within the individual. An interface of these two aspects, yields an integral view of the problem. This interface is actualized in the concept of the socialized self. The self acts out of the dictates of its own individuality and life organization. Upon socialization, the self comes to recognize the norms and beliefs of society. These norms and beliefs are internalized by the individual and the socialized self acts in part out of it's life organization and in part out of the social

organization. In studying the dilemmas and contradictions of status, one's life organization must be considered as well as the social organization, as contradictions arise from the social and dilemmas from the life organization. A common boundary of the two concepts is formed in the socialized self.

The purpose of this study has been to explore the implications of Hughes' article, theoretically and operationally. A summary of the study follows, as well as, the conclusions drawn from the problem.

OVERVIEW OF STUDY

The review of the literature, explored the implications of Hughes' article, theoretically. Within the literature review, it was found that Georg Simmel initiated the process by which status dilemmas are recognized. Robert E. Park further elaborated on status dilemmas and initiated the process by which status contradictions are recognized. Everett Stonequist further elaborated on status contradictions, as did Robert Merton and Elinor Barber. Hughes expounded on the notions, of the authors above, to arrive at his conceptualizations of status dilemmas and contradictions.

In operationalizing status dilemmas, the symbolic interactionist approach was utilized. Symbolic interactionism focuses on individuals and their interpretation of interaction situations. The technique utilized, within this symbolic interactionist framework, was that of the cultural soliloquy. The cultural soliloquies donated personal accounts of status dilemmas to the study.

The sample consisted of male and female professors. The male professors expressed dilemmas in interacting with their female colleagues. These dilemmas centered more on a general male-female relationship than on a collegial male-female relationship. The dilemmas expressed by the male professors were minor and not very problematic.

The female professors also expressed dilemmas in interacting with their male colleagues. These dilemmas centered more on the collegial male-female relationship than the dilemmas expressed by the male professors. Female professors expressed more serious and problematic dilemmas than did the male professors. The greatest dilemma seemed to occur when their male colleagues did not take the female professors seriously -- when the females professional role was not considered.

Several authors, discussed in the literature review, point out the fact that males are not accustomed to interacting with females in a professional situation. Therefore, males often experience the dilemma of having to decide how to react to females in professional situations -- as professionals or as women. The male professors in this study chose to react to females as women and the females professional capacity was ignored. This causes a dilemma for the female because she desires to be reacted to in her professional role. Females must learn how to handle these dilemmas. Female professionals face the dual task of learning their profession as well as learning to handle dilemmas that result from their professional and sexual status.

In operationalizing status contradictions, the logical positivist approach of structural functionalism was utilized. Structural functionalism focuses on the social structure. The technique utilized, within

the logical positivist framework, was that of the survey. The surveys focused on status contradictions that are located within the status structure.

The sample consisted of students in introductory sociology classes. These students were asked to rank six occupations on the basis of status that each commands. The students were then asked to rate the same occupations, assigned a sex role occupant, on a scale of 7-1. The major independent variable was the sex of the role occupant and the major dependent variable was the score assigned to the occupation. The control variables included, the sex of the respondent, the respondent's religion, mother's occupation and father's occupation. Age, race, and area of residence were controls built into the study.

In examining the data concerned with the ranking of occupations, it was found that no status contradictions were inherent in the original relationship between the sex of the role occupant and the ranking of the occupation. It was not until the control variables were introduced that discrepancies in rank occurred for male and female role occupants. The status contradictions seem to be present in the control variables of sex of the respondent, religion, mother's occupation and father's occupation, but only for the male specified sex role. The variables, sex of respondent and father's occupation caused the greatest discrepancy in rank for the male nurse and the male plumber. It was concluded from the data, concerning the ranking of occupations, that status contradictions are not inherent in the status structure of rank and prestige; but rather, status contradictions are exposed through

other factors. The data concerned with comparison of mean ratings refute this conclusion, however.

In examining the data comparing the mean ratings of the occupations, when the female sex role is specified and when the male sex role is specified, it was found that status contradictions are in the status structure when the "wrong" sex role occupant is associated with an occupation.

When the control variables were introduced, it was found that the variable, sex of respondent, had an effect on the original relationship. When the female sex role was specified, contradictions became apparent in the male dominated occupations. The variable, religion, had a slight effect on the rating of female professors. The remainder of the control variables had no effect on the original relationship, however. It was concluded from the data, concerning the comparison of mean ratings, that status contradictions exist within the status structure. These contradictions result from the sex of the role occupant, primarily. The sex of the respondent does have an effect on this relationship, however.

Relationship of Survey Data to Interview Data

The survey data relates to the interview data through the occupation of professor. It may be recalled that the cultural soliloquies were obtained from male and female professors. It was found that status dilemmas do occur for these professors. Female professors experience dilemmas as a result of their sexual status. Male professors experience dilemmas in interaction situations with female colleagues,

as a result of the females sexual status contradicting her occupational status.

The objective data reveals status contradictions for females in the occupation of professor. In comparing the mean ratings of males and females in the occupation of professor a discrepancy occurs. Males are rated higher than females, thus demonstrating a contradiction in the status system for female professors.

As several articles in the literature review point out, the socialization process supplements contradictions in the social structure. Through socialization, the expected characteristics associated with statuses are passed on to individuals within our society; thus influencing individuals to associate a certain sex with a certain occupation or role. The status structure is quite sex-biased as a result of socialization. The survey data reveals that when the "wrong" sex role occupant is associated with an occupation, a discrepancy appears in the status structure. This discrepancy is labeled a status contradiction because the "wrong" sex role associated with an occupation contradicts the magnitude of status usually attributed to the occupation.

When individuals internalize the status structure, status contradictions become apparent to them. Individuals act according to their perceptions. Therefore, when an individual perceives a status contradiction, he/she acts accordingly. In so doing, individuals create status dilemmas for themselves and the others that they interact with. The interview data, presented in the previous chapter demonstrates this phenomenon. The socialization process causes individuals to recognize

contradictions within the status structure and these contradictions are acted out causing status dilemmas.

In the study of sociology, the separate individual is an abstraction; just as the group is an abstraction. According to George Herbert Mead, the socialized self is a meshing of individualism and groupism. No individual can exist without group influence; and, no group can exist without individuals. Because the individual is an abstraction, as well as, the group, one can not be analysed and studied exclusively without the other. Rather, they must be studied together. This study, in considering both the individual and the group, has attempted an interface of the two perspectives.

Status dilemmas are an individual phenomenon. Status contradictions are a societal phenomenon. Although dilemmas and contradictions of status are two independent concepts, they do meet and act upon each other. As demonstrated above, an individual cannot experience a status dilemma without someone, in the interaction situation, first perceiving a status contradiction. Status contradictions may be abundant in the status structure, but unless they are recognized by an individual, they will not cause dilemmas.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion to this thesis, the importance of the theoretical aspects and the operational aspects are realized. In answering the questions put forth in the problem formulation, inferences must be drawn from both aspects. The operational aspects are incomplete without the theoretical insights.

In carrying out the research for this thesis several problems arose. It was very difficult to measure the status system and the contradictions within it. As the survey data indicate, the two modes of analyses yield different results. The ranked data reveal no status contradictions; whereas, the comparison of mean ratings reveals status contradictions. Thus, it is difficult to draw any conclusions regarding contradictions in the status structure. The theoretical discussions compensate for this shortcoming and it is generally concluded that contradictions exist in the status structure.

It was also difficult to connect the two concepts, status dilemmas and contradictions, operationally. Two methods were utilized necessarily to study each concept. Although these two methods related the concepts, the two concepts could only be connected theoretically through the notion of the socialized self. The two techniques differed such that the results could only coincide in a very generalized meeting ground. An interface of the dilemmas and contradictions of status is explored through the concept of the socialized self.

Throughout this thesis, theoretically and operationally, it has been demonstrated that dilemmas and contradictions of status do exist in American society. One of the implications to be drawn from this conclusion is that American society is currently in a transition period. Males have dominated the occupational arena, although females have not been entirely excluded. More females are entering the occupational arena, often seeking positions in heretofore considered male dominated occupations. This phenomena is causing problems, people do not know exactly how to react to these females. Individuals learn one

set of standards regarding behavior, but are forced to confront situations in which several standards apply or in which no standards are acceptable. This period is considered transitional because in this rapidly changing society, the standards of behavior are constantly changing. Previously the roles for men and women were, more or less, mutually exclusive. These roles now seem to be converging. As more females enter male dominated occupations, new codes of behavior will eventually become established regarding the female sex in these occupations. The status system will also change to incorporate females. When these changes occur, dilemmas and contradictions of status should gradually disappear for females in the occupational arena, and females should be recognized simply as colleagues or employees rather than attaching their sexual status to the relationship. Until the sexual distinctions are abolished, more research is called for. This problem is not easily answered particularly in the current occupational arena. Sexual distinctions are quite prominent and are not likely to disappear in the near future. A redefinition of women's roles in American society is needed to broaden women's options in the occupational arena. This study has attempted to point out the dilemmas and contradictions of status that result from the current status system. In so doing, the limitations of this system have been discussed, as well as the need for more extensive research in this area. Women must be included in order to reflect a true representation of the status system. The exclusion of women in this male dominated society has been defined as a social problem and it is up to the social scientists to research all of the ramifications of this problem.

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan. "Women and Social Stratification: A Case of Intellectual Sexism." American Journal of Sociology, 78 (January 1973), 936-945.
- Benoit-Smullyan, Emile. "Status, Status Types and Status Interrelationships." American Sociological Review, 9 (April 1944), 151-161.
- Bernard, Jessie. Academic Women. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.
- Blumer, Herbert. Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Epstein, Cynthia F. "Encountering the Male Establishment: Sex-Status Limits on Women's Careers in The Professions," in The Professional Woman, ed. Athena Theodore. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- _____. "Women Lawyers and Their Profession: Inconsistency of Social Controls and Their Consequences for Professional Performance," in The Professional Woman, ed. Athena Theodore. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- Ericksen, E. Gordon. The Friction of Space: Human Ecology as Symbolic Interaction. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Gerschwender, James A. "Continuities in Theories of Social Consistency and Cognitive Dissonance." Social Forces, 46 (December 1967), 160-171.
- Goffman, Irwin W. "Status Consistency and Preference for Change in Power Distribution." American Sociological Review, 22 (June 1957), 275-288.
- Haug, Marie R. "Sex Role Variations In Occupational Prestige Ratings." Sociological Forces, 8 (January 1975), 47-56.
- Hughes, Everett Cherrington. "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status." American Journal of Sociology, 50 (March 1945), 353-359.
- _____. "Social Change and Status Protest: An Essay on the Marginal Man," in The Sociological Eye. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, Inc., 1971.
- Kammeyer, Kenneth. "The Feminine Role: An Analysis of Attitude Consistency." Journal of Marriage and The Family, 26 (August 1964), 295-305.

- Knoke, David. "Community and Consistency: The Ethnic Factor in Status Inconsistency." Social Forces, 51 (September 1972), 23-33.
- Komarovsky, Mirra. "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles." American Journal of Sociology, 52 (November 1946), 182-189.
- _____. "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles: The Masculine Case." American Journal of Sociology, 78 (January 1973), 873-884.
- Lenski, Gerhard. "Status Crystallization: A Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status." American Sociological Review, 19 (August 1954), 405.
- Lofland, John. Analyzing Social Settings. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.
- Malewski, Andrzej. "The Degree of Status Incongruence and Its Effects," in Class, Status and Power, eds. Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset, 2nd ed. New York: The Free Press, 1966.
- Mead, George Herbert. Mind Self and Society, ed. Charles W. Morris. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Merton, Robert K. and Elinor Barber. "Sociological Ambivalence," in Sociological Theory, Values and Socio-cultural Change, ed. Edward A. Tiryakian. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967.
- Park, Robert Ezra. "Cultural Conflict and The Marginal Man," in Race and Culture. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- _____. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," in Race and Culture. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- _____. "Mentality of Racial Hybrids," in Race and Culture. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- _____. "Personality and Cultural Conflict," in Race and Culture. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Rosenberg, Bernard. The Province of Sociology: Freedom and Constraint. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc., 1972.
- Sampson, Edward E. "Status Congruence and Cognitive Consistency." Sociometry, 26 (June 1963), 146-162.
- Shearer, Lloyd. "Women Doctors Are Entering All Specialties." Parade, (February 20, 1977), 4-5.
- Simmel, Georg. "The Stranger," in On Individuality and Social Forms, ed. Donald N. Levine. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Stonequist, Everett V. The Marginal Man, 2nd ed. New York: Russell and Russell Inc., 1961.

United States 1960 Census Socioeconomic Status Scores Index in Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, ed. Delbert C. Miller, 2nd ed. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1970.

Wallin, Paul. "Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles: A Repeat Study." American Sociological Review, 15 (April 1950), 288-293.

APPENDIX



COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY (703) 951-6878

October 12, 1976

Dear Dr. Reiss:

I am a graduate student in Sociology currently working on my masters thesis. My data collection techniques consist of student surveys and professor interviews. I would greatly appreciate your help in sharing some of your experiences, as a university professor, with me. These interviews are very important to me, personally, as well as, in completing my thesis. Be assured that your interview will remain completely anonymous.

The title of my thesis is, "A Study of the Status Dilemmas and Contradictions in Certain Occupations: The Marginal Woman"; and it deals with the subtle problems encountered by persons, in several occupations, regarding expected sex roles. In the interview, which should take no more than 30 minutes, I would like to discuss with you the dilemmas and contradictions of status that you encounter in dealing with your male and female colleagues.

A brief synopsis accompanies this letter to provide you with additional information on my study, and to allow you to be thinking about your experiences in this area. For convenience, you may wish to write down these experiences in order to shorten interview time.

Thank you very much. I am looking forward to our conversation.

Sincerely,

Deborah Clopton

Endorsement _____
 E. G. Ericksen
 Thesis Chairman

Synopsis

The idea for my study originated in an article entitled, "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status" by Everett C. Hughes. The main theme of Hughes' article and my study is, in addition to formal requirements necessary in certain occupations, auxiliary requirements tend to be expected of the occupants, and when these auxiliary requirements are not met, status dilemmas and contradictions may occur. For example, the formal requirement for the occupation of university professor is a doctoral degree, and the informal or expected characteristics are that the professor be a white, anglo-saxon, male. This is not to say that a professor must be a white, anglo-saxon, male, but that this image has been stereotyped in conversation, TV, the movies, and books, and thus has become the expected norm. Recently, however, more women are becoming professors, and discrepancies may occur in the way in which the white, anglo-saxon, male professors react to and interact with female professors.

Many previous studies have focused on overt discrimination against women and also the quantitative aspect of discrimination. My study is not interested in either of the above; rather, my study is interested in the nuances of status dilemmas between colleagues. For example, does a male professor have difficulty in determining when to treat a female professor as a woman, and when as a professor? Is it possible that the male professor may, consciously or unconsciously, avoid the female professor because of this dilemma, or because feelings of inferiority or lesser intelligence are at work? The same questions may be directed towards the female professor in relation to a male professor.

It may become necessary for you to reflect back to your initial experiences with a male/female professor, because the more contact that is made, the more experienced one becomes in dealings with this dilemma. For example, after working with a woman for a period of years, one may forget she is a woman and treat her as just another professor. However, this is usually not the case, and it is felt that the subtle discrepancies that occur between the sexes, in the same occupation, will continue to occur until the white, anglo-saxon, male norm, for most high status occupations, is abolished.

In the interview I would like to discuss with you the subtle problems, dilemmas, and contradictions of status that you encounter in your occupation, as university professor, in dealing with your male/female colleagues.

A copy of Dr. Hughes' original article, as well as my thesis proposal is available to you for further explanation of my purpose, and I urge you to contact me at 951-4056 if you are interested in perusing either or both. Dr. Hughes' article is an excellent and concise treatment of the subject.

Student Survey

Please answer the background information below, before going on to the actual survey.

Sex:

Age:

Race:

Religion:

Father's occupation:

Mother's occupation:

Place in which you spent the majority of your time while growing up:

Town/City:

State:

In everyday life we encounter thousands of people in diverse occupations. Each different occupation carries with it a certain amount of prestige or status, but it is up to the individual to decide just how much prestige he or she will attribute to individuals in certain occupations. This study is interested in the prestige factors of occupation and sex, and how much prestige you assign to different occupations based on your past experience in dealing with people.

Listed below are six different occupations. Please rank these occupations according to the amount of prestige or status that you would normally give persons, regardless of their sex, who are engaged in these various occupations. Rank the occupations from the highest in prestige to the lowest; six is the highest amount of prestige and one is the lowest. Place each occupation beside its corresponding number, in terms of prestige.

Occupations: Plumber, Professor, Nurse, Custodian, Fashion Designer, and Elementary School Teacher

6.

5.

4.

3.

2.

1.

The same six occupations are listed below, but now each is held by a female and a male. Please rate each occupation according to the amount of prestige or status that you give to people in these occupations. The scale goes from 7-1, with 7 being the highest, and 1 the lowest amount of prestige.

Male Elementary School Teacher	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Male Fashion Designer	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Male Plumber	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Female Professor	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Female Nurse	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Female Custodian	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Male Professor	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Female Elementary School Teacher	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Male Nurse	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Female Plumber	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Male Custodian	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Female Fashion Designer	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

A STUDY OF THE DILEMMAS AND CONTRADICTIONS
OF STATUS IN CERTAIN OCCUPATIONS:
THE MARGINAL WOMAN

by

Deborah C. Clopton

(ABSTRACT)

The problem under investigation within this thesis is to determine whether dilemmas and contradictions of status exist for females in male dominated occupations, and to some extent, for males in female dominated occupations.

Everett C. Hughes first conceptualized the problem in "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status". (1945) Professor Hughes maintained that statuses tend to develop auxiliary characteristics which come to be expected of it's incumbents. When these auxiliary characteristics are not exhibited, dilemmas and contradictions of status may occur.

The review of the literature explored the implications of Hughes' article. In reviewing the historical development of status dilemmas and contradictions such authors as Georg Simmel, Robert E. Park, Robert Merton and Elinor Barber are perused. In reviewing the contemporary supportive literature, key authors include Jessie Bernard, Cynthia F. Epstein, Gerhard Lenski and David Knoke.

In operationalizing status dilemmas, the symbolic interactionist approach and the cultural soliloquy technique are utilized. Male and female professors at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University expressed dilemmas that they encounter in interacting with colleagues of the opposite sex.

In operationalizing status contradictions, the structural functionalist approach and the survey technique are utilized. Students in introductory sociology classes are surveyed. It is found that status contradictions exist for females in male dominated occupations and for males in female dominated occupations.

It is concluded that status contradictions exist in the status structure. When individuals, in interaction situations, internalize the contradiction and act with uncertainty, then status dilemmas occur.