

Characteristics of Women's Identities in Crisis and Inter-crisis Age Periods

Mikhail Y. Kuzmin^{1,2*}, Elena I. Mironova², Oksana A. Osipenok²

¹ Scientific Center for Family Health and Human Reproduction Problems, Irkutsk, Russian Federation

² Irkutsk State University, Irkutsk, Russian Federation

* Corresponding author. E-mail: mirroy@mail.ru

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7538-8375>, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5121-1834>,
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5200-3244>

Abstract

Introduction. This paper examines the characteristics of identities in women of various ages and ethnic groups in crisis and inter-crisis age periods. The novelty of the research lies in studying the identities of women of Russian, Buryat, and mixed ethnic groups in crisis periods regardless of their age.

Methods. The study used the following techniques: (a) the Twenty Statements Test developed by M. Kuhn and T. MacPartland, (b) the Life Line technique developed by A. Kronik, and (c) the SEI test developed by E. L. Soldatova.

Results. Regardless of the periodization of crisis and inter-crisis periods in adulthood, the level of achieved identity is higher in the crisis periods. Meanwhile, the level of diffused identity is higher in the inter-crisis periods. Differences in identity statuses are mainly inherent to women of Russian ethnic group. The SEI test results showed no significant differences in women identifying themselves with Buryat ethnic group or those of the mixed ethnic group. Certain age periods are characterized by greatest differences in identity statuses. Differences in the achieved identity statuses refer to the period between the 35th and 46th year of age. Women older than 46 years of age demonstrate differences in the diffused identity statuses. During inter-crisis periods, women represent a great number of events that may happen to them in the future, as well as in the period of life that they subjectively refer to the future. During crisis periods, women with the status of achieved identity are characterized by a more detailed representation of their future. During crisis periods, women of Russian ethnic group plan their future in terms of their unique identities. Women of Buryat ethnic group plan their future being guided by social roles attributed to them.

Discussion. The empirical results obtained in this study are compared to those from previous studies in this field. The differences in the results are analyzed in terms of differences in the study samples, cultural aspects, and approaches to studying identity development.

Keywords

identity, middle age, crisis of identity, dynamics of identity, status of identity, ethnic group, crisis period, inter-crisis period

Highlights

- ▶ In crisis and inter-crisis age periods, mature women are characterized by different statuses of identity. During crisis periods, the achieved identity status increases; the diffused identity status decreases.
- ▶ During inter-crisis periods, women are characterized by a more detailed subjective representation of their lives, including a great number of events that may happen to them in the future, as well as in the period of life that they subjectively refer to the future. However, women with the predominance of the achieved identity status provide a more detailed representation of their future during crisis periods.
- ▶ In crisis and inter-crisis periods women's statuses of identity differ depending on their ethnicity. During crisis periods, women of Russian ethnic group plan their future in terms of their unique identities. Women of Buryat ethnic group plan their future being guided by social roles attributed to them.

For citation

Kuzmin, M. Y., Mironova, E. I., & Osipenok, O. A. (2019). Characteristics of women's identities in crisis and inter-crisis age periods. *Russian Psychological Journal*, 16(3), 72–86. doi: 10.21702/rpj.2019.3.6

Received: February 13, 2019

Revision received: September 11, 2019

Accepted: September 15, 2019

Introduction

The focus of recent psychological research has been on studying identity and its crises. However, previous researches usually either concentrate on early stages in identity development: primary school age (Korotaeva, 2011; Bogdanova, 2000; Garmaeva, 2010; Miklyaeva & Rumyantseva, 2008; etc.), adolescence, and youth (Kalinina & Kholmogorova, 2007; Ivanova & Mazilova, 2008; etc.) or compare them with each other (Kuzmin, 2015, 2016). The development of identity status is well examined in adolescence (De Goede, Branje, & Meeus, 2009; Crocetti, Fermani, Pojaghi, & Meeus, 2011; Meeus, van de Schoot, Keijsers, Schwartz, & Branje, 2010). Much less attention is paid to identities in subsequent age periods. This is partly explained by the fact that when growing up the crisis age periods appear to be the most definite (for example, crises at the age of 7, 13, and 17 years in the periodization of L. S. Vygotsky (Levchenko, 2016). Further periodization of human development, as it follows, for example, from Erickson works (1996), does not have similar unambiguous frameworks.

Several publications have appeared in recent years dealing with the issue of identity development in more mature age periods. At the same time, no studies of identities in crisis periods were done. Most researchers (Fadjukoff, Pulkkinen, & Kokko, 2016; Carlsson, Wängqvist, & Frisén, 2015; Kroger, Martinussen, & Marcia, 2010) have shown that the level of achieved identity increases, while the level of diffuse identity decreases in both men and women with growing age. However, no studies examine the differences between identities in crisis and inter-crisis periods. This is partly explained by the diversity of approaches to the periodization of maturity in terms of crisis and inter-crisis periods. Soldatova (2007) generalized

various approaches to periodization (Stepanova (2000), Gansen & Golovey (Gansen, 2001), Morgun & Tkachev, Bratus (in Manukyan, 2002), etc.) and focused on the crises of adulthood, which could be watersheds separating different stages of life from each other. Thus, E. I. Stepanova considers the periods of 25–26 and 35–36 years of age as such crisis stages in adulthood. V. A. Gansen & L. A. Golovey distinguished the following crisis periods: 19–21, 25–27, 32–35, 40, and 50–65 years of age. According to V. F. Morgun & N. Yu. Tkacheva, the periods of crisis correspond to 18–23, 30, 40, and 50–55 years of age. According to B. S. Bratus, the crisis periods of life are most often associated with 28–34, 40–45, and 50–55 years of age.

In general, we can conclude that these classifications, on the one hand, extremely widen the scope of the crisis (for example, for 15 years of age, according to the classification of V. A. Gansen & L. A. Golovey), and, on the other hand, do not completely coincide with each other. An empirical study may help to optimally differentiate different life periods from each other and, accordingly, to identify specific characteristics of identities.

The present study aimed to analyze the characteristics of identity depending on the stage of its development (crisis and inter-crisis periods). Crisis periods between certain age stages are characterized by their specific characteristics. We attempted to distinguish features of identities in the crisis and inter-crisis periods. To exclude the influence of additional variables, our sample contained only women aged 18–74 years. The development of women's identity has its own specific characteristics, which have been widely investigated in psychology (Caffarella & Olson, 1993; Josselson, 1996). Accordingly, this may be taken into account when analyzing the data obtained.

Methods

A sample of 477 women of different ethnic groups aged 18–74 years took part in this study. The respondents were female students from Irkutsk State University Institute of Philology, Foreign Languages and Media Communications and also those who underwent their annual medical preventive examination in the Bokhan District Hospital, Bokhan village. We surveyed the respondents to collect information about their ethnicity and the ethnicity of their parents as well. By the results we differentiated them into several ethnic groups.

Our study used the following techniques: (a) the Structure of Ego-identity test (SEI test) developed by E. L. Soldatova (Soldatova, 2007), (b) the Life Line technique developed by A. Kronik, in its blank version (Leaders, 2008), and (c) the Twenty Statements Test developed by M. Kuhn and T. MacPartland (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954) with the authors' method for processing (Kuzmin, 2018). The data were processed using the Student t-test and Mann–Whitney U test (with normalized z-values), as the analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the Kruskal–Wallace H test. Correlation analysis was carried out using the Pearson correlation coefficient. The calculations were carried by means of the SPSS 23.0 program.

Results

Table 1 shows the differentiation of respondents according to the crisis and inter-crisis periods of development.

Table 1

Differentiation of the study sample according to the crisis and inter-crisis periods

		<u>Periodization</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>			Total
			Russian	Buryat	Mixed	
Classification of Stepanova	Crisis periods	N	88	40	13	141
		%	18,4 %	8,4 %	2,7 %	29,6 %
	Inter-crisis periods	N	194	101	41	336
		%	40,7 %	21,2 %	8,6 %	70,4 %
Classification of Gansen & Golovei	Crisis periods	N	122	87	23	232
		%	26,8 %	19,1 %	5,1 %	51,0 %
	Inter-crisis periods	N	161	42	20	223
		%	35,4 %	9,2 %	4,4 %	49,0 %
Classification of Morgun & Tkacheva	Crisis periods	N	101	30	11	142
		%	21,2 %	6,3 %	2,3 %	29,8 %
	Inter-crisis periods	N	181	111	43	335
		%	37,9 %	23,3 %	9,0 %	70,2 %
Classification of Bratus	Crisis periods	N	114	64	27	205
		%	23,9 %	13,4 %	5,7 %	43,0 %
	Inter-crisis periods	N	168	77	27	272
		%	35,2 %	16,1 %	5,7 %	57,0 %

From the results in Table 1 it follows that the majority of respondents involved in the study were girls and women who identified themselves with Russian ethnic group; 30.4 % of respondents identified themselves with Buryat ethnic group; 10.5 % of girls and women reported themselves to be of mixed origin. At the same time, depending on the classification, the total number of respondents in the crisis and inter-crisis periods could change.

At the first stage, we studied the differences in the identities of women and girls using the SEI test developed by E. L. Soldatova. As the Kolmogorov-Smirnov D-statistics turned out to be insignificant for the scales of this technique, we used the Student t test when comparing the obtained data.

Table 2
Differences in women's identity statuses in the crisis and inter-crisis periods

Scales	Status	Classification of Stepanova		Classification of Gansen & Golovei		Classification of Morgun & Tkacheva		Classification of Bratus	
		t-test	p-level	t-test	p-level	t-test	p-level	t-test	p-level
Basic	Achieved	2,21	0,03	1,34	0,18	3,87	0,00	-0,68	0,50
	Diffused	-2,62	0,01	-1,21	0,23	-2,26	0,02	0,16	0,88
	Predetermined	-0,44	0,66	0,27	0,79	-2,05	0,04	1,22	0,22
Responsibility for a choice	Achieved	3,37	0,00	0,56	0,58	4,06	0,00	-0,51	0,61
	Diffused	-2,12	0,03	-0,39	0,70	-2,18	0,03	0,03	0,98
	Predetermined	-3,10	0,00	0,05	0,96	-3,19	0,00	1,16	0,25
Ego power	Achieved	1,14	0,26	-0,15	0,88	1,61	0,11	-0,85	0,40
	Diffused	-2,59	0,01	-0,58	0,57	-2,36	0,02	1,14	0,26
	Predetermined	1,13	0,26	1,11	0,27	1,03	0,30	-0,08	0,94
Life course awareness	Achieved	0,68	0,50	2,12	0,03	2,27	0,02	-1,74	0,08
	Diffused	0,63	0,53	-2,91	0,00	-0,67	0,50	-0,38	0,70
	Predetermined	-1,82	0,07	0,85	0,40	-1,68	0,09	2,54	0,01
Emotional maturity	Achieved	1,14	0,25	0,47	0,64	0,91	0,37	-0,82	0,41
	Diffused	-1,35	0,18	-0,96	0,34	-0,62	0,54	1,63	0,10
	Predetermined	-0,41	0,68	0,77	0,44	-0,24	0,81	-0,56	0,58

Table 2

Differences in women's identity statuses in the crisis and inter-crisis periods

Scales	Status	Classification of Stepanova		Classification of Gansen & Golovei		Classification of Morgun & Tkacheva		Classification of Bratus	
		t-test	p-level	t-test	p-level	t-test	p-level	t-test	p-level
Acceptance of the present	Achieved	1,04	0,30	2,17	0,03	1,10	0,27	-0,59	0,56
	Diffused	-2,86	0,00	0,34	0,73	-0,89	0,37	0,36	0,72
	Predetermined	1,72	0,09	-3,34	0,00	-0,30	0,76	0,57	0,57
Awareness of personal values	Achieved	0,93	0,35	-0,87	0,38	4,82	0,00	1,55	0,12
	Diffused	-1,61	0,11	0,67	0,50	-3,79	0,00	-2,63	0,01
	Predetermined	0,14	0,89	0,47	0,64	-1,42	0,16	0,89	0,38
Conformity to self	Achieved	-0,31	0,76	1,74	0,08	0,99	0,32	0,55	0,58
	Diffused	-1,92	0,05	-0,29	0,77	0,65	0,51	0,31	0,76
	Predetermined	2,30	0,02	-1,49	0,14	-1,84	0,07	-0,83	0,41

From the results in Table 2 it follows that according to the classification of E. I. Stepanova, women in crisis and inter-crisis age periods differ in their achieved ($t = 2.21$, $p < 0.03$) and diffused ($t = -2.62$, $p < 0.01$) identities. The main differences were associated with the following subscales: 'responsibility for choice – achieved' identity ($t = 3.37$, $p < 0.01$); 'responsibility for a choice – diffused identity' ($t = -2.12$, $p < 0.03$), 'responsibility for a choice – predetermined identity' ($t = -3.1$, $p < 0.01$), 'diffused identity – conformity to self' ($t = -1.92$, $p < 0.05$), 'acceptance of the present' ($t = -2.86$, $p < 0.01$), and 'ego power' ($t = -2.59$, $p < 0.01$).

According to the classification of V. A. Ganzen & L. A. Golovei, no differences were found in women in the crisis and inter-crisis periods by the main scales of the SEI test. They were associated only with the following scales: 'life course awareness – achieved identity' ($t = 2.12$,

$p < 0.03$), 'life course awareness – diffused identity' ($t = -2.91$, $p < 0.01$), and 'acceptance of the present – achieved identity' ($t = 2.17$, $p < 0.03$).

According to the classification of V. F. Morgun & N. Yu. Tkacheva, women in the crisis and inter-crisis age periods differ in their achieved ($t = 3.87$, $p < 0.01$), diffused ($t = -2.26$, $p < 0.02$) and predetermined ($t = -2.05$, $p < 0.04$) identities. The differences are associated with all the subscales related to the following scales: 'responsibility for choice' ($t = 4.06$, $t = -2.18$, $t = -3.19$, respectively, $p < 0.01$) and 'awareness of personal values' ($t = 4.82$, $t = -3.79$ for the achieved and diffused identities, respectively, $p < 0.01$).

Finally, according to the classification of B. S. Bratus, no differences were found in women in the crisis and inter-crisis periods by the main scales of the SEI test. There were only differences in certain components of the following subscales: 'awareness of personal values – diffused identity' ($t = -2.63$, $p < 0.01$), 'life course awareness – predetermined identity' ($t = 2.54$, $p < 0, 01$).

In general, we can conclude that depending on the classifications women in the crisis and inter-crisis age periods demonstrate differences in both subscales and main scales. Nevertheless, if we compare the statuses of identity during the crisis and inter-crisis age periods, it is obvious that regardless various classifications the crisis period is characterized by a high level of the achieved identity status and a low level of the diffused identity status.

We differentiated the female respondents according their ethnicity and obtained the following results. During the crisis and inter-crisis age periods women of Russian ethnic group demonstrated the greatest differences by the SEI test scales. These differences were mainly associated with the diffused identity status ($t = 2.1$, $p < 0, 01$ for classifications E. I. Stepanova, and V. F. Morgun & N. Yu. Tkacheva) and the achieved identity status ($t = 3.4$, $p < 0.01$ for the classification of V. F. Morgun & N. Yu. Tkacheva). Women of Buryat ethnic group or those of mixed ethnicity had no significant differences by the main scales of the SEI test.

Thus, we can formulate the following conclusions: (a) There is no classification that helps to unambiguously characterize the identities of women in the crisis and inter-crisis age periods. (b) Depending on the classification, differences will be associated with different identity statuses. (c) At the same time, the status of achieved identity is more pronounced in women during the crisis period; the status of diffused identity is less pronounced. (d) Moreover, this feature is more characteristic of women of reproductive age (before 46 years of age) (Nadelyaeva & Suturina, 2018) belonging to Russian ethnic group.

We also made an attempt to identify the age period that determines the greatest differences in women's identities in the crisis and inter-crisis age periods. The classification of E. I. Stepanova was the only valid classification. According to the results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA), the main differences in the level of women's achieved identity take place between 35 and 46 years of age ($F = 2.41$, $p < 0, 01$); the main differences in the level of women's diffused identity start manifest themselves after 46 years of age ($F = 2.43$, $p < 0.01$). Moreover, these differences are inherent in women of Russian ethnic group.

At the second stage, using the Life Line technique we studied differences in the subjective views of the life course in women in the crisis and inter-crisis age periods.

Table 3

Subjective views of the life course in women in the crisis and inter-crisis periods

Classifications			Total number of events	Representation of the past	Representation of events of the past	Representation of the future	Representation of events of the future	End of the event period
Classification of Stepanova	Inter-crisis periods	Md	7	7,5	4	7	2	55
		Qr (25,75)	6	2,975	3	5	3	19
	Crisis periods	Md	8	5	4	6,8	4	40,5
		Qr (25,75)	6	4,05	4	6	4	18,5
Classification of Gansen & Golovei	Inter-crisis periods	Md	7	6,5	4	7,2	3	45
		Qr (25,75)	6	3,4	3	5	3	21
	Crisis periods	Md	7	8	5	6,5	2	56
		Qr (25,75)	6	3,175	4	5,175	4	13
Classification of Morgun & Tkacheva	Inter-crisis periods	Md	6	7,4	4	7	2	50
		Qr (25,75)	5	3,125	3	4,85	3	20,5
	Crisis periods	Md	9	6,8	4	6	4	52
		Qr (25,75)	5	4,675	4	4,85	3	25
Classification of Bratus	Inter-crisis periods	Md	7	7,2	4	6	2	50
		Qr (25,75)	5	4,1	3	5,2	3	23
	Crisis periods	Md	7	7,3	4	7,5	3	52
		Qr (25,75)	6	2,8	3	5	3	16,5

According to the classification of E. I. Stepanova (by the Mann–Whitney U test), both reproductive-age women (before 46 years of age) and those of post-reproductive age (after 46 years of age) have significant differences in their subjective importance of the past ($Z = 7, 6, p < 0.01$), the number of events represented in the future ($Z = 4, p < 0.01$), as well as the end of the event period ($Z = 4.3, p < 0.01$).

Moreover, according to this classification, during the inter-crisis periods female respondents are characterized by a more distant end of the event period, and also indicate more events that may happen to them in the future. However, according to the median, such women indicate more events in their past.

According to the classification of V. A. Gansen & L. A. Golovey, there are differences in subjective importance of the past ($Z = 7.1, p < 0.01$), the number of represented events in the future ($Z = 3.1, p < 0.01$) and in the past ($Z = 3.2, p < 0.01$), as well as the end of the event period ($Z = 2.9, p < 0.01$). In this case, on the contrary, during the crisis age periods women report a more distant end of the event period.

According to the classification of V. F. Morgun & N. Yu. Tkacheva, during the inter-crisis and crisis periods women differ in the total number of specified events ($Z = 4.2, p < 0.01$), the subjective importance of the past ($Z = 4, p < 0.01$), the number of events represented in the future ($Z = 2.8, p < 0.01$), and the end of the event period ($Z = 2.1, p < 0.03$).

Finally, using the classification of B. S. Bratus, we did not find significant differences between these periods.

In general, regardless of the classifications women in the inter-crisis period represent a greater number of events that will happen to them in the future, as well as their period of life subjectively related to the future. The classification of B. S. Bratus is the only exception here. Moreover, we cannot unequivocally assert that the end of the event period of life somehow depends on whether the respondent is in a crisis age period. It depends on the approach to periodization that we use.

An interesting dynamics is also associated with the end of the event period – the age after which the subjects ceased to specify any important events in the future. In early adulthood the end of the event period corresponds to 30 years of age. In the first half of middle adulthood this period constitutes 35-years period and corresponds to its end. In the second half of middle adulthood this period is shorter than the period of previous life. Consequently, starting from the second half of middle adulthood women 'experience' themselves, leaving the event period of their lives in the past.

An additional analysis showed that the revealed differences are mainly inherent in women who identify themselves with Russian ethnic group. They have significant differences in the total number of represented events ($H = 19.9, p < 0.01$), the subjective significance of the past ($H = 48.8, p < 0.01$), the number of represented events in the future ($H = 17.6, p < 0.01$) and its subjective significance ($H = 27.5, p < 0.01$), as well as the end of the event period ($H = 29.2, p < 0, 01$). On the contrary, Buryat women demonstrate differences only in the subjective importance of the past ($H = 8.1, p < 0.05$) and the end of the event period ($H = 6.1, p < 0.05$). We found no differences in female respondents of mixed ethnicity.

We also carried out a correlation analysis of the statuses of identity and representations of lives in women in the crisis and inter-crisis periods. As follows from the correlation analysis, there are certain associations between the scales of the SEI test and the characteristics of the representations of life by female respondents in the inter-crisis period. These associations vary from classification

to classification. The subjects' representations of past events have strong negative associations with the status of diffused identity and positive ones with the status of achieved identity.

Table 4

Associations between the subjective image of the life course and identity statuses in women in crisis and inter-crisis age periods

<u>Classifications</u>	<u>Scales</u>	<u>Total number of events</u>	<u>Representation of the past</u>	<u>Representation of events of the past</u>	<u>Representation of the future</u>	<u>Representation of events of the future</u>	<u>End of the event period</u>
Inter-crisis periods							
Classification of Stepanova	Achieved identity	,139*	,055	,140*	,037	,101	,021
	Diffused identity	–,051	,008	–,058	–,022	–,033	–,101
	Predetermined identity	–,231**	–,092	–,122*	–,023	–,100	,118
Classification of Gansen & Golovei	Achieved identity	,076	–,014	,108	–,024	,181**	,017
	Diffused identity	–,113	,046	–,063	,014	–,127	–,145
	Predetermined identity	–,205**	–,048	–,075	,017	–,091	,176
Classification of Morgun & Tkacheva	Achieved identity	,086	,111	,167**	–,031	,060	,073
	Diffused identity	–,054	–,026	–,132*	–,007	–,143*	–,196*
	Predetermined identity	–,060	–,124*	–,061	,055	–,036	,153
Classification of Bratus	Achieved identity	,169*	–,013	,206**	–,067	,095	,011
	Diffused identity	–,015	,017	–,164*	,045	–,063	–,097
	Predetermined identity	–,184*	–,005	–,066	,035	–,051	,120

Table 4

Associations between the subjective image of the life course and identity statuses in women in crisis and inter-crisis age periods

<u>Classifi- cations</u>	<u>Scales</u>	<u>Total number of events</u>	<u>Represen- tation of the past</u>	<u>Represen- tation of events of the past</u>	<u>Represen- tation of the future</u>	<u>Represen- tation of events of the future</u>	<u>End of the event period</u>
Crisis periods							
Classifi- cation of Stepanova	Achieved identity	,329**	-,158	,200**	-,088	,265**	,061
	Diffused identity	-,281**	,091	-,202**	-,070	-,213*	-,143
	Predeter- mined identity	-,087	,106	-,009	,235*	-,090	,085
Classifi- cation of Gansen & Golovei	Achieved identity	,289**	,012	,195*	,038	,315**	,064
	Diffused identity	-,297**	,041	-,107	-,091	-,252**	-,085
	Predeter- mined identity	-,131	-,070	-,124	,069	-,088	,022
Classifi- cation of Morgun & Tkacheva	Achieved identity	,206**	-,166	,184*	,188*	,239**	-,057
	Diffused identity	,020	,132	,011	-,133	-,187*	,082
	Predeter- mined identity	-,097	,039	-,179*	-,070	-,120	-,045
Classifi- cation of Bratus	Achieved identity	,194*	,029	,092	,101	,183*	,070
	Diffused identity	-,171*	,084	,001	-,127	,015	-,102
	Predeter- mined identity	-,050	-,156*	-,133	,028	-,138	,036

On the contrary, regardless of the classification in a crisis situation, we observe close associations between the total number of represented events and the status of achieved and diffused identity (positive and negative, respectively, with a significance level of $p < 0.01$). Moreover, they are mostly associated with the women's representations of the events of their future. It turns out that in a crisis period, the pronounced status of achieved identity positively correlates with women's representations of their future. On the contrary, the pronounced status of diffused identity negatively correlates with women's representations of their future. In the inter-crisis period, such a tendency is not observed.

The associations between the scales of the SEI test and Russian women's representations of their lives did not differ from those obtained in the entire sample. At the same time, we found certain specific associations in Buryat women. It turned out that during the crisis period Buryat women are mostly characterized by positive associations between the representations of their future and the status of predetermined identity ($r = 0.39$, $p < 0.01$). In addition, there is a relationship between the end of the event period and the status of predetermined identity ($r = 0.33$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, a more detailed representation of the future in Russian women is associated with their statuses of achieved identity. A more detailed representation of the future in Buryat women is associated with their statuses of predetermined identity. In other words, during the crisis period women of Russian ethnic group plan their future in terms of their unique identities. Buryat women plan their future being guided by social roles attributed to them.

Finally, at the third stage, we examined the distribution of answers to the items of the Twenty Statements technique among women in the crisis and inter-crisis age periods. However, we did not find any unambiguous differences in any components in all the classifications (E. I. Stepanova, V. A. Gansen & L. A. Golovei, V. F. Morgun & N. Yu. Tkacheva, and B. S. Bratus). For example, according to the classification of E. I. Stepanova, female respondents in the crisis period demonstrate a more pronounced family component of identity ($z = 2.8$, $p < 0.01$). However, the results obtained are not confirmed in any other classification. On the other hand, according to the classification of B. S. Bratus, in the crisis period, women have a more pronounced personality component of identity ($z = 2.05$, $p < 0.05$). However, this difference is not confirmed by other classifications.

Discussion

We found that depending on the classifications, women in crisis and inter-crisis periods are characterized by specific differences in their identities. However, regardless of the classification, in the crisis period the level of achieved identity is higher; the level of diffused identity is lower. Moreover, this tendency is characteristic of two of the four classifications considered – namely, the classifications of E. I. Stepanova, V. F. Morgun, & N. Yu. Tkacheva.

Our results do not coincide with the conclusions drawn from previous studies. According to Fadjukoff, Pulkkinen, & Kokko (2016), with increasing age women's achieved identity becomes more pronounced, compared to diffused identity. This tendency affected various aspects of life including religious beliefs, political preferences, careers, intimate and personal relationships, and lifestyle. The authors found that in earlier age periods achieved identity is more characteristic of women than men. However, by the age of 50 years, gender differences decreased in most areas (excluding the religious component, where men were characterized by diffused identities) (Fadjukoff, Pulkkinen, & Kokko, 2016). Similarly, according to the results of Kroger, Martinussen, & Marcia (2010), the status of achieved identity also increases by the age of 30–36 years; on the contrary, the status

of moratorium decreases. Soldatova (2007) demonstrated that in the crisis age periods the values of autonomous identity increase, while those of diffused identity decrease.

In our opinion, there are various reasons for such contradiction of the results obtained. On the one hand, this may be explained by the absence of clear boundaries of the crisis age periods. Accordingly, the crisis stages, intersecting with the crisis ones, bring interference to the results.

In addition, we found that differences in identity statuses are inherent to representatives of the Russian ethnic group; we found no differences among women of the Buryat ethnic group and among women of mixed ethnic origin in the crisis and inter-crisis age periods. We may assume that the classifications of E. I. Stepanova, V. A. Gansen & L. A. Golovei, V. F. Morgun & N. Yu. Tkacheva, and B. S. Bratus were developed on a sample of representatives of the Russian ethnic group. Otherwise, we fail to explain why there are no differences in identities among representatives of other ethnic groups.

Previous research has documented differences in the statuses of identity in individuals belonging to various cultures. For example, Abu-Rayya & Abu-Rayya (2009) focused on the identity characteristics of Australian Muslims. Pals (2006) investigated specific characteristics of narrative identity depending on ethnic belonging. Gfellner & Cordoba (2017) studied the features of ego power among Native Americans. Mohanty (2013) examined the features of ego power among Asians. McLean & Pasupathi (2012) studied general issues of the development of individuals depending on their ethnic belonging. Apparently, the indigenous inhabitants of Eastern Siberia have the same features, which explains the absence of differences in identity statuses depending on age.

Regardless of the classifications, women in the inter-crisis period represent a greater number of events that may happen to them in the future, as well as in the period of their lives that they subjectively relate to the future. Moreover, we cannot unequivocally assert that the end of the event period of life depends on whether the respondent is in a crisis period. This depends on the periodization that we use. Thus, blurring the boundaries of the crisis age periods cause interference of the results, as the crisis periods overlap the inter-crisis ones. However, our findings still suggest that women's subjective representations of the past and especially the future are more detailed in the inter-crisis periods.

Research Limitations

This study is a part of a more comprehensive study of identity in adult respondents depending on their family status, gender, ethnic, and religious belonging. Accordingly, the results presented in this paper are not conclusive. In particular, we did not specify family statuses of women in our study. We look forward to fill this gap in further research.

Conclusions

The data obtained in this study enabled us to conclude the following:

- In crisis and inter-crisis periods mature women are characterized by different statuses of identity. During crisis periods, the status of the achieved identity increases; the status of diffused identity decreases.
- During inter-crisis periods, women are characterized by a more detailed subjective representation of their lives, including a great number of events that may happen to them in the future, as well as in the period of life that they subjectively refer to the future. However, women with

the predominance of the achieved identity status provide a more detailed representation of their future during crisis periods.

- In crisis and inter-crisis periods women's statuses of identity differ depending on their ethnicity. During crisis periods, women of Russian ethnic group plan their future in terms of their unique identities. Women of Buryat ethnic group plan their future being guided by social roles attributed to them.

References

- Abu-Rayya, M. H., & Abu-Rayya, H. M. (2009). Ethnic identification, religious identity, and psychological well-being among Muslim and Christian Palestinians in Israel. *Mental Health, Religion & Culture, 12*(2), 147–155. doi: [10.1080/13674670802387330](https://doi.org/10.1080/13674670802387330)
- Bogdanova, N. A. (2000). *Psychological difficulties in the development of self-identity in primary schoolchildren* (Doctoral dissertation). Tula. (in Russ.).
- Caffarella, R. S., & Olson, S. K. (1993). Psychosocial development of women: a critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 43*, 125–151.
- Carlsson, J., Wängqvist, M., & Frisé, A. (2015). Identity development in the late twenties: A never ending story. *Developmental Psychology, 51*(3), 334–345. doi: [10.1037/a0038745](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038745)
- Crocetti, E., Fermani, A., Pojaghi, B., & Meeus, W. (2011). Identity formation in adolescents from Italian, mixed, and migrant families. *Child Youth Care Forum, 40*, 7–23. doi: [10.1007/s10566-010-9112-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-010-9112-8)
- De Goede, I., Branje, S., & Meeus, W. (2009). Developmental changes and gender differences in adolescents' perceptions of friendships. *Journal of Adolescence, 32*, 1105–1123.
- Erickson, E. (1996). *Childhood and society*. St. Petersburg: Universitetskaya kniga. (in Russ.).
- Fadjukoff, P., Pulkkinen, L., & Kokko, K. (2016). Identity formation in adulthood: A longitudinal study from age 27 to 50. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research, 16*(1), 8–23. doi: [10.1080/15283488.2015.1121820](https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2015.1121820)
- Garmaeva, T. V. (2010). Features of ethnic identity in primary schoolchildren and adolescents living in a megalopolis. *Psychological studies, 2*(10). Retrieved from <http://psystudy.ru/index.php/num/2010n2-10/310-garmaeva10.html> (in Russ.).
- Gfellner, B. M., & Cordoba, A. I. (2017). Identity problems, ego strengths, perceived stress, and adjustment during contextual changes at university. *Identity, 17*(1), 25–39. doi: [10.1080/15283488.2016.1268961](https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2016.1268961)
- Hansen, V. A. (2001). Towards a system-based description of human ontogenesis. In V. A. Gansen, L. A. Golovey, *Developmental psychology* (pp. 81–97). St. Petersburg: Piter. (in Russ.).
- Ivanova, N. L., & Mazilova, G. B. (2008). Changes in ethnic and civic identity in the new social environment. *Voprosy Psikhologii, 2*, 83–93. (in Russ.).
- Josselson, R. (1996). *Revising herself: The story of women's identity from college to midlife*. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.
- Kalinina, O. G., & Kholmogorova, A. B. (2007). The influence of fathers' image on adolescents' emotional well-being and gender-role identity. *Voprosy Psikhologii, 1*, 15–26. (in Russ.).
- Korotaeva, A. I. (2011). Development of gender identity in primary schoolchildren. *Yaroslavskii pedagogicheskii vestnik = Yaroslavl Pedagogical Bulletin, 2*(4), 241–244. (in Russ.).
- Kroger, J., Martinussen, M., & Marcia, J. E. (2010). Identity status change during adolescence and young adulthood: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Adolescence, 33*, 683–698. doi: [10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.11.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2009.11.002)

- Kuhn, M. H., & McPartland, T. S. (1954). The empirical investigation of self-attitude. *American Sociological Review*, 19, 68–76.
- Kuzmin, M. Yu. (2015). Comparing identities in primary schoolchildren, adolescents, and young people. *Sibirskii psikhologicheskii zhurnal = Siberian Journal of Psychology*, 58, 61–75. doi: [10.17223/17267080/58/4](https://doi.org/10.17223/17267080/58/4) (in Russ.).
- Kuzmin, M. Yu. (2016). Dynamics of identities in primary schoolchildren, adolescents, and young people. *Sibirskii psikhologicheskii zhurnal = Siberian Journal of Psychology*, 62, 54–66. doi: [10.17223/17267080/62/5](https://doi.org/10.17223/17267080/62/5) (in Russ.).
- Kuzmin, M. Yu. (2018). Associations among the components of identity and its statuses in students. *Sibirskii psikhologicheskii zhurnal = Siberian Journal of Psychology*, 69, 69–84. doi: [10.17223/17267080/69/4](https://doi.org/10.17223/17267080/69/4) (in Russ.).
- Leaders, A. G. (2008). *Psychological examination of families*. Moscow: Akademiya. (in Russ.).
- Levchenko, V. A. (2016). Views of activity and social relations in the works of L. S. Vygotsky and his followers. *Young Scientist*, 27.1, 18–20. Retrieved from <https://moluch.ru/archive/131/35955/> (in Russ.).
- Manukyan, V. R. (2002). Classifications and psychological content of crises in adulthood. *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta = Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. Philosophy and Socio-political studies*. (in Russ.).
- McLean, K. C., Pasupathi, M. (2012). Processes of identity development: Where I am and how I got there. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 12(1), 8–28. doi: [10.1080/15283488.2011.632363](https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2011.632363)
- Meeus, W., van de Schoot, R., Keijsers, L., Schwartz, S. J., & Branje, S. (2010). On the progression and stability of adolescent identity formation: A five-wave longitudinal study in early-to-middle and middle-to-late adolescence. *Child Development*, 81(5), 1565–1581.
- Miklyaeva, A. V., & Rummyantseva, P. V. (2008). *Individuals' social identity: Content, structure, and formation mechanisms*. St. Petersburg: Russian State Pedagogical University. (in Russ.).
- Mohanty, J. (2013). Ethnic and racial socialization and self-esteem of Asian adoptees: The mediating role of multiple identities. *Journal of Adolescence*, 36(1), 161–170. doi: [10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.10.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.10.003)
- Nadelyaeva, Ya. G., & Sutura, L. V. (2018). Polycystic ovary syndrome and menopause. *Doctor. Ru*, 10(154), 47–50. doi: 10.31550 / 1727-2378-2018-154-10-47-50 (in Russ.).
- Pals, J. L. (2006). Narrative identity processing of difficult life experiences: Pathways of personality development and positive self-transformation in adulthood. *Journal of Personality*, 74(4), 1079–1110. doi: [10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00403.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00403.x)
- Soldatova, E. L. (2007). *The structure and dynamics of the regulatory crisis of transition to adulthood*. Chelyabinsk: SUSU. (in Russ.).
- Stepanova, E. I. (2000). *Adult psychology: Experimental acmeology*. St. Petersburg: Aleteiya. (in Russ.).

No conflict of interest