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(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of gender and gender-role orientation, defined as levels of instrumentality and expressiveness, to Eriksonian ego identity achievement in young adults.

Erikson's theory of psychosocial development was the theoretical framework for the study. It was hypothesized that a regression model can predict ego identity from the independent variables of instrumentality, expressiveness, gender, self-esteem, age, intergenerational intimacy, significant other intimacy, intergenerational fusion-individuation, intergenerational intimidation, and significant other fusion-individuation.

The sample consisted of 156 college students, 73 males and 83 females. Respondents ranged in age from 19 to 25.

Ego identity achievement was defined as the respondent's score on Rasmussen's Ego Identity Scale (Rasmussen, 1961). Instrumentality and expressiveness were operationalized as scores on the Instrumental (M) Scale and the Expressive (F) Scale of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Self-esteem was
operationalized by scores on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1979). The three individuation variables and the two intimacy variables were operationalized by five subscale scores of the Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire, Version C (Williamson, Bray, Malone, 1984).

Based on the results of stepwise multiple regression analysis the null hypothesis was not accepted. Instrumentality was the strongest predictor of ego identity achievement level. Self-esteem, significant other fusion-individuation, gender, intergenerational fusion-individuation, and significant other intimacy were also significant predictors of ego-identity achievement. Males reported significantly lower ego identity scores than females. Individuation from parents and significant other predicted identity achievement.

Results of the investigation did not support the thesis that the psychological meaning of identity is defined by intimacy issues for females and individuation issues for males.
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A central challenge in each human life is the development of an identity. Erikson (1956, 1959, 1963, 1968) formulated a theory of psychosocial development that has ego identity as its focus. The relevance, meaning, and answer to the question, "Who am I?", while present throughout the life span, is particularly salient to the adolescent and young adult. Ego identity formation proceeds gradually, unconsciously, and often unintentionally. Decision and action, "I will do, be, or value this and not that," lead to a sense of internal continuity, identity, that is congruent with external reality.

The synthesizing theoretical structure of this study is Erikson's theory of psychosocial development. According to Erikson (1956, 1968), psychosocial development occurs epigenetically; that is, psychosocial development is based on a series of internally regulated, sequential stages that occur in conformity with a prearranged order and design. In resolving the identity dilemma, the biological, cognitive, psychological, and psychosocial processes of the individual intersect and interact with society within the historical time and cultural context of the individual.

The ego identity versus identity confusion process begins in early adolescence, around age 12 years. For 75 percent to 86 percent of persons, ego identity crystallizes in late adolescence/young adulthood at approximately age 22 years (Constantinople, 1969; Waterman, Geary, & Waterman, 1974). Thus ego identity is the bridge from childhood to adulthood. Identity merges the past experiences and identifications of
the person with future aspirations. Identity is also the bridge from the individual to society.

Erikson presents several perspectives which together form ego identity. Ego identity is the product of human development from birth to death but especially the product of adolescence. Identity provides structure to personality. Without identity the person lacks initiative and purpose. Identity is dynamic and tests personal experience, past and present, in light of present society. A sense of identity provides subjective continuity for the self. Identity is also a definition of self in terms of a particular relationship to a family, society, intimate partner, or group. Identity includes basic life commitments; the individual's vocational, social, marital, ideological, and ethical commitments. Ego identity, partly conscious and partly unconscious, gives meaning to the sum of an individual's experience, tests reality, integrates experience, conflict, and personality, while providing continuity for the self (Bourne, 1978; Erikson, 1959, 1968).

Theoretical Framework

Erikson (1959, 1968) proposed a series of eight psychosocial stages, beginning at birth and ending at death. The eight stages while prominent at certain ages are not finite but are present in some form throughout the life span. Each stage or critical time period presents a psychosocial crisis or task expressed in terms of a polarity, for example, stage one, Trust versus Mistrust. Stage one represents a time when both potential for Trust and vulnerability for Mistrust are
present. The "crisis" of each stage refers to the necessity of successful resolution of each task in order to form the component parts, ego qualities, of the psychosocial personality, ego identity.

Ego identity is related to the four stages preceding it and the three to follow by seven part-conflicts (Erikson, 1956, 1968). Erikson thought that successful resolution of each stage in turn was necessary for optimal psychosocial health. His theory and writings focus primarily on the Identity versus Identity Confusion stage and its part-conflicts that encompass all stages. The eight psychosocial stages (Erikson, 1968) with approximate age ranges of salience and the eight part-conflicts of each stage (listed in parenthesis) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Psychosocial/Tasks and Part-Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Trust versus Mistrust, birth to 18 months (Temporal Perspective versus Time Confusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Autonomy versus Shame, Doubt, 18 months to 3 years (Self Certainty versus Self-Consciousness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Initiative versus Guilt, 3 to 6 years (Role Experimentation versus Role Fixation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Industry versus Inferiority, 6 to 12 years (Apprenticeship versus Work Paralysis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Identity versus Identity Confusion, 12 to 22 years (Task Identification versus Sense of Futility) (Anticipation of Roles versus Role Inhibition) (Will to Be Oneself versus Self-Doubt) (Mutual Recognition versus Autistic Isolation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Intimacy versus Isolation, 22 to 35 years (Sexual Polarization versus Bisexual Confusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Generativity versus Stagnation, 35 years to retirement (Leader and Followership versus Authority Confusion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Integrity versus Despair, retirement years (Ideological Commitment versus Confusion of Values)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ego identity is formed in reciprocal relationship with society, and ego identity and society live in continuing reciprocal relationship with each other. Society includes family, community, schools, and other institutions of the culture. Erikson (1968) saw the environment as the catalyst to identity development. The environment provided challenges to the young adult while at the same time providing choices, validation, and support.

Sanford (1962, 1967) indicated some of the ways in which the college environment, to the extent that it challenges the student to reevaluate self and offers the student the freedom to try out the results of such reevaluation, can influence the nature and extent of personality development. Constantinople (1964, 1967) thought that the goals of college students might be related to their level of ego identity achievement. Erikson (1959) thought that a conviction that future goals are "sufficiently predictable to be worth working and waiting for" (p. 97) was a characteristic of ego identity achievement.

In summary, if ego identity is achieved (Erikson, 1956, 1959, 1963, 1968) the person will:

1. Be able to delay gratification, set goals and work toward them.
2. Develop autonomy and a sense of self as an individual.
3. Have confidence in self and want to participate in life.
4. Have a sense of competence and purpose.
5. Learn emotional independence of parents and later interdependence.
6. Deal with career issues, educational issues, and decide on a career.
7. Develop the capacity for effective interpersonal and intimate
relationships.

8. Desire and achieve socially responsible behavior.

9. Learn to lead and follow.

10. Achieve a masculine or feminine gender role and gender identity.

11. Acquire a set of values and an ethical system.

Erikson's theoretical model of ego identity development was based on case studies of men. In his essay on the development of ego identity in women, Erikson (1968) discussed the different psychological meanings of ego identity for males and females as arising from their anatomical differences. He did not suggest that ego identity developmental processes, for example, stage sequence, were different for women and men.

Erikson (1968) stated that a woman's innerspace predisposes her to activities marked by harmony, relative passivity, and union. Males, on the other hand, incline toward independent and assertive activity. The male adolescent tests who he is by objective yardsticks in active and/or competitive pursuits. The female adolescent tests her identity by subjective yardsticks of ethics, relationship, and home. Erikson proposed that a female's moratorium ended with the choice of a mate; whereas, a male's moratorium ended with a commitment to career and ideological choices (Erikson, 1956, 1963, 1968, 1975).

Erikson's (1968) psychological distinction between a masculine "fondness for what works and for what man can make, whether it helps to build or to destroy" and a more "ethical" feminine commitment to "resourcefulness in peacekeeping and devotion in healing" (p. 283) is
the traditional gender-role identity concept. Both historically and cross-culturally feminine gender-role identity has had an expressive (interpersonal) focus, concern for the welfare of others and the harmony of the group. Whereas, masculine gender-role identity has had an instrumental (intrapersonal) focus, concern for getting the job done or the problem solved.

For Erikson, gender-role identity is a central issue of ego identity. In his discussion of the part-conflict of sexual polarization versus bisexual confusion, he presented a concept of gender identity with three components. These are: (a) a sexual preference for members of the opposite gender, (b) a gender-role identity as either masculine or feminine, and (c) a secure sense of one's femaleness or maleness. In discussing gender identity, Erikson (1968, p. 285) stated, "In other words: anatomy, history, and personality are our combined destiny."

Erikson presented ego identity as a construct with multiple, non-operational, and relatively intangible meanings and referents. To objectively measure ego identity others developed assessment measures. These measures assess ego identity achievement in one of two ways. These are: (a) measurement of the level of resolution of the stage tasks and the part-conflicts (Constantinople, 1969; Dignan, 1965; Rasmussen, 1964), and (b) measurement of the individual's amount of exploration (crisis) and commitments in the areas of occupation and ideology of religion and politics (Marcia, 1966). The assessment measures led to considerable research regarding ego identity development and its personality and behavioral correlates.

Initially, investigations of ego identity development were
conducted with male samples (Block, 1961; Gruen, 1960; Marcia, 1966; Pedd, 1969). When female identity development began to be investigated, Marcia and Friedman (1970) concluded that assessment of crisis and commitment in attitudes toward premarital sex should be included in the identity interview for females. Matteson (1977) included crisis and commitment in the area of gender-role ideology in a study of ego identity development in Danish males and females. Early investigations of identity development in females led to conclusions that the process and correlates of ego identity development were different for men and women (Hodgson, 1977; Josselson, 1973; Marcia & Friedman, 1970).

Bourne (1978), Orlofsky (1977), and Raphael (1976) published critiques of the literature regarding differences in female and male ego identity development. One point made was that the majority of studies of identity development had used either females or males as subjects. Thus conclusions could not be made as to whether gender differences postulated were due to differences between the genders or to differences between the populations from which subjects were drawn. Another methodological problem was that often studies were compared for gender differences when the subjects involved were of different ages. Differences in results may have occurred because of the age differences of samples rather than gender differences. In addition, different identity status interviews were used for women and men.

In order to assess differences and similarities in ego identity development between women and men, subjects of both genders should be drawn from the same population and tested concurrently using uniform identity status interviews and measures of dependent variables. Factors
known to significantly predict ego identity achievement, for example, age (Protinsky, 1975; Waterman & Waterman, 1976), should be controlled. A number of studies have been conducted using samples composed of both genders. These studies are reviewed in Chapter Two.

As a result of investigations of ego identity development using samples of females and males two areas of controversy have developed. These are: (a) the psychological meaning of ego identity may be different for females and males, and (b) the developmental process leading to ego identity achievement may be different for males and females.

The female psychological meaning of identity has been defined as connectedness and relating to others (Gilligan, 1982; Selva & Dusek, 1984). The male psychological meaning of identity has been defined as individual competence and autonomy (Marcia, 1985). These definitions resulted from research results that indicate women are more likely to be identity achieved in areas of interpersonal relationships and sexual ideology than are men. Men tend to be identity achieved in the areas of occupation and politics but foreclosed in the areas of sexual ideology (Hodgson, 1977).

Personality characteristics have frequently been measured in relationship to level of ego identity achievement. Women who are in the identity achievement status have been found to score lower on self-esteem and higher in anxiety than women in the identity foreclosure status. The reverse is true for men (Marcia & Friedman, 1970; Romano, 1975; Schenkel & Marcia, 1972). Marcia (1980) postulated this was true because there is more cultural support for male exploration of
alternatives than for female exploration of alternatives (Marcia, 1980).

Self-esteem is the evaluation of self and is a vital part of the personality. Self-esteem is generally regarded as an important resource in achieving a sense of personal identity (Grotevant, 1983). Josselson (1973) suggested that women look outside themselves for evidence of development as a capable person while men look inside themselves for this evidence.

Erikson suggested that self-esteem is concomitant not only with the achievement of an identity, but also of intimacy. Erikson stated, "Thus, self-esteem confirmed at the end of each major crisis, grows to be a conviction that one is learning effective steps toward a tangible future, that one is developing a defined personality within a social reality which one understands" (1959, p. 89).

Orlofsky (1978) thought that the lack of social support for women's exploration of alternatives was responsible for gender differences in identity correlates. A number of researchers have suggested that traditional gender-role socialization, masculine-instrumental, feminine-expressive, account for these differences (Schiedel & Marcia, 1953; Selva & Dusek, 1984).

Erikson thought that intimacy was contingent on identity. "True engagement with others is the result and the test of firm self-delineation..." (Erikson, 1968, p. 167). Research has indicated that there may be separate pathways to identity achievement that are gender specific. For females the intimacy stage may precede or coincide with the identity stage. For males, the identity task precedes intimacy, following the Eriksonian pathway (Tesch & Whitbourne, 1980; Zampick,
Marcia (1985) and Rossi (1980) have suggested women deal with intimacy issues first and may not deal with identity issues until their mid-thirties.

Erikson postulated that ego identity was the prerequisite of intimacy with both parents and significant other. Bray, Williamson, and Malone (1984) described a process whereby an individual can act from an individuated position with parents and significant other and still remain connected to or intimate with parents and significant other.

While Erikson (1968) discussed the developmental change in parental-young adult relationships, he did not delineate the process of the change. A major issue in adolescent/young adult identity formation is the definition of the process of disengaging from parents while maintaining basic and lasting identifications with them. In gaining a sense of self that is separate (individuated) from the family, the young adult develops "self-certainty" (Erikson, 1968, p. 183).

If greater differentiation, independence, and autonomy are more adaptive for men than for women and if women deal with the intimacy task prior to or concurrently with the identity task while males progress from the identity task to the intimacy task, then individuation in relation to parents and significant other would be expected to be different for females and males. Individuation, a sense of ego identity or self as separate, from significant other and parents, would be more pronounced for males than females. Likewise, males who are high in intimacy with parents and significant other would be expected to be high in identity, whereas, females who are high in intimacy would not necessarily be high in identity.
Gender-role orientation influences choices, values, and behaviors throughout the life span. Gender-role orientation is central to Erikson's theory of psychosocial development. At the time Erikson developed his theory, masculinity and femininity were viewed as representing a bipolar continuum on a single scale. Constantinople (1973), Bem (1974), and Spence and Helmreich (1978) argued that traditional ideas of masculinity and femininity represent complementary domains of positive traits and behaviors. They thought that the instrumental and expressive had to be balanced in order to be an effective human.

Bem (1974) applied the term "androgynous" to people who possess both feminine and masculine characteristics. Spence and Helmreich (1978, 1979, 1980) used the term "dualistic" to refer to the idea that the expressive and instrumental are independent dimensions of personality that can develop in the same person. A person's gender-role orientation is the extent to which he or she perceives self to possess the characteristics stereotypically associated with maleness or femaleness. Thus a person may be in one of four gender-role orientation categories: (a) feminine-expressive (EXPR), (b) masculine-instrumental (INST), (c) dualistic or androgynous - high in both instrumental and expressive traits (ANDRO), or (d) undifferentiated - low in both expressive and instrumental traits (UDIFF).

If indeed the female meaning of identity is defined by interpersonal concerns and the male meaning of identity is defined by intrapersonal concerns, then gender-role orientation ought to impact issues of ego identity development. An expressive gender-role
orientation would be expected to be related to high intimacy; whereas, an instrumental gender-role orientation would be expected to be related to high identity. Similarly, individuals high in intimacy and identity should tend to be dualistic, high in both expressiveness and instrumentality.

In summary, it has been postulated that the psychological meaning of ego identity and the pathways to ego identity achievement are gender specific. These differences for females and males are: (a) males may deal with identity issues then intimacy issues whereas for females the reverse may be true; (b) the psychological meaning of identity for females revolves around the interpersonal and expressive (intimacy) whereas for males the psychological meaning of identity revolves around the intrapersonal and instrumental (individuation). Further, it may be that gender-role orientation, generally defined as a combination of instrumentality and expressiveness, may be related to these proposed gender differences in the meaning and pathway of ego identity achievement.

Statement of the Problem

Because the literature on ego identity development suggests there may be different male and female ego identity developmental pathways and psychological meanings, further investigation of the relationship of gender-role orientation and gender to ego identity development is indicated.
The purpose of this study was to investigate the significance of the concept of gender-role orientation and gender to the ego identity achievement of college students.

The study examined the relationships between the variables of self-esteem, identity, individuation, intimacy, gender, age, instrumentality, and expressiveness. Ego identity was regressed on the independent variables of self-esteem, age, gender, instrumentality, expressiveness, intimacy, and individuation in order to determine the significant predictors of ego identity for this sample. Finally, the relationship between identity, gender-role orientation, and goals for self as a college student were explored.

Hypotheses

An alternative research hypothesis for this study is that a regression model can predict ego identity from the independent variables of instrumentality, expressiveness, gender, self-esteem, age, intergenerational fusion-individuation, intergenerational intimacy, intergenerational intimidation, significant other fusion-individuation, and significant other intimacy. The multiple regression model is as follows:
\[ Y = B_0 + B_1 X_1 + B_2 X_2 + B_3 X_3 + B_4 X_4 \ldots B_{10} X_{10} \]

\[ Y = \text{ego identity score} \]
\[ X_1 = \text{age} \]
\[ X_2 = \text{gender} \]
\[ X_3 = \text{instrumentality} \]
\[ X_4 = \text{expressiveness} \]
\[ X_5 = \text{intergenerational fusion-individuation} \]
\[ X_6 = \text{intergenerational intimacy} \]
\[ X_7 = \text{significant other fusion-individuation} \]
\[ X_8 = \text{significant other intimacy} \]
\[ X_9 = \text{self-esteem} \]
\[ X_{10} = \text{intergenerational intimidation} \]

The specific null hypothesis being tested is that there is no relationship between ego identity and the independent variables listed above.

**Definitions**

**Self-esteem** - the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to self.

**Individuation** - also called differentiation of self (Bowen, 1978), individuation is a process in which a person becomes increasingly differentiated from one's family of origin and nuclear family.

**Fusion** - a relationship between two people in which boundaries are blurred; there is closeness without voluntariness or boundaries.

**Intimacy** - voluntary closeness with distinct boundaries to the self. Intimacy is composed of trust, love-fondness, self-disclosure, and commitment.

**Identity achievers** - individuals who have experienced a decision-making period and are pursuing self-chosen occupational and ideological
goals in areas of occupation, sexuality, religion, and politics. 

**Foreclosures** - individuals who have not experienced a decision-making period and are pursuing goals chosen by others, generally parents.

**Diffusions** - persons who have experienced a period of exploration but made no commitments and have stopped searching.

**Moratoriums** - individuals currently actively searching in the area of occupational and/or ideological issues.

**Identity achieved** - persons are considered identity achieved when they successfully resolve the tasks of Stages One-Five and the parts of conflicts of Stages One-Eight of Erikson's theory of psychosocial development.

**Crisis** - a period of active searching during which alternatives in the areas of occupation, interpersonal relationships, and ideology are considered.

**Commitment** - a firm sense of decision and purpose.

**Gender-role** - (a) normative expectations that members of a given culture or subculture hold about the "position" of men and women, emphasizes division of labor, (b) relationship - the process of role taking (c) the differences in behavior, personality, abilities, preferences, and the like of women and men (d) stereotyped expectations about how females and males ought to behave.

**Gender-role orientation** - a combination of the abstract personality traits of instrumentality and expressiveness.

**Instrumental** - self-assertive personality traits judged to be more characteristic of males than females and socially desirable in both
genders.

Expressive - interpersonally-oriented personality traits judged to be more characteristic of females than males and socially desirable in both genders.

Gender-role orientation group (PAG) - categories of individuals based on a median-split method of determining score combinations on measures of expressiveness and instrumentality.

Limitations

1. The study was limited by the demographic characteristics of its sample such as: (a) age - persons were age 19-25 years, (b) university setting - mid-sized state university, (c) nationality - subjects were reared in a Western culture, primarily the United States, and (d) educational level - college students. (See Chapter Four for a description of the sample.)

2. The study was limited by the use of self-report questionnaires.

3. The study was limited by the validity and reliability of the assessment instruments used.

4. The study was limited by the use of a sample of convenience.

Significance of the Study

Life-span developmental psychology is the study of psychological development within multiple contexts, including the life course itself, the social context, and the encompassing cultural and historical
context. As such its study is of interest to counselors and educators.

Theories of human development are the foundation of the practice of student affairs. Identity development is of particular interest to those who work in secondary school and higher education settings as counselors or student affairs practitioners.

Organization of the Study

Chapter Two contains a review of related literature. Chapter Three delineates the methodology used in the study and data collection methods. Chapter Four reports the results of the study. Chapter Five contains the discussion, summary, and recommendations.
Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

The literature review is divided into five topic areas. The first is an introduction to the literature on ego identity development. The second topic area is gender issues in identity development. The third section reviews studies that examine the relationship of gender-role orientation to ego identity development. The fourth section is a discussion of individuation and family issues and a review of related studies. The fifth section discusses the college environment and reviews longitudinal studies of identity development.

Introduction

To summarize Erikson's theory of psychosocial development, the task of late adolescence/young adulthood is the formation of ego identity. Some of the general issues for young adults are arriving at career and educational decisions, gender-role clarification, individuation, separation from family, the forming of values, developing and maintaining intimate relationships with family and significant others.

In order to operationalize Erikson's theory, Marcia (1966) developed the Identity Status Interview. Marcia proposed two psychosocial criteria for ego identity formation: (a) the person has experienced a period of crisis and role experimentation, and (b) has subsequently made basic life commitments in the areas of occupation and
ideology. Initially ideology included the areas of religion and politics. Presently the ISI Revised also includes the areas of sexual ideology and interpersonal relations.

The definitions of the identity statuses (diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement) are included in Chapter One. High identity status refers to the statuses of achievement and moratorium. Low identity means the diffusion and foreclosure statuses. Identity achievement is also measured by self-report pencil-and-paper instruments (Constantinople, 1969; Dignan, 1965; Marcia, 1966; Rasmussen, 1961). These instruments operationalize the concept of identity achievement by measurement of the amount of resolution of the stage tasks and part-conflicts (see Chapter One). The term identity achieved means an individual who has achieved identity by successfully resolving the tasks of stages one-five and/or by reason of crisis and commitment in the areas of career and ideology.

Gender Issues in Ego Identity Development

Orlofsky (1978) conducted a study for the stated purposes of: (a) "clarifying whether the four identity positions have different consequences for men and women" (p. 49), and (b) exploration of factors involved in gender differences between statuses. Specifically, Orlofsky was concerned about the differences between the grouping of statuses for women and the grouping of statuses for men.

On many variables, the status grouping for men had been Identity Achievement plus Moratorium versus Foreclosure plus Identity Diffusion,
whereas, the status grouping for women had been Identity Achievement plus Foreclosure versus Moratorium plus identity Diffusion. In other words, foreclosing an identity had seemed to result in about the same positive effects for women as achieving an identity.

On a number of variables (conformity, field dependence, locus of control, difficulty of college major, and anxiety) the foreclosure and identity achievement statuses were most adaptive for women whereas the identity achievement and moratorium statuses were most adaptive for men (Howard, 1975; Marcia & Friedman, 1970; Schenkel, 1972; Toder & Marcia, 1973). This led to the conclusion that the woman who struggled to develop her own beliefs and life style faced more uncertainty and conflict and less acceptance and guidance than a man in the same situation (Marcia, 1980; Schenkel, 1972; Toder & Marcia, 1973).

Orlofsky (1978) examined the performance of female and male identity statuses on achievement-related variables to clarify whether the four identity positions have different consequences for men and women. Measures used included the Identity Status Interview (Marcia, 1966) and paper-and-pencil measures of need achievement and fear of success (TAT), anxiety (Achievement Anxiety Test), Good and Good Fear of Success Scale, and a self-esteem questionnaire constructed by Orlofsky. The subjects were 55 men and 56 women--college sophomores, juniors, and seniors.

The identity achievement and moratorium men and women scored higher in achievement motivation and self-esteem than foreclosure and diffusion subjects. However, while diffusions and foreclosures were highest in fear of success of the male statuses, moratoriums and achievements were
highest in fear of success of the female statuses. Orlofsky (1978) concluded "while greater differentiation, independence, and autonomy are clearly adaptive in men, these qualities have not traditionally been viewed as desirable in women" (p. 61).

Fitch and Adams (1983) administered the Identity Status interview and the Intimacy Interview to 78 college students. The study evaluated the identity-intimacy relationship over a one year period. The findings indicated that the moratorium status was more stable for females and the achievement status was more stable for males. Moreover, moratorium and achievement statuses were indicative of deeper levels of intimacy, regardless of gender. Another finding indicated that occupational identity in males and religious identity in females contributed the most to advanced intimacy.

Hodgson and Fischer (1978) examined gender differences in the processes of identity and intimacy development among college youth. Interviewees were 50 male and 50 female undergraduates, all of whom were between the ages of 18-21 years. Assessment methods were the Identity Status Interview (Revised), the Intimacy Status Interview, and Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale. The revised ISI has generally been in use since 1972. In addition to the areas of occupational choice, political ideology, and religious ideology, it measures crisis and commitment in the areas of sexual values and gender roles (sexual ideology).

Subjects were grouped according to high (achievement or moratorium) versus low (foreclosure or diffusion) identity status, and gender differences were presented. Significantly more males than females
were developmentally advanced in the part-conflicts of occupation, politics, and religion, while more females were developmentally advanced in sexual ideology. More females than males were in the high intimacy statuses. High identity status in the male (intraperpersonal areas) of occupation and political/religious ideology predicted high self-esteem for males. High identity status in the female (interpersonal areas) of sexual ideology best predicted self-esteem for women.

Rosenberg (1979) defined self-concept as the totality of the individual's thoughts and feelings having reference to self as an object, and self-esteem as the most vital part of the self-concept. Self-esteem or self-evaluation at a global level refers to a person's perceived sense of basic adequacy to cope with basic life-space situations and to bring about important life goals.

Marcia and Friedman (1970) found that college female identity achievers scored significantly lower on a measure of self-esteem than the other identity statuses. However, Schenkel and Marcia (1972) did not replicate this finding.

Adams, Ryan, Hoffman, Dobson, and Nielson (1985) conducted three related studies to test the relationship between identity status, personality, and conformity behavior. Study I has a sample of 80 college students and employed the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (OM-EIS), Test of Attentional and Interpersonal Style (TAIS), and the Asch conformity task. Study II was designed to assess the reliability between the ISI and the OM-EIS. One hundred thirty-eight college freshmen participated in the second study. Study III was conducted with 84 subjects. The OM-EIS, Dilemmas Test for College
Students (DCIS), California Psychological Inventory, and a peer rating scale were the assessment tools employed in this study. An analysis of data from studies I and III suggested diffusion subjects were the most affected by peer pressure conformity while identity achieved subjects tended to engage in conformity behavior for achievement gains. The results showed no significant differences between identity status and social behavior based on gender.

Protinsky and Wilkerson (1986) examined the relationship between ego identity, formal operations, and egocentrism in adolescents ranging in age from 13-24 years. Multiple regression analysis indicated age (grade in school) explained 21 percent of the variance while formal operational thinking, egocentrism, and gender accounted for only an additional 3 percent of the variance.

Tesch and Whitbourne (1982) investigated intimacy status in relation to ego-identity status in occupation, religion, politics, and gender role. The sample was 48 men and 44 women (M age=25). Orlofsky's intimacy status measure was modified for use with adults. There were no significant gender differences in intimacy status or identity status. As predicted by Erikson's theory, intimacy status was generally related to identity status among males and females. This relationship was not observed for occupational identity in either gender. The authors suggested that the age of the sample (M age=25) and the educational level (graduate school) may have been the reason females and males demonstrated similar patterns of crisis resolution.

Waterman and Nevid (1976) designed a study to investigate the relative importance of premarital sexual ideology for females and males
as well as gender differences in identity status on occupation, religion, and politics. Subjects were 70 male and 70 female college students. In all areas except sexual ideology, female identity followed basically the same pattern as male identity. Females were significantly more likely than males to have experienced crisis and commitment in the area of sexual ideology.

Matteson (1977) conducted a study of identity development in Danish adolescents of both genders. The sample included 47 males and 52 females, ages 17 or 18. Matteson added questions regarding gender-roles and sexual ideology to Marcia's semi-structured interview. A few weeks after the interviews pencil-and-paper instruments were given. Matteson investigated locus of control, anomie, autonomy, personal integration, attitudes toward authority, and self-esteem.

For females and males, the status of achievement or moratorium in the area of gender-roles and sexual ideology was the most powerful predictor of adjustment on the personality variables.

Ego Identity Development and Gender-Role Orientation

Only four studies of male-female samples have investigated ego identity development from a gender-role orientation perspective (Schiedel & Marcia, 1985; Orlofsky, 1977; Waterman & Whitbourne, 1982; Selva & Dusek, 1984). One study investigated the ego identity development of women from a gender-role perspective (Prager, 1977). These studies are reviewed in some detail.

Prager (1977) gave 88 college women identity and intimacy
interviews, specifically the Identity Status Interview (Marcia, 1966) and the Intimacy Interview (Orlofsky, Marcia, & Lesser, 1973). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ) was administered to assess gender-role orientation. Prager found high identity to be contingent on high instrumental scores and unrelated to expressive scores. She also found a trend for high-identity females to have higher intimacy scores. She did not find mean instrumental, expressive, or androgyny scores to differ significantly between women in the different intimacy statuses. Prager did not find intimacy to be related to identity. Androgynous women had the highest self-esteem followed by the instrumental, expressive, and undifferentiated groups.

Orlofsky (1977) administered the Identity Status Interview (ISI) and the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) to 111 males and females. He found that males and females rated high in identity had significantly higher masculinity scores than did their counterparts rated low in identity. He also found high-identity subjects to have higher androgyny scores. However, gender-role classification did not differentiate among the statuses with regard to self-esteem for either gender.

Waterman and Whitbourne (1982) had both college students and adults complete the Bem Sex Role Inventory and The Inventory of Psychosocial Development (Constantinople, 1969). They reported that in general androgynous individuals scored higher on the six IPD measures of resolution of the first six Eriksonian crises. This finding came from an omnibus between-subjects effect from an analysis of covariance with repeated measures on the six IPD scales. Inspection of the means revealed that different trends existed for some groups of subjects, for
example, the college males. Because no individual analyses were presented for the six scales of the IPD it was not possible to determine if the general trend reported held for all scales and all gender subgroups.

Selva and Dusek (1984) examined the relative influence of masculinity and femininity with regard to the resolution of two Eriksonian crises. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) and the Industry versus Inferiority and Identity versus Identity Confusion scales from Constantinople's Inventory of Psychosocial Development (IPD) were administered to 404 college students, 182 males and 222 females. Selva and Dusek noted that "the processes of identity development may be different for males and females because of traditional sex role orientations" (p. 205).

A series of 2x4 (gender x gender-role classification) ANOVAs were conducted. The main effects due to gender and gender-role classification were statistically significant. The interaction term was not significant. On the Industry scale, the androgynous subjects scored highest, the masculine and feminine subjects had equivalently lower scores, and the undifferentiated subjects had the lowest score. On the Identity scale, the androgynous and masculine subjects had equivalently high scores, the feminine subjects were next highest, and the undifferentiated had the lowest score. The results supported the hypothesis that an androgynous gender-role leads to better adjustment. "Better adjustment" refers to a higher level of resolution of the Industry and Identity tasks. Further analysis of the data by multiple regression analysis indicated that the masculine component of the
gender-role orientation was a better predictor of resolution of the two crises. Selva and Dusek concluded that for the tasks of Industry and Identity an "instrumental orientation will lead to a more positive resolution..." (p. 210).

Selva and Dusek also reported that the ANOVAs resulted in significant gender effects for each of the four dependent variables. Each time, the females had mean scores that indicated better adjustment. It has been hypothesized by Selva and Dusek and others (Constantinople, 1969; Waterman & Whitbourne, 1981; Waterman, 1982) that females are further along than males in resolution of Eriksonian crises.

Forty female and 40 male college students were assessed on measures of ego identity development, intimacy development, and gender-role orientation (Schiedel & Marcia, 1985). The ego identity measure was Marcia's (1966) semi-structured interview. The semi-structured intimacy interview developed by Orlofsky, Marcia, and Lesser (1973) was used to assess intimacy status. The gender-role orientation measure was the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BEM). Subjects were interviewed first and completed the BEM following the second interview.

Some findings supported the hypothesis that the issues of identity and intimacy are merged for women. There were equal numbers of females in the high-identity statuses, combined with the finding of significantly more females high in intimacy and somewhat more females than males high in both identity and intimacy. More women than men were found in the low identity-high intimacy group.

With respect to gender-role orientation, subjects of both genders high in identity were higher in masculinity than subjects low in
identity. This was consistent with previous research by Prager (1977) and Orlofsky (1977). For males, identity was related to instrumentality and intimacy was related to expressiveness. Expressiveness discriminated between males who were high and low in intimacy. While high identity-high intimacy was not contingent on androgyny, as hypothesized, proportionately more androgynous (57%) than nonandrogynous (24%) subjects were in this category.

To summarize, there is evidence of gender differences in the developmental process and the psychological meaning of ego identity. There may be gender differences in the salience of identity and intimacy issues for females and males. In late adolescence and young adulthood, intimacy issues may be most salient for females and identity issues most salient for males. There is evidence that the stage progression of identity then intimacy may be the norm for males while the opposite, intimacy then identity, is the progression for females. There is also evidence that the four statuses have different psychological meanings for the genders.

Gilligan (1982) discussed gender-role differences in terms of attachment and separation, the anchors of the life cycle. Males are socialized to separate emotionally in order to achieve a separate identity and to define and empower the self. Women are socialized to define themselves through intimate relationships since the ongoing process of attachment creates and sustains relationships.

Thus the idea of the expressive (feminine) and instrumental (masculine) is the basis for Gilligan's theory as it has been the basis for explanations of gender differences in the process of ego identity
development in the Eriksonian literature. It may be, however, that such explanations ignore the many similarities in the identity development of females and males. It may also be that there are multiple pathways to identity achievement and that the personality traits of expressiveness and instrumentality may influence the pathway taken.

Individuation - Family Issues

Identity is never a final, immutable achievement, but a relatively cohesive integration of one's own capacities, liabilities, identifications, and values in relation to society's expectations and opportunities (Erikson, 1956). Erikson referred to the resolution of the parent-child relationship as part of the identity development process. Erikson thought that self certainty required a "definite sense of independence from the family as the matrix of self-images and sureness of anticipation" (p. 183). Erikson's concept of self-certainty refers to the process of individuation.

Erikson thought that the resolution of identity was necessary prior to the resolution of the task of intimacy. Bowen (1978) asserted that the degree of differentiation consolidated during adolescence remains at a constant level throughout the life cycle. Bowen saw differentiation as a multi-generational phenomenon. Bowen's model advocates "family voyages," planned trips home in attempting to "define a self" in relation to one's own family of origin (Liddle & Halpin, 1978).

The process of individuation or independence from family and then the establishment of a "new configuration," a qualitatively different
relationship with parents is mentioned by Erikson. As Erikson (1968) suggests, "Identity formation begins where the usefulness of identification ends. It arises from the selective repudiation and mutual assimilation of childhood identifications and their absorption in a new configuration" (p. 159).

Bowen calls the concept of differentiation of self the "cornerstone" (Bowen, 1978, p. 362) of his theory. Differentiation of self is the ability to separate emotional and intellectual functioning while remaining within the emotional intensity of one's family or other emotional system. It is the extent to which one can deal objectively with emotionally sensitive issues within the family. Fusion is the polar opposite of differentiation. Fusion has two meanings within the theory. There are (a) fusion of feeling and thinking when objective thinking is confounded by emotionality, and (b) the absence of boundaries or lack of individuation between two or more individuals.

Fleming and Anderson (1986) investigated the relationships between level of personal adjustment and individuation from the family of origin in a group of college students. The sample was 126 undergraduate students from a New England university. The theoretical basis for the study was the theories of Minuchin and Bowen. For purposes of the study, individuation was defined as an "intra-individual, subjective process by which adolescents come to perceive themselves as psychologically involved or detached from the transactional processes which help to define the family's level of differentiation" (Fleming & Anderson, 1986, p. 311). Significant correlations were found between the competing loyalty (demand for side taking) form of triangulation and
adolescents' self-esteem and sense of mastery; that is, less triangulation was significantly related to greater self-esteem and mastery. Greater self-esteem, greater mastery, less college maladjustment and fewer number of reported health problems was significantly correlated to a low level of perceived fusion with parents.

Bell and Bell (1982) interviewed ninety-nine families in their homes. The identified adolescent girl (age 15-17 years old) had previously completed Loevinger's sentence completion measure of ego development, selected scales of the California Psychological Inventory, and a sociometric questionnaire. A shortened version of the Family Environment Scale was utilized. The adolescent's summed standard scores on the three tests were used to divide the group in to high-scoring (girls who scored in the top 15%) and low scoring (girls scoring in the bottom 15%). High-scoring girls tended to have family members that described their families as more cohesive, more expressive of feelings, more self-sufficient, and less organized and controlled. The high scoring adolescents were less likely to be triangled into the marital relationship—either as a scapegoat or in a cross-generational coalition with one parent.

LaVoie (1976) reports that male high school students high in identity reported less regulation and control by their mothers and fathers and more frequent praise by their fathers than did males low in identity. LaVoie found that high identity high school females reported less maternal restrictiveness and greater freedom to discuss problems with their mothers and fathers than did low identity females. High
identity adolescents appear to be characterized by a family environment involving less parental restrictiveness and better child-parent communication than do low identity adolescents.

In their longitudinal study of college freshmen, Waterman and Waterman (1971) found that those students who showed stable identity achievement status for the entire year—and many did not—scored significantly higher on a measure of family independence than did those students who changed out of the achievement status. Those students who initially were foreclosures and then left this status by the end of the freshman year were also significantly higher scorers on a measure of family independence than those students who did not change out of this status.

Campbell, Adams, and Dobson (1984) studied the predictive utility of measures of family connectedness and individuality in differentiating among the four identity statuses. Data were obtained from 286 college students and their parents, using the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status and the Parent-Adolescent Relationship Questionnaire. The results indicated that foreclosed subjects were most strongly bonded to their parents and overly dependent upon parents for a self-definition. The family environment of foreclosed subjects was characterized by strong emotional attachment and a low level of independence. By comparison, identity achieved and moratorium subjects were highly attached to their mothers but experienced greater levels of independence from parents. Diffused subjects had the least emotional attachment to their parents but were granted limited independence.
The College Environment

According to Chickering (1969), Erikson (1968), Keniston (1969), and Perry (1970) the central concern of the college student is the resolution of identity. There is an extensive body of research findings that provide descriptions of characteristic changes in the content of identity elements, such as vocational plans and religious and political beliefs, during the college years (Feldman & Newcomb, 1969). However, evidence of changes in the content of identity elements does not provide evidence of the developmental process of growth in ego identity.

From Erikson's perspective, the college environment may be seen as a nonfamilial social milieu where open communication of ideas and minimal restrictiveness of search for roles are involved. Sanford (1962) has speculated that because of these properties the college experience promotes identity achievement.

The majority of studies reported in this literature review were conducted with samples of college students. No measurement of the impact of the college environment on identity development was made as part of these studies. A few studies have investigated identity development in college students longitudinally. These studies are reviewed with particular attention to environmental correlates.

Constantinople (1969) conducted a longitudinal study, spanning four years, with an initial sample of 952 college students of both genders. By the fourth year only 33% of the original sample were still in attendance. The followup studies indicated that, within the same subjects, resolution of the identity tasks continued across the span of
four years. Most showed a significant increase in level of identity status so that by the senior year 78% were in the identity achieved status. The Inventory of Psychosocial Development (Constantinople, 1969) was the measure of stage resolution used in the study.

Waterman, Greary, and Waterman (1974) conducted a longitudinal study of a sample of males. They were interviewed as freshman and again as seniors. The College Student Questionnaire-Part I (Peterson, 1965) was given to all participants at the beginning of their freshman year. At both the technological institute and the private liberal arts college where the studies were conducted, students who became identity achievers during their college years had significantly more cultural interests as freshmen than did students who did not enter the achievers status. Overall results indicated that by the senior year 86% of students were in the identity achiever status for both occupational and ideological identity.

Waterman and Waterman (1971) found that in ninety-two male college freshmen tested at intervals over a year, fourteen persons shifted toward Identity Achievement or Moratorium status in the area of occupation, whereas sixteen persons shifted toward Identity Diffusion status in the area of ideology. In a related study with a sample of male and female college students, Waterman and Archer found that females and males who wrote poetry were significantly more likely to be in the identity achievement status than subjects who did not write poetry (1979).

In summary, a few of the studies of identity development in college students have been longitudinal. While overall the majority of subjects
(from 75% to 86%) did resolve the identity crisis and reach a status of identity achievement by their senior year, individual differences in stage progression occurred.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Sample

The sample for this investigation consisted of 156 young adult college students, 73 males and 83 females, ranging in age from 19-25 years. Volunteers were recruited from an apartment complex population in Radford, Virginia. The complex houses about 720 persons. The majority of residents of the complex are students at Radford University. Radford University, located in Radford Virginia, is a mid-sized, co-educational state university with a student body of approximately 8,500 students.

The researcher obtained permission to conduct this study from Virginia Tech's Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects. Permission was obtained from the manager of the apartment complex to contact residents regarding participation in the investigation.

A description of the sample is given in Chapter Four.

Data Collection Procedure

Individuals were contacted in person at their apartments regarding participation in the study. A short "speech for recruitment" (Appendix A) was made to introduce the researcher and provide a brief explanation
Persons who volunteered to participate were given a packet of materials. The packet consisted of the following materials which were compiled in the order listed: (a) a cover letter (Appendix B), (b) a consent form (Appendix C), (c) a demographic information questionnaire (Appendix D), (d) the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (Appendix E), (e) the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Appendix F), (f) Rasmussen's Ego Identity Scale (Appendix G), (g) the Constantinople College Scale (Appendix H), (h) and the Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire with answer sheet (Appendix I).

All materials in the packet except the cover letter and consent form were coded by number. The researcher explained to volunteers that the numerical code was for the purpose of identification of each set of data while maintaining the confidentiality of respondents. It was explained that the consent forms would be removed from each packet of questionnaires before scoring thus maintaining the confidentiality of participants.

Volunteers were asked to complete the packets within two to four days. An appointment was made to return for the completed packets. If schedules conflicted, packets were taped to doors or left with neighbors.

Of 235 packets distributed, 194 packets were recovered. Of these 194 packets, 31 were either not completed at all or had missing data. A total of 156 packets were usable, 83 from female respondents and 73 from male respondents.
Instruments

**Personal Authority in the Family System Questionnaire - Version C.** The PAFS (Williamson, Bray, & Malone, 1984) was developed to measure family processes consistent with current intergenerational family systems theory. PAFS is associated with behavior typifying an integrated, differentiated, autonomous, intimate self within the family system. The behavior characteristic of differentiation indicates resolution of both intrapsychic conflicts and issues of relational intimacy with both significant other and parents. Differentiation of self provides the opportunity to belong to one's family of origin in an intimate manner yet relate to each member in an autonomous manner (Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984a).

The PAFS-C is the version developed for use with young adults (1984). The key concepts measured on the five scales of the PAFS-C that were used in this study are: Significant other fusion/individuation (SPFUS), Intergenerational fusion/individuation (INFUS), Significant other intimacy (SPINT), Intergenerational intimacy (ININT), and Intergenerational Intimidation (INTIM). For purposes of this investigation, the young adult's amount of individuation from parents and significant other, amount of intimacy with parents and significant other, and level of intimidation by parents are operationalized by the above PAFS-C subscales.

According to Bray, Williamson, and Malone (1984), the "essence of leaving home psychologically (having presumably earlier left the parental home physically) is the willful giving up of the need to be
parented, and the subsequent compassionate acceptance of the 'former parents' as being absolutely A-OK just as they are today" (p. 4). The outgrowth of individuation, leaving home psychologically, is intimacy with parents and significant other based on trust, commitment, self-disclosure, and love-fondness with definite boundaries (Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Peplau, 1982).

Bray (1988) stated that the five subscales, SPFUS, INFUS, SPINT, ININT, and INTIM, are related theoretically to Erikson's concepts of identity and individuation (personal communication, April 2, 1988). The process of individuation or achieving an identity separate from family and then an establishment of a qualitatively different relationship with parents (Erikson, 1968) is measured by the INFUS, ININT, and INTIM scales. Erikson's ideas of individuation of self in relation to significant other and intimacy with persons of the opposite gender is measured by the SPFUS and SPINT scales.

The reliability of the PAFS questionnaire was assessed by measures of internal consistency, coefficient alpha, calculated for each scale at Time 1 and Time 2. At Time 1 the coefficients were: SPFUS - .92, INFUS - .87, SPINT - .95, ININT - .94, and INTIM - .89. At Time 2 the coefficients were: SPFUS - .87, INFUS - .90, SPINT - .93, ININT - .93, and INTIM - .87. Overall, the scales demonstrated good reliability (Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984, p. 172).

Test-retest reliability estimates were also calculated. Results were: SPFUS - .70, INFUS - .55, SPINT - .71, ININT - .71, and INTIM - .82. All of the reliabilities except INFUS were within an acceptable range. The scale developers reported that anecdotal evidence from
subjects indicated that "taking the Intergenerational Fusion/
Individuation scale is an intervention which produces changes in their
perceptions of their parents" (Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984, p. 5).

Content validity was determined by having a group of mental health
professionals trained in transgeneration family therapy and a group of
students enrolled in a course involving transgenerational family therapy
evaluate an initial pool of items based on their clinical experience and
relevant literature. Each item was evaluated in terms of its content
and face validity in measuring the relevant behaviors and concepts.
Based on these evaluations, items were moved to different scales,
reworded or deleted.

Concurrent validity was indicated by a study completed by Bray,
Williamson, and Malone in 1984 (cited in Bray et al., 1984). They used
the PAFS, the Family Adaptability and Cohesion and Evaluation Scales-I
(FACES-1), (Olson, Bell, & Portner, 1978), and the Dyadic Adjustment
Scale (DAS), (Spanier, 1976) to assess the concurrent validity of the
PAFS.

For purposes of this study, the SPFUS scale operationalizes the
variable of significant other fusion/individuation. The INFUS scale
operationalizes the variable of intergenerational fusion-individuation.
The SPINT scale operationalizes the variable of significant other
intimacy. The ININT scale operationalizes the variable of
intergenerational intimacy. The INTIM scale operationalizes the
variable of intergenerational intimidation.

The synthesizing concept of the INFUS scale, the SPFUS scale, and
the INTIM scale is individuation. Higher scores on the INFUS and SPFUS
scales indicate greater individuation. Higher scores on the INTIM scale indicate less parental intimidation. The synthesizing concept of the SPINT and ININT scales is intimacy. Both scales are scored in the positive direction; higher scores indicate a higher level of intimacy. Each scale results in a discreet score; there is no composite score for the five subscales.

The PAFS-Q, an explanation of items composing each subscale, and the scoring key are located in Appendix I.

The Personal Attributes Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) consists of 24 abstract trait dimensions. The scale is designed to measure an individual's expressive and instrumental trait characteristics. A sample instrumental item is: "not at all independent - very independent". A person reports on a scale of one to five his/her amount of each of the 24 trait dimensions. None of the descriptions of personal attributes make reference to overt behavior or situations. In pilot studies leading to the development of the scales, the eight items on the M scale were judged to be stereotypically more characteristic of men, but socially desirable in both genders. Similarly, the eight items on the F scale were judged to be stereotypically more characteristic of women but socially desirable for both genders.

In content, the M items reflect goal oriented, instrumental traits and the F items reflect interpersonally oriented, expressive traits. For purposes of this study, the variable instrumentality is operationalized by the M (instrumental) scale of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (PAQ). The PAQ F (expressive) scale operationalizes the variable expressiveness.
The M-F scale contains items on which social desirability ratings for the genders differed, with the ideal man falling toward the stereotypic masculine pole and the ideal woman toward the stereotypic feminine pole. The M-F scale is mixed in content, containing two instrumental items ("aggressive" and "dominant") and six items suggesting emotional vulnerability. The scale score was not used in this study because it is a bi-polar scale of the stereotypic "ideal man" - "ideal woman".

To provide a quantitative measure of the ability of the PAQ to differentiate the genders, discriminant analyses were conducted using the PAQ. Wilks' lambdas for the 24-item PAQ were .58, .68, and .58 respectively for a sample of high school students, college students, and an adult group. Correct gender classification in each of these groups was 80 percent, 77 percent, and 81 percent respectively with highly significant Chi squares (p. < .0001).

Cronbach Alphas (for college students) have been determined to be .85, .82, and .78 for the instrumental (M), expressive (F), and M-F scales, respectively (Spence, Helmreich, & Wilhelm, 1981).

A number of studies have given evidence of the construct and predictive validity of the PAQ (Ickes & Barnes, 1978; Klein & Willerman, 1978; Lippa, 1978; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The scale has been shown repeatedly to differentiate the genders in diverse populations (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The scale measures the constructs of instrumentality and expressiveness. However, the PAQ does not measure some global idea of masculinity and femininity (Spence, 1984).

As stated above, the eight-item expressive (F) scale and the eight-
item instrumental (M) scale operationalized the independent variables of instrumentality and expressiveness for this investigation. The PAQ scale and a notation of the statements composing each scale are located in Appendix F.

For this study, the expressive (F) scale score and the Instrumental (M) scale score were used as continuous scores in multiple regression analysis. The median-split method of scoring which creates a joint distribution of M and F scores to categorize persons into four groups was also used (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

Each item is set up on a five-point scale, end points having verbal labels. Each item is scored from 1-5. Responses to the M scale items are keyed in an instrumental direction and responses to the F scale in an expressive direction.

The four gender-role orientation groups result from a median-split scoring method (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). See Table 1 for an explanation of the scoring method.

For this sample the median for the instrumental scale score was 29. The median for the expressive scale score was 32. These medians resulted in the following gender-role orientation groups for this sample:

Group #

1. INST GE 29 and EXPR GE 32 = Androgynous
2. INST GE 29 and EXPR LT 32 = INST (M)
3. INST LT 29 and EXPR GE 32 = EXPR (F)
4. INST LT 29 and EXPR LT 32 = Undifferentiated
Table 1

Median Split Scoring Method for Personality Attributes Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M (Instrumental) Score</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above</td>
<td>Androgynous</td>
<td>Expressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F score</td>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undifferentiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Spence & Helmreich, 1978)
The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE) is a ten item Guttman scale that can be used to measure overall self-regard or global self-esteem (Wylie, 1979). The term "self-concept" has a complex meaning and refers to the person's ideas of self which include more than self-esteem, but self-esteem is the most important part of the self-concept. For purposes of this study, the RSE operationalizes the variable, self-esteem.

The RSE is brief and is widely used and often cited (Keith, 1981; Vesta & Brockner, 1979; Zuckerman, 1980). The type of scale does not foster an evasive response style, and it is an alternative to multidimensional analysis. It has been reported to be one of the most frequently used and well-validated measures of self-esteem (McCarthy & Hoge, 1982).

The design of the RSE is important, because agreement bias is usually a validity threat when all the items in a scale are phrased in the same direction. The scale consists of positive and negative statements presented alternately in order to reduce the likelihood of a response set.

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was administered to 5,024 high school juniors and seniors from 10 randomly selected public high schools in New York and found to have internal reliability (Cronbach Alphas = .85); reproducibility was 92% and scalability was 72% (Rosenberg, 1979). Using college samples in a two-week test-retest, the reliability coefficient was .85; and in another two-week test-retest using college samples, the reliability coefficient was .88. The items deal with a generally favorable or unfavorable global self-attitude, and there is
evidence of both convergent and predictive discriminant validity (Rosenberg, 1979).

For purposes of this study, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale operationalizes the variable of self-esteem. On a scale of 0-6 points, higher scores indicate greater self-esteem. The RSE and the scoring method are located in Appendix E.

Rasmussen's Ego Identity Scale (Rasmussen, 1961) was derived from Erikson's theory. Erikson's papers, "Growth and Crises of the Healthy Personality" and "The Problem of Ego Identity" (Erikson, 1950, 1956), were the theoretical basis for Rasmussen's 72 statement questionnaire. The specific statement and source may be found in Appendix G. The scale evaluates the degree of resolution of Stages One through Six of Erikson's theory of identity development. The part-conflicts of Stage Five are included. For each crises period, there are three criteria of adequate or inadequate resolution. Each criterion is sampled by four statements (Rasmussen, 1961).

Construct validity was measured by Rasmussen's (1964) study of the relationship of ego identity to psychosocial functioning. Psychosocial adjustment of two groups of Naval recruits was measured by means of the Peer Nomination form created by Rigby and Opsoria (1959). Rasmussen found a significant (p<.01) positive association between ego identity scores and psychosocial adjustment.

Further construct validity was obtained by evidence of a significant positive association (p<.01) between identity scores and self-acceptance as measured by Gough's (1950) Self-Acceptance Adjective Check List.
Reliability was checked by Rasmussen on two different samples of Navy recruits. Correlation coefficients of .849 and .851 were obtained using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula (Rasmussen, 1964).

Construct validity was established by evaluating the statements based on Erikson's theory. Two judges were used to establish construct validity of each final statement used in the scale. Rasmussen reported unanimous agreement (Rasmussen, 1964).

For purposes of this study, the level of ego identity achievement is operationalized by the score on the EIS. The total score is obtained, and higher scores indicate higher levels of ego identity achievement. The EIS and the scoring key are found in Appendix G.

Constantinople developed the College Scale as part of the Inventory of Psychosocial Development (1969). The College Scale was used initially in a longitudinal study at the University of Rochester.

The scale consists of 14 goal statements. The first 14 items ask the respondent to mark on a scale from one-five the extent to which he/she pursued a goal while in college. In formulating the 14 goal statements, Constantinople used Erikson's theory of psychosocial development as a theoretical framework. For purposes of this study, Constantinople's College Scale (Appendix H) operationalizes college goals for self.

Analysis of the Data

Means, standard deviations, and ranges were computed for the following variables: instrumental, expressive, self-esteem, age,
identity, intergenerational intimacy (INTIM), significant other intimacy (SPINT), intergenerational fusion - individuation (INFUS), significant other fusion - individuation (SPFUS), and intergenerational intimidation (INTIM). Medians were computed for the instrumental and expressive scores.

Frequency analysis was done in order to provide a description of the sample. Frequencies were computed for the demographic variables of age, gender, classification as a university student, marital status, ethnic group, and nationality.

Pearson Correlations were computed for all variables. Pearson Correlations between variables were computed for the total sample, the female sample, and the male sample.

A multiple regression analysis was produced using the stepwise method. The ego identity score was regressed on the measures of age, instrumentality, expressiveness, gender, self-esteem, intergenerational intimacy, significant other intimacy, intergenerational fusion - individuation, significant other fusion - individuation, and intergenerational intimidation (predictor variables).

The stepwise method of regression analysis enters each predictor variable one at a time. The first variable selected for inclusion into the regression model is the predictor variable that has the highest correlation with the criterion (ego identity score) variable. The next predictor variable selected is the one with the highest partial correlation with the criterion variable, with the effects of the first variable taken out. At each step, after a new predictor variable is added to the model, a second significance test is conducted to determine
the contribution of each previously selected variable, as if it were the last variable entered. A predictor variable may be deleted at any step if it loses effectiveness as a predictor when considered in combination with the other predictors in the equation. The stepwise solution ends when all independent variables are entered or when the remaining independent variables do not make a statistically significant contribution to the equation.

Crosstabulation tables were computed for each of the 14 goal statements in Constantinople's College Scale.
Chapter Four

Results of the Study

Organization of the Chapter

This chapter is divided into five sections. The first section delineates the characteristics of the sample. The second section reports the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients for all variables. The correlations between ego identity and all other variables are reported. Correlations for the genders are contrasted. The third section reports the multiple regression analysis. The fourth section describes the gender-role orientation groups. The fifth section presents the results of a series of crosstabulation tables computed between college goals and the gender-role orientation groups.

Description of the Sample

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between gender, gender-role orientation group and ego identity development in young adults. Three variables were chosen that have individuation as a synthesizing construct. Two variables were chosen that have as a synthesizing construct, intimacy. Self-esteem and age were also considered as variables impacting ego identity achievement.

The sample for this investigation consisted of 156 college students, 46.8 percent (73) were males and 53.2 percent (83) were
Table 2

Age of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percents</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percents</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

University Classification of Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percents</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequencies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percents</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
females.

Participants ranged in age from 19-25 (see Table 2) with a mode for both genders of 21. The mean age for females was 20.92. The mean age for males was 21.50. Table 2 reports age for both males and females by frequency and percent.

Table 3 reports the frequencies and percentages of university classification for the sample. Persons are classified in five categories: freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, and graduate.

Of the women respondents, 100 percent were full-time college students. One female (1.2 percent) was a full-time student at another university. The remainder (n=82, 98.8 percent) were students at Radford University. Of the male respondents, 70 (95.9 percent) were full-time students at Radford University. Three male respondents (4.1 percent) were part-time students at a community college.

The sample was also homogeneous with regard to ethnicity and nationality. Of the men, 97.3 percent were White and 2.7 percent (2) were Black. All but two (2.7 percent) had been reared in the United States. Those two had been reared in England.

Of the females, two (2.4 percent) were Hispanic, three (3.6 percent) were Oriental, and 78 (94 percent) were White. All but one (1.2 percent) of the women was reared in the United States. She was reared in South America.

All of the male sample (n=73) were single. Of the female sample, one (1.2 percent) was divorced, the rest (98.8 percent) were single.

In summary, the sample was a sample of convenience consisting of volunteers recruited from an apartment complex housing primarily college
students. The sample reflected homogeneity in regard to ethnicity, nationality, marital status, education, and age. Seventy-three respondents were male and eighty-three were female.

Introduction

The specific null hypothesis tested in this study assumed no relationship between ego identity and a set of predictor variables. An alternative research hypothesis suggested that a regression model could predict ego identity from a set of predictor variables.

The predictor variables were chosen with the purpose of the study in mind. The purpose was to investigate the significance of the concept of gender-role orientation, defined as levels of the personality traits of instrumentality and expressiveness, and gender in relation to Eriksonian ego identity achievement. The predictor variables included instrumentality, expressiveness, gender, age, and self-esteem. In addition, three variables related to individuation, intergenerational fusion-individuation, intergenerational intimidation, and significant other fusion-individuation, were included. Two variables related to intimacy, intergenerational intimacy and significant other intimacy, were included.

Means and standard deviations for the variables of instrumentality (INST), expressiveness (EXPR), identity (IDEN), self-esteem (SEST), intergenerational intimacy (ININT), significant other intimacy (SPINT), intergenerational fusion-individuation (INFUS), significant other fusion-individuation (SPFUS), intergenerational intimidation (INTIM),
and age are listed in Table 4. Means and standard deviations are given for the total sample (n=156), for females (n=83), and for males (n=73).

Relationships Between Variables

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed between all variables. This was done to check for multicollinearity and to investigate the relationships between the variables for the total sample, for males, and for females.

Table 5 contains the Pearson Product Moment Correlations for the total sample. Table 6 contains the Pearson Product Moment Correlations for the male sample. Table 7 contains the Pearson Product Moment Correlations for the female sample.

Correlations for the Total Sample

The correlation matrix of Table 5 presents the relationships between all variables for the total sample (n=156). Of particular interest are the correlations between ego identity and all other variables.

The strongest relationships between predictor variables and identity are the moderate positive correlations between identity and self-esteem (r=.57, p=.000) and identity and instrumentality (r=.58, p=.000).

Identity and age have little if any correlation (r=.09, p=.12) for this sample. The two variables, age and gender, are not significantly
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Total Sample (n=156)</th>
<th>Males (n=73)</th>
<th>Females (n=83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>29.269</td>
<td>4.591</td>
<td>30.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>32.269</td>
<td>4.293</td>
<td>30.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEN</td>
<td>54.526</td>
<td>8.942</td>
<td>53.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEST</td>
<td>4.808</td>
<td>1.291</td>
<td>4.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINT</td>
<td>45.974</td>
<td>7.846</td>
<td>44.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFUS</td>
<td>29.250</td>
<td>5.895</td>
<td>28.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFUS</td>
<td>32.526</td>
<td>5.328</td>
<td>32.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIM</td>
<td>30.462</td>
<td>6.769</td>
<td>29.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>21.231</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>21.589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Among All Variables for Total Sample

(N = 156)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>INST</th>
<th>EXPR</th>
<th>IDEN</th>
<th>SEST</th>
<th>SPINT</th>
<th>SFFUS</th>
<th>ININT</th>
<th>INFUS</th>
<th>INTIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td></td>
<td>.2958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>-.4193</td>
<td>.0339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEN</td>
<td>-.1130</td>
<td>.5767</td>
<td>.2551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEST</td>
<td>-.0296</td>
<td>.5477</td>
<td>.1060</td>
<td>.5661</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINT</td>
<td>-.2187</td>
<td>.2475</td>
<td>.2843</td>
<td>.4116</td>
<td>.3098</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFFUS</td>
<td>-.1929</td>
<td>.1953</td>
<td>.1844</td>
<td>.4054</td>
<td>.2141</td>
<td>.3519</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ININT</td>
<td>-.1397</td>
<td>.0721</td>
<td>.1904</td>
<td>.2587</td>
<td>.1450</td>
<td>.2059</td>
<td>.1628</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFUS</td>
<td>.0741</td>
<td>.2337</td>
<td>-.0237</td>
<td>.3918</td>
<td>.2484</td>
<td>.1133</td>
<td>.3651</td>
<td>.4939</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIM</td>
<td>-.0680</td>
<td>.1868</td>
<td>.0061</td>
<td>.3218</td>
<td>.0981</td>
<td>.0752</td>
<td>.3539</td>
<td>.2377</td>
<td>.3844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.2304</td>
<td>.1598</td>
<td>-.1938</td>
<td>.0937</td>
<td>.0510</td>
<td>-.0287</td>
<td>.1384</td>
<td>-.0692</td>
<td>.1077</td>
<td>.1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.361</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6

**Pearson Correlation Coefficients Among All Variables for Males**

(N = 73)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IMST</th>
<th>EXPR</th>
<th>IDEN</th>
<th>SEST</th>
<th>SPINT</th>
<th>SPFUS</th>
<th>ININT</th>
<th>INFUS</th>
<th>INTIM</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMST</td>
<td>.3571</td>
<td>.6521</td>
<td>.5798</td>
<td>.4127</td>
<td>.2463</td>
<td>.1416</td>
<td>.1944</td>
<td>.2641</td>
<td>.1455</td>
<td>.1455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .001</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .018</td>
<td>P = .116</td>
<td>P = .050</td>
<td>P = .012</td>
<td>P = .110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>.3433</td>
<td>.0732</td>
<td>.3613</td>
<td>.1517</td>
<td>.3257</td>
<td>.1626</td>
<td>.1517</td>
<td>-.0518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .001</td>
<td>P = .269</td>
<td>P = .001</td>
<td>P = .100</td>
<td>P = .002</td>
<td>P = .085</td>
<td>P = .100</td>
<td>P = .332</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.5308</td>
<td>.4674</td>
<td>.3331</td>
<td>.2561</td>
<td>.3590</td>
<td>.5262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .002</td>
<td>P = .014</td>
<td>P = .001</td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2308</td>
<td>.0738</td>
<td>.2149</td>
<td>.3226</td>
<td>.2495</td>
<td>.0641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .025</td>
<td>P = .267</td>
<td>P = .034</td>
<td>P = .003</td>
<td>P = .017</td>
<td>P = .295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4396</td>
<td>.2601</td>
<td>.1688</td>
<td>.2220</td>
<td>.0834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .013</td>
<td>P = .077</td>
<td>P = .030</td>
<td>P = .241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0433</td>
<td>.3120</td>
<td>.3348</td>
<td>.1646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .358</td>
<td>P = .004</td>
<td>P = .002</td>
<td>P = .082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ININT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4972</td>
<td>.1755</td>
<td>-.0418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .000</td>
<td>P = .069</td>
<td>P = .363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3530</td>
<td>.1306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .001</td>
<td>P = .135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.3205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P = .003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Pearson Correlation Coefficients Among All Variables for Females

(N = 83)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INST</th>
<th>EXPR</th>
<th>IDEN</th>
<th>SEST</th>
<th>SPINT</th>
<th>SPFUS</th>
<th>ININT</th>
<th>INFUS</th>
<th>INTIM</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>.0546</td>
<td>.6419</td>
<td>.5951</td>
<td>.2768</td>
<td>.2876</td>
<td>.1058</td>
<td>.2455</td>
<td>.1904</td>
<td>.0591</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.312</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.006</td>
<td>P=.004</td>
<td>P=.170</td>
<td>P=.013</td>
<td>P=.042</td>
<td>P=.298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>.1276</td>
<td>.1325</td>
<td>.0671</td>
<td>.0853</td>
<td>.0079</td>
<td>-.1322</td>
<td>-.1459</td>
<td>-.1767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.125</td>
<td>P=.116</td>
<td>P=.273</td>
<td>P=.222</td>
<td>P=.472</td>
<td>P=.117</td>
<td>P=.094</td>
<td>P=.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEN</td>
<td>.6029</td>
<td>.3271</td>
<td>.4477</td>
<td>.2410</td>
<td>.4458</td>
<td>.1745</td>
<td>.1666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.001</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.014</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.057</td>
<td>P=.066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEST</td>
<td>.4045</td>
<td>.3456</td>
<td>.0839</td>
<td>.1806</td>
<td>-.0163</td>
<td>.0541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.001</td>
<td>P=.225</td>
<td>P=.051</td>
<td>P=.442</td>
<td>P=.314</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINT</td>
<td>.2056</td>
<td>.1126</td>
<td>.0951</td>
<td>-.0666</td>
<td>-.0580</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.031</td>
<td>P=.155</td>
<td>P=.196</td>
<td>P=.275</td>
<td>P=.301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFUS</td>
<td>.2143</td>
<td>.4557</td>
<td>.3611</td>
<td>.2241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.026</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ININT</td>
<td>.5241</td>
<td>.2653</td>
<td>-.0363</td>
<td>.372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.008</td>
<td>P=.372</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFUS</td>
<td>.4249</td>
<td>.0517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P=.000</td>
<td>P=.321</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIM</td>
<td>.1253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(alpha = .05) correlated with identity for the total sample.

In contrast to instrumentality, expressiveness has a low positive correlation with identity (r=.25, p=.001).

For this sample, the instrumentality score and expressiveness score have little if any correlation (r=.03, p=.34). This is to be expected based on factor analyses from several samples of adolescent and middle-aged males and females that indicate the INST (M) and EXPR (F) scales are each unifactorial. The correlation between the two factors is close to zero in both genders (Helmreich, Spence, & Wilhelm, 1981).

The three individuation variables have significant correlations with identity. Intergenerational fusion-individuation (INFUS) has an r of .39 (p=.000). Significant other fusion-individuation (SPFUS) has an r of .41 (p=.000). The variable of intergenerational intimidation has an r of .32 (p=.000).

The two intimacy variables are intergenerational intimacy (ININT) and significant other intimacy (SPINT). Correlations with identity are: ININT, r=.26 (p=.001), SPINT, r=.41 (p=.000).

In summary, instrumentality and self-esteem have the strongest correlations with identity. As was expected, there is little if any correlation between instrumentality and expressiveness scores.

Gender Correlations Contrasted

For both genders, the variable with the strongest correlation to identity is instrumentality. The correlation for females is r=.64 (p=.000), for males r=.65 (p=.000). Self-esteem also has a significant
positive correlation with identity for both genders. The correlations are: \( r = .58 \) (\( p = .000 \)) for males, \( r = .60 \) (\( p = .000 \)) for females.

For females, the correlation of expressiveness and identity scores is \( r = .13 \) (\( p = .125 \)). For males, the correlation of expressiveness and identity scores is \( r = .34 \) (\( p = .001 \)), indicating that for males in this sample approximately 12 percent of the variance in identity scores can be associated with the variance in expressiveness scores. Whereas, for females, only about 2 percent of the variance in identity scores can be associated with the variance in expressiveness scores.

The gender correlations for identity and intergenerational intimacy are about the same. The correlations are \( r = .24 \) (\( p = .01 \)) for females and \( r = .26 \) (\( p = .01 \)) for males. Both r's indicate little if between any correlation. The correlations between identity and significant other intimacy are \( r = .47 \) (\( p = .000 \)) for males and \( r = .333 \) (\( p = .001 \)) for females. For males approximately 22 percent of the total variance in identity can be associated with the variance in significant other intimacy. For females \( r^2 \) is approximately 11 percent.

The individuation variables are significant other fusion-individuation (SPFUS), intergenerational fusion-individuation, (INFUS) and intergenerational intimidation (INTIM). The correlations of each of these individuation variables and identity follow: (a) for INTIM, \( r = .17 \) (\( p = .057 \)) for females, \( r = .53 \) (\( p = .00 \)) for males; (b) for SPFUS, \( r = .45 \) (\( p = .000 \)) for females, \( r = .33 \) (\( p = .002 \)) for males, and (c) for INFUS, \( r = .45 \) (\( p = .000 \)) for females, \( r = .36 \) (\( p = .001 \)) for males.

For males, 28 percent of the intergenerational intimidation score variance can be associated with variance in identity scores. For
females, only about 3 percent of the variance in identity and INTIM scores is associated. All of the individuation correlations were significant except the correlation between identity and intergenerational intimidation for females. The two fusion-individuation correlations were somewhat stronger for females than males. For the SPFUS and identity variables, the coefficient of determination is 20 percent and 11 percent for females and males respectively. For INFUS and identity, $r^2$ is 20 percent for females and 13 percent for males.

Correlations between expressiveness and the two intimacy variables were higher for males than females although the correlations were in the low range for males. For males, the correlations between expressiveness and SPINT and ININT are .36 ($p=.001$) and .33 ($p=.002$) respectively. For females, the correlations between expressiveness and SPINT and ININT are .07 ($p=.26$) and .01 ($p=.47$) respectively.

For instrumentality and ININT, the correlations are: $r=.14$ ($p=.116$) for males, and $r=.11$ ($p=.170$) for females. Both correlations are extremely low and are not significant. For instrumentality and SPINT, the correlations are: $r=.28$ ($p=.006$) for females and $r=.41$ ($p=.000$) for males. Instrumentality and SPINT have 17 percent associated variance for males and 0.08 percent associated variance for females.

In summary, the correlations between predictor variables and identity are given for each gender. The order is from greatest correlation to least correlation. For females, the correlations are:

1. INST - $r=.64,****$
2. SEST - $r=.60,****$
3. SPFUS - $r=.45,****$
Instrumentality and self-esteem have the highest correlation with identity for both genders. Higher scores on the measures of fusion-individuation are associated with higher identity scores for both genders. The correlations for expressiveness and intergenerational intimidation provide the strongest contrasts between the genders. Age is not significantly correlated with identity for either gender.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Introduction

In formulating the alternative hypothesis for the prediction equation, it was assumed from Erikson's theory and previous research that a regression model would predict ego identity from the stated variables. The variables are instrumentality, expressiveness, gender, self-esteem, age, intergenerational fusion-individuation,
intergenerational intimacy, intergenerational intimidation, significant other fusion-individuation, and significant other intimacy. The rationale for including the ten predictor variables in the model was given in Chapter One.

The multiple regression model is as follows:

\[ Y = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + B_3X_3 + B_4X_4 \ldots B_{10}X_{10} + e \]

where

- \( Y \) = ego identity score
- \( X_1 \) = age
- \( X_2 \) = gender
- \( X_3 \) = instrumentality
- \( X_4 \) = expressiveness
- \( X_5 \) = intergenerational fusion-individuation
- \( X_6 \) = intergenerational intimacy
- \( X_7 \) = significant other fusion-individuation
- \( X_8 \) = significant other intimacy
- \( X_9 \) = self-esteem
- \( X_{10} \) = intergenerational intimidation

Ego identity achievement was defined as the respondent's score on Rasmussen's Ego Identity Scale (1961). Instrumentality and expressiveness were operationalized as scores on the instrumental (M) scale and expressive (F) scale of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Self-esteem was operationalized by scores on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1979). The three individuation variables and the two intimacy variables were operationalized by the five subscale scores of the PAFS-Q, Version C (Williamson, Bray, Malone, 1984).

The stepwise selection of independent variables was the regression procedure used in this investigation. By regressing identity on the independent variables control of the independent variables was possible.
The first variable selected for inclusion in the regression model was the predictor variable that had the highest correlation with the criterion variable, ego identity score. The next predictor variable to enter was the one with the highest partial correlation with ego identity score with the effects of the first variable partialed out.

Each time a predictor variable entered the equation the partial correlations between ego identity score and each of the independent variables not in the equation, adjusted for the independent variables in the equation, were determined. The one with the highest partial correlation with ego identity score controlling for the effects of the other variables in the equation entered.

At each step, after a new predictor variable was added, the Student's t distribution test statistic determined the significance of each predictor variable in relationship to the other variables in the equation. If a variable no longer made a statistically significant (alpha = .05) contribution to the equation it was deleted from the equation.

The test statistic to determine whether the multiple R for each set of predictor variables was statistically significant was the F distribution. An independent variable entered the equation only if the probability associated with the F test was less than or equal to 0.05.

Regression Analysis Results

A multiple regression analysis was produced using the stepwise
method. The ego identity scores were regressed on age, instrumentality, expressiveness, gender, self-esteem, individuation (three measures), and intimacy (two measures). For the regression model presented here instrumentality and expressiveness are continuous scores.

An interaction term (INST x EXPR) was computed for previous regression models. When the interaction variable failed to reach significance (did not enter the equation) it was dropped from the equation. The conclusion is that there is not sufficient evidence to conclude an interaction effect for the variables of instrumentality and expressiveness. The joint contribution of instrumentality and expressiveness to the criterion did not yield more or different information than can be inferred from the simple effects of instrumentality and expressiveness.

Further, interaction terms were computed for gender X instrumental, gender X expressive, and gender X (instrumental X expressive). When entered as variables in the regression model none of the interaction terms were statistically significant (alpha = .05). Thus it can be concluded that there is not sufficient evidence to conclude an interaction effect for gender, instrumentality, and expressiveness. In other words, the effect of levels of instrumentality and expressiveness is the same for both genders.

Thus the multiple regression model presented does not include an interaction term. The model presented is for the total sample (n=156). Alpha is .05.

The stepwise regression of identity on the independent variables resulted in the equation found in Table 8.
Table 8

Regression of Identity on INST...Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>BETA</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SIG T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.409</td>
<td>5.690</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEST</td>
<td>1.522</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>3.224</td>
<td>.0016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFUS</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>.0532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-3.367</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-3.032</td>
<td>.0029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFUS</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>3.255</td>
<td>.0014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINT</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>2.204</td>
<td>.0290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R = .75 R Square = .56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BETA IN</th>
<th>PARTIAL</th>
<th>MIN TOLER</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>SIG T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>.106799</td>
<td>.141927</td>
<td>.559689</td>
<td>1.744</td>
<td>.0832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ININT</td>
<td>.037623</td>
<td>.047707</td>
<td>.566868</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.5621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIM</td>
<td>.106056</td>
<td>.141364</td>
<td>.553278</td>
<td>1.737</td>
<td>.0844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.029195</td>
<td>.042089</td>
<td>.565334</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.6091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable entered on step number one was instrumental. This resulted in a multiple R of .58 and an R² of .33. In other words, 33 percent of the variation of the ego identity scores can be attributed to the score on instrumentality.

The variable entered on step number two was self-esteem. This resulted in a multiple R of .65 and an R² of .42.

The variable entered on step number three was significant other fusion-individuation. Its entry resulted in a multiple R of .70 and an R² of .49.

The variable entered on step number four was gender. The result was a multiple R of .72 and an R² of .52.

The variable entered on step number five was intergenerational fusion-individuation. This resulted in a multiple R of .74 and an R² of .55.

The variable entered on step number six was significant other intimacy. The entry resulted in an R² of .56 and a multiple R of .75 for the set of predictor variables. Adjusted R² was .54.

No other variables entered. As can be seen in Table 8, the variables of expressiveness, intergenerational intimacy, intergenerational intimidation, and age did not enter the equation.

The raw score regression equation for the total sample is:

\[ Y = 5.6 - 3.4 \text{ (gender)} + .8 \text{ (INST)} + .19 \text{ (SPFUS)} + 1.5 \text{ (SEST)} + .15 \text{ (SPINT)} + .33 \text{ (INFUS)} \]

The raw score regression equation for females is:
\[ Y = 5.6 + 1.2 \text{ (gender)} + 0.8 \text{ (INST)} + 0.19 \text{ (SPFUS)} + 1.5 \text{ (SEST)} + 0.15 \text{ (SPINT)} + 0.33 \text{ (INFUS)} \]

The raw score regression equation for males is:

\[ Y = 5.6 - 2.2 \text{ (gender)} + 0.8 \text{ (INST)} + 0.19 \text{ (SPFUS)} + 1.5 \text{ (SEST)} + 1.5 \text{ (SPINT)} + 0.33 \text{ (INFUS)} \]

It is of interest to determine the relative significance of the predictor variables for this sample. As can be seen in Table 8, instrumentality has a t test significance level of < .0001. Three independent variables, self-esteem, gender, and intergenerational fusion-individuation have significance levels of < .01. Significant other intimacy has a statistical significance of < .05. Significant other fusion-individuation barely reached significance (alpha = .05) at p=.053.

The analysis revealed that instrumentality was the strongest predictor of the ego identity score, significantly explaining 33 percent of the variation in ego identity scores. Self-esteem explained an additional 9 percent of the variance. Significant other fusion-individuation explained an additional 7 percent of the variance. Gender explained an additional 3 percent of the variance with females having significantly higher ego identity scores than males. Intergenerational fusion-individuation explained approximately 3 percent of the variance. Lastly, significant other intimacy explained about 1 percent of the variation in ego identity scores.
In building this regression equation, no variables were deleted after entering the equation.

For the set of predictor variables, $F = 32.09$, $p < .0001$, thus the conclusion is the correlation between ego identity scores and the combined predictor variables is different from zero. The null hypothesis is not accepted, and it is concluded that a regression model can predict ego identity from the variables of gender, instrumentality, self-esteem, significant other intimacy, significant other fusion-individuation, and intergenerational fusion-individuation.

In combination, the set of predictor variables explain 56 percent of the variation in identity scores for this sample. One could expect the variables to explain 55 percent (adjusted $R$ square) of the variation in identity scores in the population.

**Summary**

The results of the multiple regression analysis were as follows:

1. There was no significant interaction effect for gender, instrumentality, and expressiveness.

2. There was no significant interaction effect for instrumentality and expressiveness for this sample.

3. Instrumentality was the strongest predictor of identity score ($\hat{\beta} = .409$, $p < .00001$).

4. Members of the androgynous and instrumental gender-role orientation groups have significantly higher ego identity scores than members of the expressive and undifferentiated
gender-role orientation groups.

5. Gender was a significant predictor of identity score ($\hat{\beta} = -.188, p < .01$).

6. For the sample, males have significantly lower ego identity scores than females.

7. Self-esteem was a significant predictor of ego identity score ($\hat{\beta} = .220, p = .0016$).

8. Significant other fusion-individuation was a significant predictor of ego identity score ($\hat{\beta} = .123, p = .0532$).

9. Intergenerational fusion-individuation was a significant predictor of ego identity score ($\hat{\beta} = .195, p = .0014$).

10. Significant other intimacy was a significant predictor of ego identity score ($\hat{\beta} = .136, p = .0290$).

Gender-Role Orientation Groups

The gender-role orientation groups are the result of the median split scoring of the instrumental and expressive scales of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The scoring is explained in Chapter Three. Table 9 is a frequency table of membership in the four gender-role orientation groups by gender.

As can be seen from Table 9, the INST group is predominantly male, and the EXPR group is predominantly female. For the sample, 32.9 percent of the males and 31.3 percent of the females are androgynous. The undifferentiated group contains 21.9 percent of the males and 14.5 percent of the females.
Table 9

Frequency of Gender-Role Orientation Group Membership for Females and Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALES</strong></td>
<td>(n=73)</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FEMALES</strong></td>
<td>(n=83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDRO</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDIFF</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 presents the mean scores for the independent variables (age is excepted) of the multiple regression analysis. The mean scores are given for both genders by membership in gender-role orientation group. Of interest are the scores for the androgynous group. There is a trend in the ANDRO group for the mean variable scores for males and females to have a low difference as compared to the other groups. The differences of the scores for the ANDRO group are 1.36, .4, 1.08, .58, .10, 3.44, .22, 1.17, and 1.23 for the IDEN, SEST, SPFUS, SPINT, INFUS, ININT, INTIM, EXPR, and INST variable scores respectively.

College Goals and Level of Identity Achievement

The results of the regression analysis indicated that instrumentality is the strongest and most significant predictor of the level of ego identity achievement for this sample. Therefore members of the androgynous and instrumental gender-role orientation groups have significantly higher ego identity scores. Members of the expressive and undifferentiated gender-role orientation groups have significantly lower identity scores.

One of the purposes of this study was to explore the relationship between level of ego identity achievement and the respondents goals for self as college students. The rationale for this investigation is explained in Chapter One.

The measure of college goals for this study was Constantinople's College Scale (1969). The College Scale is found in Appendix H. As can be seen from the scale for each goal statement respondents indicate the
Table 10

Mean Scores of Variables for Gender-Role Orientation Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Androgyous</th>
<th>Instrumental</th>
<th>Expressive</th>
<th>Undifferentiated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males (n=24)</td>
<td>Females (n=26)</td>
<td>Males (n=28)</td>
<td>Females (n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEN</td>
<td>58.79</td>
<td>60.15</td>
<td>55.50</td>
<td>59.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEST</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFUS</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>31.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINT</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>48.54</td>
<td>44.43</td>
<td>49.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFUS</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>33.85</td>
<td>33.03</td>
<td>35.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ININT</td>
<td>104.21</td>
<td>107.65</td>
<td>100.93</td>
<td>107.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTIM</td>
<td>31.91</td>
<td>31.69</td>
<td>29.82</td>
<td>35.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>35.42</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>29.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INST</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>32.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
level of importance of the goal to self as a student.

For purpose of the crosstabulation, respondents were divided into two categories of ego identity achievement. These categories were high identity achievement group and low identity achievement group. The high identity group was defined as all respondents in the androgynous and instrumental gender-role orientation groups. The low identity group was defined as all respondents in the expressive and undifferentiated gender-role orientation group.

Responses on the College Scale were collapsed for purposes of crosstabulation and Chi-square analysis. "Very important" and "important" combined to define the high importance response category. "Average importance" defined the average importance response category. "Unimportant" and "very unimportant" combined to define the low importance category.

Crosstabulation tables for the total sample were computed for each goal statement. Identity achievement (two levels) by the three levels of response resulted in 14 2 x 3 crosstabulation analyses.

The relationship between level of ego identity achievement and goals for self as a college student was tested for significance using the Chi-square test of independence. Of the total goal statements four Chi-square tests were significant and ten did not reach significance (alpha = .05). In other words, one can conclude that high levels of ego identity and goal statements are dependent variables in four instances.

The ten contingency tables of student goals that did not reach significance when tested are presented in Tables One through Ten of Appendix J.
The goal statements for which the Chi-square test of independence was not significant are: goal 1 - "learning how to learn from books and teachers" (Table 1, Appendix J), goal 2 - "acquiring an appreciation of ideas" (Table 2, Appendix J), goal 4 - "developing relationships with the opposite sex" (Table 3, Appendix J), goal 5 - "contributing in a distinguished, meaningful manner to some campus group" (Table 4, Appendix J), goal 6 - "developing your ability to understand and get along with persons of other cultures, races, and religions" (Table 5, Appendix J), goal 7 - "becoming self-confident" (Table 6, Appendix J), goal 8 - "personal independence" (Table 7, Appendix J), goal 9 - "finding a spouse" (Table 8, Appendix J), goal 11 - "having many good friends" (Table 9, Appendix J) and goal 12 - "discovering your own strong points and limitations (Table 10, Appendix J).

The contingency tables for the six goals for which the Chi-square test of independence was significant are found in Table 11 through Table 14.

For each contingency table, the row totals are the same. Row one contains the responses of the high identity group (n=89, 57.1 percent). Row two contains the responses of the low identity group (n=67, 42.9 percent). The column totals change for each goal. Column 1 is the "low importance" response category. Column 2 is the "average importance" response category. Column 3 is the "high importance" response category.

Table 11 presents the 2 x 3 contingency table for goal 3, "establishing your own moral, personal, and spiritual values." The Chi-square test result was 11.86 which was significant at the level of .002.

"Achieving academic distinction," goal statement 10, resulted in a
Chi-square test result of 8.20 which was significant at p=.02 (see Table 12).

Goal statement 13, "preparing for a career which begins right after graduation" resulted in a significant difference in response frequency for the two identity groups. Chi-square was 7.13 at the .03 level of significance (see Table 13).

The result of the contingency table analysis for goal statement 14 was significant. The statement was, "preparing for a career which requires further study beyond the B.A. or B.S." The Chi-square result was 11.18 which was significant at the probability level of .004. The results are presented in Table 14.

In summary, the strongest Chi-square values were for goal 3, a personal values statement, and goal 14, a study beyond the bachelor's level statement. Both were significant at alpha = .01. Overall, of the four goals, one statement regards academics, two statements regard career issues, and one statement regards self-discovery via establishing moral and spiritual values.

Organization of Chapter Five

Chapter Five begins with a summary of the purpose and procedure of the study. There follows a summary of major results. Thirdly, the results are discussed in light of previous research and Erikson's theory of ego identity development. Finally, limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are presented.
Table 11

Frequency of Responses to Goal Three by Identity Status Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Identity</strong> (ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Identity</strong> (EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Percent</strong></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance
11.86128 2 .0027

Goal 3. "Establishing your own moral personal and spiritual values" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 12

Frequency of Responses to Goal Ten by Identity Status Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square: 8.20028
D.F.: 2
Significance: .0166

Goal Ten. "Achieving academic distinction" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 13

Frequency of Responses to Goal Thirteen by Identity Status Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity (ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity (EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square D.F. Significance
7.13885 2 .0282

Goal Thirteen. "Preparing for a career which begins right after graduation" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 14

Frequency of Responses to Goal Fourteen by Identity Status Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Status</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity (ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity (EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square: 11.18170, D.F.: 2, Significance: .0037

Goal Fourteen. "Preparing for a career which requires further study beyond the B.A. or B.S." (Constantinople, 1967)
Chapter Five

Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations

Summary of Purpose and Procedure

Erikson (1956, 1959, 1963, 1968) formulated a theory of psychosocial development that has the process of ego identity development as its focus. Erikson's theory was the guiding theoretical orientation for this study.

The literature on ego identity development has suggested that the psychological meaning of ego identity and the pathways to ego identity achievement may be different for females and males. The proposed differences for males and females are: (a) males may deal with identity issues then intimacy issues whereas for females the reverse may be true; (b) the psychological meaning of identity for females revolves around the interpersonal and expressive (intimacy) whereas for males the psychological meaning of identity revolves around the intrapersonal and instrumental (individuation).

Both historically and cross-culturally self-assertive, goal-oriented (instrumental) traits have been judged to be more characteristic of males, and interpersonally oriented, nurturant traits have been judged to be more characteristic of females. This fact led to a definition of gender-role orientation as a combination of the abstract personality traits of expressiveness (feminine) and instrumentality (masculine).
Gender-role orientation may be related to the proposed gender differences in the meaning and pathway of ego identity achievement. The purpose of this study was to investigate the significance of the concept of gender-role orientation, defined as levels of expressiveness and instrumentality, and gender to the ego identity achievement of young adults.

The specific null hypothesis tested in the study assumed no relationship between ego identity and a set of predictor variables. An alternative research hypothesis suggested that a regression model could predict ego identity achievement from a set of predictor variables.

The predictor variables were chosen with the purpose of the study in mind. Instrumentality, expressiveness, and gender were predictor variables.

Erikson (1959) suggested that self-esteem is concomitant not only with the achievement of an identity, but also of intimacy. Self-esteem has been measured as a correlate of ego identity achievement that may be related to gender (Marcia, 1980; Grotevant, 1983). Self-esteem was a predictor variable for the study.

Individuation has been postulated to be more relevant to ego identity achievement for males; whereas, intimacy has been postulated to be more relevant to ego identity achievement for females. Three predictor variables related to individuation, intergenerational fusion-individuation, intergenerational intimidation, and significant other fusion-individuation, were included. Two variables related to intimacy, intergenerational intimacy and significant other intimacy were included.

Age was included as a predictor variable for purposes of control.
Age has been shown to significantly predict ego identity achievement (Protinsky, 1975; Waterman & Waterman, 1976).

Constantinople (1967) thought that the goals of college students might be related to their level of ego identity achievement. Erikson (1959) thought that a conviction that future goals are "sufficiently predictable to be worth working and waiting for" (p. 97) was a characteristic of persons who had achieved ego identity. The study included an investigation of the relationship between level of ego identity achievement and goals for self as a college student.

The sample for this investigation consisted of 156 college students, 46.8 percent (73) were males and 53.2 percent (83) were females. The sample was a sample of convenience consisting of volunteers recruited from an apartment complex housing primarily college students. The sample reflected homogeneity in regard to ethnicity, nationality, marital status, education, and age.

Ego identity achievement was defined as the respondent's score on Rasmussen's Ego Identity Scale (1961). Instrumentality and expressiveness were operationalized as scores on the instrumental (M) scale and expressive (F) scale of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Self-esteem was operationalized by scores on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1979). The three individuation variables and the two intimacy variables were operationalized by the five subscale scores of the PAFS-Q, Version C (Williamson, Bray, & Malone, 1984). College goals for self were operationalized by Constantinople's College Scale (1969).

Multiple regression analysis, Pearson Product-Moment Correlation
analysis, frequency analysis, and crosstabulation frequency analysis with computation of the Chi-Square test of independence were used in data investigation.

The guiding purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between gender, level of instrumentality and expressiveness and the ego identity development of young adults.

Summary of Major Results

1. All of the independent variables for the regression problem were significantly (alpha = .05) correlated with the ego identity variable except age and gender.

2. For the total sample, there was little if any correlation between instrumentality and expressiveness (r=.03, p=.34).

3. For females, all of the independent variables for the regression problem were significantly (alpha = .01) correlated with ego identity except age, expressiveness, and intergenerational intimidation.

4. For males, all of the independent variables for the regression problem were significant (alpha = .05) correlated with ego identity except age.

5. There was no significant interaction effect for gender, instrumentality, and expressiveness.

6. There was no significant interaction effect for instrumentality and expressiveness for this sample.

7. Instrumentality was the strongest predictor of identity score
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\(^{\wedge} (\hat{\beta} = .409, p < .00001).\)

8. Members of the androgynous and instrumental gender-role orientation groups have significantly higher ego identity scores than members of the expressive and undifferentiated gender-role orientation groups.

9. Gender was a significant predictor of identity score \((\hat{\beta} = -.188, p < .01)\).

10. For the sample, males have significantly lower ego identity scores than females.

11. Self-esteem was a significant predictor of ego identity score \((\hat{\beta} = .220, p = .0016)\).

12. Significant other fusion-individuation was a significant predictor of ego identity score \((\hat{\beta} = .123, p = .0532)\).

13. Intergenerational fusion-individuation was a significant predictor of ego identity score \((\hat{\beta} = .195, p = .0014)\).

14. Significant other intimacy was a significant predictor of ego identity score \((\hat{\beta} = .136, p = .0290)\).

15. There was a significant difference \((\chi^2 = 11.86, p = .003)\) between the high identity group and the low identity group in response to goal statement 3: "Establishing your own moral, personal, and spiritual values."

16. There was a significant difference \((\chi^2 = 8.20, p = .02)\) between the high identity group and the low identity group in response to goal statement 10: "Achieving academic distinction."

17. There was a significant difference \((\chi^2 = 7.14, p = .03)\) between the high identity group and the low identity group in response
to goal statement 13: "Preparing for a career which begins right after graduation."

18. There was a significant difference ($\chi^2 = 11.18$, $p = .003$) between the high identity group and the low identity group in response to goal statement 14: "Preparing for a career which requires further study beyond the B.A. or B.S."

Discussion of Results

Instrumentality, Expressiveness, and Ego Identity

The stepwise regression of identity on the independent variables resulted in the equation found in Table 8. The variable entered on step number one was instrumental. This entry resulted in a multiple $R$ of .58 and an $R^2$ of .33 ($p < .00001$). Thus instrumentality was the strongest predictor of ego identity score, significantly explaining 33 percent of the variation in ego identity scores.

Praeger, working with a sample of 88 college women (1977), found high identity to be contingent on high instrumental scores and unrelated to expressive scores. Orlofsky (1977) administered the Identity Status Interview and the Bem Sex Role Inventory to 111 males and females. He found that males and females rated high in identity had significantly higher instrumental scores than their low identity counterparts. Selva and Dusek (1984) and Schiedel and Marcia (1985) also found high identity to be related to high instrumental scores. The present investigation is consistent with prior research in that it demonstrates significant
differences in identity scores based on the level of instrumentality.

An interaction term (INST x EXPR) was computed for previous regression models. When the interaction variable failed to reach significance it was dropped from the equation so that the regression model for this sample does not include an interaction term. The conclusion was that for the present sample there is no significant interaction effect for the variables of instrumentality and expressiveness. The joint contribution of instrumentality and expressiveness to the criterion did not yield more or different information than can be inferred from the simple effects of instrumentality and expressiveness.

Some studies (Prager, 1977; Selva and Dusek, 1984; Waterman and Whitbourne, 1982) using ANOVA analysis have concluded that androgyny results in significantly higher ego identity scores as compared to membership in the other three gender-role orientation groups. Psychological androgyyn is conceptualized as the interaction between instrumental (masculine) and expressive (feminine) personality traits. Since the interaction term was not significant the present research does not support the thesis that psychological androgyyn results in significantly higher ego identity scores as compared to all other PAG groups.

Results of this study indicated that membership in the androgynous and the instrumental gender-role orientation groups resulted in significantly higher ego identity scores as compared to membership in the Expressive or Undifferentiated groups. The rationale for this conclusion was the strength of instrumentality as a predictor of ego
identity score. The masculine (instrumental) component explained 33 percent \((p < .00001)\) of the variance in identity scores while expressiveness failed to enter the regression equation \((p=.08)\).

The Pearson Product Moment Correlations between identity and instrumentality were almost identical for genders. The correlation for females was \(r=.64 \,(p=.000)\); for males the correlation was \(r=.65 \,(p=.000)\). For males, the correlation of expressiveness and identity scores was \(.34 \,(p=.001)\), indicating that for males in this sample approximately 12 percent of the variance in identity scores can be associated with the variance in expressiveness scores. Whereas, for females, the correlation between identity scores and expressiveness was very weak and was not significant \((r=.13, \, p=.125)\).

An important question to ask when investigating gender-role orientation and ego identity achievement is to what degree the components of instrumentality and expressiveness contribute to the level of ego identity achievement. This does not imply an either/or stance as related to instrumentality and expressiveness but rather an investigation of the relative contribution of the two traits.

The finding that instrumental scores were highly predictive of high ego identity scores is consistent with Erikson’s (1959, 1963, 1968) theory. Searching for answers to fundamental questions about ideology and occupation and defining an autonomous self would seem to require a level of instrumentality.
Gender and Ego Identity

Gender was a significant predictor of ego identity score for the multiple regression analysis. Results (p=.002) indicated that females had significantly higher ego identity scores than males for the total sample. The raw score regression equations for males and females are found in Chapter Four.

These results replicated the findings of Constantinople (1969), Waterman and Whitbourne (1981), Waterman (1982), and Selva and Dusek (1984). In each of these research instances females obtained significantly higher ego identity scores than did males. All of the studies were conducted with college students.

The explanation suggested by Waterman and Whitbourne (1981) was the age and college student classification of the sample for their study. Women tended to be older and classified as juniors and seniors more often than men. Selva and Dusek (1984), Constantinople (1969), and Waterman (1982) suggested that the most plausible reason was that females are further along in the resolution of Eriksonian crises than are males.

Age was entered as a predictor variable in the regression analysis for the purpose of control. Age was not found to be a significant predictor of ego identity score ($\hat{\beta} = .029, p = .61$) for this sample. This was likely because the sample was homogeneous in regard to age. Participants ranged in age from 19-25 (see Table 2) with a mode for both genders of 21. The mean age for females was 20.92. The mean age for males was 21.50.
For the present sample, which is also homogeneous in regard to college classification, the most plausible explanation for the significant gender difference in identity scores is that the females are further advanced in the identity achievement task than are males.

The mean identity scores for the four gender-role orientation groups are found in Table 10. As can be seen the difference between the identity scores for females and males are: 1.36 ANDRO group, 4.23 INST group, 6.86 EXPR group, and 6.65 UDIFF group.

While there was a significant overall effect in the sample for gender, the interaction term was not significant. Interaction terms were computed for gender X instrumental, gender X expressive, and gender X (instrumental X expressive). When entered as variables in the regression model none of the interaction terms were significant. Thus there was not sufficient evidence to conclude a difference in the effect of levels of instrumentality and expressiveness for the genders.

There was no significant (alpha = .05) interaction of gender with identity for instrumentality, gender with identity for expressiveness, or gender with identity for instrumentality X expressiveness. These findings support the findings of Selva and Dusek (1984) who found the interaction term was not significant in a series of gender X gender-role ANOVA's.

Self-Esteem and Ego Identity

Self-esteem was found to be a significant predictor of the level of ego identity for this sample. The variable entered the regression
equation on step 2 accounting for 9 percent of the variation in ego identity scores. Beta was .220 (p=.0016).

Women who are in the identity achievement status have been found to score lower on self-esteem and higher in anxiety than women in the identity foreclosure status. The reverse is true for men (Marcia & Friedman, 1970; Romano, 1975; Schenkel & Marcia, 1972). Marcia (1980) postulated this was true because there is more cultural support for male exploration of alternatives than for female exploration of alternatives (Marcia, 1980).

For this sample, self-esteem had a significant positive correlation with identity for both genders. Pearson correlations are: \( r = .58 \) (\( p < .0001 \)) for males and \( r = .60 \) (\( p < .0001 \)) for females. Therefore approximately 34 percent and 36 percent, for males and females respectively, of the variance in identity scores can be associated with the variance in self-esteem scores. The means and standard deviations for females and males are found in Table 4. Rounded, both genders have self-esteem means of 4.8 with standard deviations of 1.35 and 1.23, males and females respectively.

Although it has been difficult to demonstrate consistent differences in self-esteem among high and low identity statuses (Bourne, 1978), self-esteem is generally regarded as an important resource in achieving an ego identity (Grotevant, 1983).

The present research findings did not support the idea that self-esteem scores as a correlate of high scores on measures of ego identity achievement are lower for females than for males. Erikson's theoretical stance that "...self-esteem confirmed at the end of each major
crisis..." (Erikson, 1959, p. 89) increases as one defines an ego identity was supported by the results.

**Individuation and Intimacy Issues**

**Introduction**

The female psychological meaning of identity has been defined as connectedness and relating to others (Gilligan, 1982; Selva & Dusek, 1984). The male psychological meaning of identity has been defined as individual competence and autonomy (Marcia, 1985). These definitions resulted from research results that indicate women are more likely to be identity achieved in areas of interpersonal relationships and sexual ideology than are men. Men tend to be identity achieved in the areas of occupation and politics but foreclosed in the areas of sexual ideology (Hodgson, 1977; Marcia, 1980).

Erikson thought that ego identity was the prerequisite of intimacy with both parents and significant other. Bray, Williamson, and Malone (1984) described a process whereby an individual can act from an individuated position with parents and significant other and still remain connected to or intimate with parents and significant other.

A major issue in adolescent/young adult identity formation is the definition of the process of disengaging from parents while maintaining basic and lasting identifications with them. In gaining a sense of self that is separate (individuated) from the family, the young adult develops "self-certainty" (Erikson, 1968, p. 183).
Identity (individuation) and intimacy issues are central to Eriksonian psychosocial development theory since identity and intimacy define Stages 5 and 6. Identity and intimacy issues are also central to the issue of the psychological meaning of ego identity for the genders.

Discussion

The individuation variables for this study were significant other fusion-individuation (SPFUS), intergenerational fusion-individuation (INFUS), and intergenerational intimidation (INTIM).

For males, 28 percent of the intergenerational intimidation score variance can be associated with variance in identity scores. For females, only about three percent of the variance in identity and INTIM scores is associated. All of the individuation correlations were significant except the correlation between identity and INTIM for females.

The two fusion-individuation correlations were somewhat stronger for females than males. For the SPFUS and identity variables, $r^2$ was 20 percent and 11 percent for females and males respectively. For INFUS and identity, $r^2$ is 20 percent for females and 13 percent for males.

For this sample, multiple regression analysis indicated that significant other fusion-individuation explained seven percent of the variance in identity scores. Intergenerational fusion-individuation explained approximately 3 percent of the variance in identity scores.

Thus high levels of significant other and intergenerational individuation predicted high identity scores. High levels of
significant other and intergenerational fusion predicted low identity scores. The two individuation variables that entered the equation were significantly \( p < .01 \) correlated with identity for both genders.

The results do not support the thesis that individuation as a correlate of identity has different psychological meanings for females and males. The results do support Erikson's theory of ego identity development because high identity scores are predicted by high levels of individuation from significant other and parents.

These results support the research of Campbell, Adams, and Dobson (1984). Data were obtained from 286 college students and their parents. High identity subjects exhibited high levels of individuation. Low identity subjects were characterized by a low level of individuation.

In their longitudinal study of college freshmen, Waterman and Waterman (1971) found that those students who showed stable identity achievement status for the entire year scored significantly higher on a measure of family independence than those students who changed out of the achievement status.

Fleming and Anderson (1986) investigated the relationships between level of personal adjustment and intergenerational individuation in a group of 126 college students. Greater self-esteem, greater mastery, less college maladjustment and a fewer number of reported health problems were significantly correlated to a low level of perceived fusion with parents.

As Erikson (1968) suggests, "Identity formation begins where the usefulness of identification ends. It arises from the selective repudiation and mutual assimilation of childhood identifications and
their absorption in a new configuration" (p. 159).

The results of the present study indicate that individuation is a significant correlate of high ego identity scores regardless of gender. This supports the results of Waterman and Nevid (1976) and Tesch and Whitbourne (1982).

For this sample, the gender correlations for identity and intergenerational intimacy indicated little if any correlation. The correlations were $r = .24$ ($p = .01$) for females and $r = .26$ ($p = .01$) for males. The results of multiple regression analysis indicated that intergenerational intimacy had a beta of .0376 at the significance level of .56.

These results may indicate that while the individuation from family of origin process is salient to ego identity achievement in young adults intimacy levels do not yet differentiate high identity persons from low identity persons.

In contrast, the correlations between identity and significant other intimacy are $r = .47$ ($p = .000$) for males and $r = .33$ ($p = .001$) for females. For males approximately 22 percent of the total variance in identity can be associated with the variance in significant other intimacy. For females $r^2$ is approximately 11 percent.

Significant other intimacy entered the regression equation on the last step. The predictor variable accounted for about 1 percent of the variance in identity scores ($p = .03$). Significant other intimacy significantly predicted high identity scores.

Correlations between expressiveness and the two intimacy variables were higher for males than females although the correlations were in the
low range for males. The correlations between intergenerational intimacy and instrumentality were extremely low and insignificant for both genders. Instrumentality and significant other intimacy had 17 percent associated variance for males and .08 percent associated variance for females.

In light of the above results, there is no evidence that women define themselves (achieve identity) through intimate relationship whereas for men intimacy is less salient to high identity achievement. The results support the findings of Tesch and Whitbourne (1982) and Matteson (1977).

The research results for the three variables that have as a synthesizing construct, individuation, and the two variables that have as a synthesizing construct, intimacy, support the Eriksonian theory of ego identity achievement in young adults.

Individuation from parents and significant other were significant predictors of high levels of ego identity. The expressive and undifferentiated gender-role orientation groups (low identity) are characterized by fusion.

Erikson thought that individuation, a sense of self as separate, was necessary for ego identity achievement. The achievement of identity precedes intimacy. Erikson discussed the part-conflict of young adults of "sexual polarization versus bisexual confusion." The significance of significant other intimacy as a predictor of high identity would follow from the resolution of this part-conflict. Whereas intimacy with parents to the extent it differentiates levels of ego identity achievement would likely follow the individuation process according to
Erickson's theory.

College Goals and Level of Identity Achievement

There was a significant difference between the high identity group and the low identity group in response to four goal statements (Constantinople, 1967).

Persons in the high identity category indicated that the four goals were "important" or "very important" more frequently than did persons in the low identity category.

One goal statement concerned the establishment of personal and spiritual values. One concerned academic goals. Two concerned preparing for a career.

These statements would seem to support Erikson's theory of ego identity development. Erikson emphasized actively searching for values and the choosing of a career as part of the ego identity formation process.

Limitations

1. Results of the study are not generalizable beyond the sample because the sample was a sample of convenience.
2. The study is limited by the use of self-report questionnaires.
3. The researcher was unable to structure the environment in which respondents completed the assessment instruments.
4. The study is limited by the validity and reliability of the
scales used to operationalize the variables.

5. The study was limited by the demographic characteristics of the sample.

Summary and Recommendations

The synthesizing and guiding purpose of the present research was to investigate the relationship of gender and levels of instrumentality and expressiveness (gender-role orientation) to Eriksonian ego identity achievement in young adults.

Results of the investigation did not support the thesis that the psychological meaning of identity is defined by intimacy issues for females and individuation issues for males. Instrumentality was the strongest predictor of ego identity achievement scores for both genders. For this sample intimacy with significant other was a stronger predictor of identity for males than for females.

One of the strengths of this research was the use of measures of individuation - fusion from parents and significant other and measures of intimacy with parents and significant other as predictors of ego identity achievement. The process of individuation or independence from family and then the establishment of a "new configuration," a qualitatively different relationship (intimacy) with parents is discussed by Erikson (Erikson, 1968, p. 159). Erikson did not explain the process of the resolution of the parent-child relationship. The measurement of levels of individuation and intimacy with parents and significant other concurrently with level of ego identity achievement
seems to shed some light on the process of the resolution of the parent-child relationship.

It was not feasible to present a multiple regression model for females and males separately because of the limits of sample size. A replication of this study using a larger sample so that building a regression model for each gender is statistically sound is recommended.

The notion that college goals may be associated with level of ego identity received some support. Replication of this part of the study is warranted. Again, a larger sample size is recommended.

Research regarding the development of ego identity in young adults has practical importance to professionals who work with young adult college students. The most salient reason for this practical importance is the fact that the ego identity process is recognized as the primary developmental and psychological process of this age group.

In order to answer questions regarding stage progression in ego identity development longitudinal research is necessary. Suppositions regarding stage progression in ego identity development are unwarranted without longitudinal research.
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Speech for Recruitment

My name is Sandra Vidler and I am a doctoral student in Counseling at Virginia Tech. I am conducting a research study about college students - your attitudes and beliefs about yourself and life in general, your relationships with other people, and your goals for yourself as a college student.

If you decide to participate in this study I will leave you this packet of materials. The packet contains a letter that explains the study and give my name and telephone numbers.

The letter also explains confidentiality. If you decide to participate your responses will be treated as highly confidential. In the packet, there is a consent form for you to sign. All consent forms will be kept separate from the rest of the packet. Questionnaires are number coded and no names will be associated with the questionnaires.

It takes about 35 minutes to complete all the questionnaires. Would you be willing to participate?

Each questionnaire has instructions for completion. Please answer all items for each scale. Thank you very much for your help.
Dear Participant,

You have been chosen to participate in a study designed to learn more about young adult university students. This study is being conducted as part of my doctoral dissertation under the direction of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University's College of Education. The results will add to the knowledge about young adult university students and their interpersonal relationships and goals.

This packet contains questionnaires designed to collect information in three areas. The three areas are: (1) your ideas and feelings about yourself and life in general, (2) your relationships with your parents and significant other, and (3) the goals you have for yourself as a university student and your opinion as to whether the university has helped or hindered your progress toward your goals.

I am asking your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaires. They take about 35 minutes to complete. Please complete the questionnaires as soon as possible. I will pick them up on Wednesday or Thursday.

I want to assure you that your name will not be revealed and that all information will be treated as highly confidential. The questionnaires are coded so that sets of questionnaires may be kept together.

If you have any questions or desire more information, please feel free to call me at (703) 731-9535 or (703) 961-5106. If you would like to discuss the results of your questionnaires, please call to make an appointment.

Please complete the questionnaires according to the instructions on each. Your participation is important to the completion of this study. Thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Sandra Vidler  
Doctoral Candidate  
College of Education
Consent Form

I, the undersigned, do hereby consent to being a participant in the investigation currently being conducted by Sandra Vidler. A letter has been given to me describing the investigation and offering to answer questions about the study or the results of my questionnaires. I understand that my name will not be used in any report of the study and that all information collected will be treated as highly confidential. I understand that no medical service or compensation is provided to participants by Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University or the individual investigator as a result of stress or injury from participation in the research. I understand that I may withdraw from this study at anytime and may refrain from responding to any questions which I consider to be too personal. If you wish to discuss this project with Virginia Tech's Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects the Chairman, Charles Waring, may be contacted at 961-5283.

__________________________  __________________________
signature                              date
Demographic Information Questionnaire

Background Information

1. Age _____________

2. Gender (check one)
   male _____ female _____

3. Name of college or university
   ___________________________________________________________

4. Major __________________________________________________

5. Classification (check one)
   Freshman _________  Junior _____________
   Sophomore _________  Senior _____________
   Graduate __________
   Full-time student _____  Part-time student _____

6. Marital status (check one)
   single _____ married _____
   divorced/separated _____ widowed _____

7. Ethnic group (check one)
   Black _____ White _____
   Hispanic _____ Oriental or Asian _____
   Other (specify) ___________

8. Birthplace _________________________________________________

9. Were you reared in the United States?
   (check one)  yes _____ no _____
   If not, specify in what country you grew up.
   _________________________________________________________
APPENDIX E
**Self-Esteem Scale**

Directions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you **strongly agree** with the statement, circle **SA**. If you **agree**, circle **A**. If you **disagree**, circle **D**. If you **strongly disagree**, circle **SD**.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>I feel I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rosenberg, 1964
Self-Esteem Scale Key

Directions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you strongly agree with the statement, circle SA. If you agree, circle A. If you disagree, circle D. If you strongly disagree, circle SD.

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. 
   SA* A* D SD

2. At times I think I am no good at all. 
   SA A D* SD*

3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities. 
   SA* A* D SD

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people. 
   SA* A* D SD

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of. 
   SA A D* SD*

6. I certainly feel useless at times. 
   SA A D* SD*

7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. 
   SA* A* D SD

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself. 
   SA A D* SD*

9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. 
   SA A D* SD*

10. I take a positive attitude toward myself. 
    SA* A* D SD

Rosenberg, 1964
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Scoring Key

The scale was scored in a positive direction so that higher scores indicate higher levels of self-esteem.

The scale is a ten-item Guttman scale that results in a total scale score of 1.-6.

Positive responses which indicate high self-esteem are indicated on the Key by (*) asterisks.

Scale #I - items 3, 7, 9
If 3 out of 3 or 2 out of 3 positive (*) - score 1. If 1 out of 3 or 0 out of 3 positively - score 0.

Scale #II - items 4 and 5
One out of 2 or 2 out of 2 positive (*) responses = 1, 0 out of 2 = 0.

Scale #III - item 1
An * = 1, otherwise 0.

Scale #IV - item 8
An * = 1, otherwise 0.

Rosenberg, 1964
APPENDIX F
Personal Attributes Questionnaire

The items below inquire about what kind of a person you think you are. Each item consists of a pair of characteristics, with the numbers 1-5 in between. For example:

Not at all Artistic 1...2...3...4...5 Very Artistic

Each pair describes contradictory characteristics—that is, you cannot be both at the same time, such as very artistic and not at all artistic.

The numbers form a scale between the two extremes. You are to choose a number which describes where you fall on the scale. For example, if you think you have no artistic ability, you would choose 1. If you think you are pretty good, you might choose 4. If you are only medium, you might choose 3, and so forth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Not at all aggressive</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Not at all independent</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not at all emotional</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Very submissive</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Not at all excitable in a major crisis</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very excitable in a major crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Very passive</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Not at all able to devote self completely to others</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Able to devote self completely to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Very rough</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Not at all helpful to others</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very helpful to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Not at all competitive</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Very home oriented</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very worldly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Not at all kind</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Indifferent to others' approval</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Highly needful of others' approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Feelings not easily hurt</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Feelings easily hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Not at all aware of feelings of others</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very aware of feelings of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Can make decisions easily</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Has difficulty making decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Gives up very easily</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Never gives up easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Never cries</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Cries very easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Not at all self-confident</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very self-confident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Feels very inferior</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Feels very superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Not at all understanding of others</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very understanding of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Very cold in relations with others</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very warm in relations with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Very little need for security</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Very strong need for security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Goes to pieces under pressure</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5 Stands up well under pressure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal Attributes Questionnaire

Key

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrumental M-Scale Items</th>
<th>Expressive F-Scale Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>22.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M-F Scale

Both the F-Scale and the M-Scale are scored so that 5 indicates the greatest and 1 indicates the least amount of a trait. The exception is item number 16 which is scored in reverse. Scale scores are summed resulting in two discreet scores for Expressiveness (F) and Instrumentality (I).

Note: In accord with the scoring procedures of Spence & Helmreich the M-F scale was not used in the present study.

(Spence & Helmreich, 1978, 1984)
APPENDIX G
STATEMENTS AND DERIVATIVES FOR RASMUSSEN'S EGON IDENTITY SCALE

This Appendix contains the eighteen derivatives of Erikson's Psychosocial Crisis Stages used in development of writing. A letter in parentheses, along with a page number, follows each derivative. The letters refer to the following papers: (A) "The Problem of Ego Identity"; (B) "Growth and Crisis of the Healthy Personality". Additionally, following each statement, its numerical position in the scale will also be indicated in parentheses.

First Crisis Stage
Infancy

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Basic Trust
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Mistrust

Derivative I

The individual has a well developed perspective of time in that he believes future satisfactions or goals are sufficiently predictable to be worth working and waiting for (A, pp. 97).

Statements:

1. I lose interest in things if I have to wait too long to get them. (72)
2. I can't stand to wait for things I really want. (51)
3. I seem to have regrets when I have to give up my pleasures right now for goals or things I want in the future. (1)
4. If a person wants something worthwhile, he should be willing to wait for it. (68)

Derivative II

Belief in the trustworthiness of others, i.e., basic trust in others (B, pp. 101).

Statements:

1. If I am not careful, people try to take advantage of me. (20)
2. In general, people can be trusted. (21)
3. A man who can be trusted is hard to find. (41)
4. People are usually honest in dealing with each other. (6)
Derivative III

Attitude on the part of the individual of having missed his opportunity for success; a feeling of having suffered a premature and fatal loss of useful potential (A, pp. 82).

Statements:

1. When I think about my future, I feel I have missed my best chances for making good. (58)

2. The best part of my life is still ahead of me. (33)

3. I am confident that I will be successful in life when I finally decide on a career. (16)

4. I feel I have missed my opportunity to really be a success in life. (67)

Second Crisis Stage
   Early Childhood

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Autonomy
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Shame, Doubt

Derivative I

A feeling of certainty or self-confidence as to the correctness of courses of action which the individual has followed (A, pp. 99).

Statements:

1. The decisions I have made in the past have usually been the right ones. (13)

2. After I do something, I usually worry about whether it was the right thing. (15)

3. It doesn't pay to worry much about decisions you have already made. (5)

4. As a rule, I don't regret the decisions I make. (63)

Derivative II

A sense of independence in that the individual comfortably makes decisions and lives his life without being primarily dependent upon his family for guidance (A, pp. 99).
Statements:

1. I never make any important decisions without getting help or advice from my family. (70)

2. I believe that I must make my own decision in important matters, as no one can live my life for me. (42)

3. At my age a man must make his own decisions, even though his parents might not agree with the things he does. (24)

4. It is very important that your parents approve of everything you do. (61)

Derivative III

A fear of being shamed or publicly exposed to peers and leaders (A, pp. 99).

Statements:

1. It doesn't worry me if I make a mistake in front of my friends. (12)

2. I have a fear of being asked questions in class because of what other people will think if I don't know the answer. (3)

3. It is better to say nothing in public than to take a change on other people hearing you make a mistake. (71)

4. It doesn't bother me when my friends find out that I can't do certain things as well as other people. (62)

Third Crisis Stage

Play Age

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Initiative
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Guilt

Derivative I

Contempt for and tendency to deny background hostility toward roles considered proper and desirable in one's family or immediate community (A, pp. 85).

Statements:

1. I am proud of my family background. (44)

2. It is easier to make friends with people you like if they don't know too much about your background. (39)
3. It's best not to let other people know too much about your family or background if you can keep from it. (17)

4. One of the hardest things for a young person to overcome is his family background. (32)

**Derivative II**

Emotionally comfortable role experimentation in adolescent subsocieties, where discipline and boundaries are provided by the group (A, pp. 100).

**Statements:**

1. During the past few years I have taken little or no part in clubs, organized group activity, or sports. (47)

2. I never enjoyed taking part in school clubs or student government activity. (19)

3. One of the good parts of being a teenager is getting together with a group which makes its own rules and does things as a group. (54)

4. A person who hasn't been a member of a well organized group or club at some time in his life has missed a lot. (57)

**Derivative III**

Tireless initiative, in the quality of "go-at-iveness" at any cost. An overcompensation, attention, or concern is limited entirely to what is being done at present rather than what is to be done next (B, pp. 126).

**Statements:**

1. I am always busy but it seems that I am usually spinning my wheels and never seem to get anywhere. (60)

2. When given a job, I try never to get so tied up in what I am doing at the moment so as to lose sight of what comes next. (8)

3. I am always busy doing something, but I seem to accomplish less than other people even though they don't work as hard as I do. (27)

4. It is a good idea to have some plan as to what has to be done next, no matter how much you have to do at the moment. (46)
Fourth Crisis Stage
School Age

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Industry
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Inferiority

Derivative I

The individual anticipates achievement in work endeavors, which are a source of pleasure and recognition (A, pp. 74).

Statements:

1. When I have to work, I usually get pretty bored no matter what the job is. (11)
2. When it comes to working, I never do anything I can get out of. (55)
3. I like to tackle a tough job as it gives me a lot of satisfaction to finish it. (59)
4. Working is nothing more than a necessary evil that a person must put up with to eat. (4)

Derivative II

Excessive awareness as well as abhorrence of competition (A, pp. 84).

Statements:

1. I work best when I know my work is going to be compared with the work of others. (9)
2. I don't like sports or games where you always have to try and do better than the next guy. (40)
3. At home, I enjoyed work or spare time activities where I had to compete against others. (69)
4. A person can't be happy in a job where he is always competing against others. (66)

Derivative III

Inability to concentrate on required or suggested tasks (A, pp. 84).

Statements:

1. I cannot keep my mind on one thing. (45)
2. I don't have any trouble concentrating on what I am doing. (65)

3. It's hard to keep your mind on one thing if you really have to. (25)

4. Even though I try, it is usually pretty hard for me to keep my mind on a task or job. (53)

Fifth Crisis Stage
Adolescence

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Ego Identity
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Identity Diffusion

Derivative I

Sense of psychosocial well-being; being at home in one's body (A, pp. 74).

Statements:

1. It is very seldom that I find myself wishing I had a different face or body. (22)

2. I am pretty content to be the way I am. (50)

3. I do not feel that my looks and actions keep me from getting ahead in life. (30)

4. I would get along better in life if I were better looking. (23)

Derivative II

Reconciliation of the conception of one's self and the response or recognition of the community to one (A, pp. 67).

Statements:

1. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others. (56)

2. No one seems to understand me. (2)

3. Even when I do a good job in my work, other people don't seem to realize it or give me credit. (31)

4. I have found that people I work with frequently don't appreciate or seem to understand my abilities. (48)
Derivative III
The individual has a sense or feeling of knowing what his plans and goals are, and where he is headed in the foreseeable future (A, pp. 74).

Statements:

1. It seems as if I just can't decide what I really want to do in life. (26)

2. I feel pretty sure that I know what I want to do in the future and I have some definite goals. (64)

3. I am not sure what I want to do as a lifetime occupation, but I have some pretty definite plans and goals for the next few years. (38)

4. I really don't have any definite goals or plans for the future; I'm content to let the Navy decide what I should do. (18)

Sixth Crisis Stage
Early Adulthood

Criteria for Psychosocial Health: Intimacy
Criteria for Psychosocial Ill-Health: Isolation

Derivative I
The individual maintains and acts upon his values within the influence of a group of friends; recognizes where he ends and others begin.

Statements:

1. I have no difficulty in avoiding people who may get me in trouble. (10)

2. When I'm in a group I find it hard to stand up for my ideas if I think other people won't agree with me. (28)

3. In a group, I can usually stand up for what I think is right without being embarrassed. (34)

4. I can't seem to say no when the group does something which I don't think is right. (36)

Derivative II
The individual seeks and is comfortable in emotionally close relationships.
Statements:

1. I have at least one close friend with whom I can share almost all of my feelings and personal thoughts. (29)

2. Being without close friends is worse than having enemies. (37)

3. In order to feel comfortable or feel at ease, a person must get along with others but he doesn't really need close friends. (43)

4. A person is a lot happier if he doesn't get too close to others. (52)

Derivative III

The individual seeks casual friendships in social settings; he feels comfortable interacting with others in these group settings.

Statements:

1. From what others have told me, I feel I am a person who is very easy to talk to. (7)

2. Although I sometimes feel very strongly about things, I never show other people how I feel. (14)

3. I seem to have the knack or ability to make other people relax and enjoy themselves at a party. (35)

4. For some reason, it seems that I have never really gotten to know the people I have worked with, even though I liked them. (49)
STATEMENT MODIFICATIONS IN THE EGC IDENTITY SCALE

BY STAGE AND DERIVATIVE

This Appendix contains the eleven questions from Rasmussen's Ego Identity Scale which were modified for the purpose of this research project. This Appendix will include: (a) the crisis stage, (b) the derivative, (c) the original statement, and (d) the statement as used in this research project.

First Crisis Stage
Infancy

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Basic Trust
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Mistrust

Derivative III

Attitude on the part of the individual of having missed his opportunity for success; a feeling of having suffered a premature and fatal loss of useful potential.

Original Statement:

16. I am confident that I will be successful in life when I finally decide on a career.

Modified Statement:

16. I am confident that I am/will be successful in life in my chosen career area.

Second Crisis Stage
Early Childhood

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Autonomy
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Shame, Doubt

Derivative II

A sense of independence in that the individual comfortably makes decisions and lives his life without being primarily dependent upon his family for guidance.

Original Statement:

24. At my age a man must make his own decisions, even though his parents might not agree with the things he does.
Modified Statement:

24. At my age a person must make his own decisions, even though his parents might not agree with the things he/she does.

Derivative III

A fear of being shamed or publicly exposed to peers and leaders.

Original Statement:

3. I have a fear of being asked questions in class because of what other people will think if I don't know the answer.

Modified Statement:

3. I have a fear of being asked questions in groups because of what other people will think if I don't know the answer.

Third Crisis Stage

Play Age

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Initiative
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Guilt

Derivative I

Contempt for and tendency to deny background; hostility toward roles considered proper and desirable in one's family or immediate community.

Original Statement:

32. One of the hardest things for a young person to overcome is his family background.

Modified Statement:

32. One of the hardest things for a person to overcome is his family background.

Original Statement:

57. A person who hasn't been a member of a well organized group or club at some time in his teens has missed a lot.

Modified Statement:

57. A person who hasn't been a member of a well organized group or club at some time in his/her life has missed a lot.
Derivative II
Emotionally comfortable role experimentation in adolescent subsocieties, where discipline and boundaries are provided by the group.

Original Statement:

47. During the past few years I have taken little or no part in clubs, organized group activity, or sports.

Modified Statement:

47. During the past few years I have taken little or no part in clubs or organized group activity.

Original Statement:

54. One of the good parts of being a teenager is getting together with a group which makes its own rules and does things as a group.

Modified Statement:

54. One of the good parts of being an adult is getting together with a group which establishes its own guidelines and does things as a group.

Fourth Crisis Stage
School Age

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Industry
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Inferiority

Derivative II

Excessive awareness as well as abhorrence of competition.

Original Statement:

40. I don't like sports or games where you always have to try and do better than the next guy.

Modified Statement:

40. I don't like sports or games where you always have to try and do better than the next person.
Fifth Crisis Stage
Adolescence

Criteria of Psychosocial Health: Ego Identity
Criteria of Psychosocial Ill-Health: Identity Diffusion

Derivative II

Reconciliation of the conception of one's self and the response of recognition of the community to one.

Original Statement:

48. I have found that people I work with frequently don't appreciate or seem to understand my abilities.

Modified Statement:

48. I have found that people with whom I work or associate often don't appreciate or seem to understand my abilities.

Derivative III

The individual has a sense or feeling of knowing what his plans and goals are, and where he is headed in the foreseeable future.

Original Statement:

38. I am not sure what I want to do as a lifetime occupation, but I have some pretty definite plans and goals for the next few years.

Modified Statement:

38. Even though it is difficult to predict how the rest of my life will go, I have some pretty definite plans and goals for the next few years.

Original Statement:

18. I really don't have any definite goals or plans for the future; I'm content to let the Navy decide what I should do.

Modified Statement:

18. I really don't have any definite goals or plans for the future; I'm content to let others decide what I should do.
Ego Identity Scale

Directions: The following statements express opinions and feelings about yourself and life in general. There are no right or wrong answers. If the statement is one with which you AGREE or DISAGREE as it applies to you or what you believe, circle one (1). If you DISAGREE or GENERALLY DISAGREE with the statement, circle two (2). It is important that you answer each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I seem to have regrets when I have to give up my pleasures right now for goals or things I want in the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No one seems to understand me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have a fear of being asked questions in groups because of what other people will think if I don't know the answer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Working is nothing more than a necessary evil that a person must put up with to eat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It doesn't pay to worry much about decisions you have already made.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People are usually honest in dealing with each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. From what others have told me, I feel I am a person who is very easy to talk to.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When given a job, I try never to get so tied up in what I am doing at the moment so as to lose sight of what comes next.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I work best when I know my work is going to be compared with the work of others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have no difficulty in avoiding people who may get me in trouble.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When I have to work, I usually get pretty bored no matter what the job is.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It doesn't worry me if I make a mistake in front of my friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The decisions I have made in the past have usually been the right ones.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rasmussen, 1961
14. Although I sometimes feel very strongly about things, I never show other people how I feel.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

15. After I do something I usually worry about whether it was the right thing.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

16. I am confident that I am/will be successful in life in my chosen career area.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

17. It's best not to let other people know too much about your family or background if you can help it.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

18. I really don't have any definite goals or plans for the future; I'm content to let others decide what I should do.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

19. I never enjoyed taking part in school clubs or student government activity.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

20. If I am not careful people try to take advantage of me.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

21. In general, people can be trusted.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

22. It is very seldom that I find myself wishing I had a different face or body.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

23. I would get along better in life if I were better looking.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

24. At my age a person must make his/her own decisions, even though her/his parents might nor agree with the things he/she does.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

25. It's not hard to keep your mind on one thing if you really have to.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

26. It seems as if I just can't decide what I really want to do in life.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

27. I am always busy doing something, but I seem to accomplish less than other people even though they don't work as hard as I do.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2

28. When I'm in a group I find it hard to stand up for my ideas if I think other people won't agree with me.  
AGREE: 1  
DISAGREE: 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I have at least one close friend with whom I can share almost all of my feelings and personal thoughts.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I do not feel that my looks and actions keep me from getting ahead in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Even when I do a good job in my work, other people don't seem to realize it or give me credit.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>One of the hardest things for a person to overcome is his family background.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>The best part of my life is still ahead of me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>In a group I can usually stand up for what I think is right without being embarrassed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I seem to have the knack or ability to make other people relax and enjoy themselves at a party.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>I can't seem to say no when the group does something which I don't think is right.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Being without close friends is worse than having enemies.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Even though it is difficult to predict how the rest of my life will go, I have some pretty definite plans and goals for the next few years.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>It is easier to make friends with people you like if they don't know too much about your background.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I don't like sports or games where you always have to try and do better than the next person.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>A person who can be trusted is hard to find.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I believe that I must make my own decisions in important matters, as no one can live my life for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>In order to be comfortable or feel at ease, a person must get along with others but he doesn't really need close friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I am proud of my family background.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45. I cannot keep my mind on one thing.  
46. It is a good idea to have some plan as to what has to be done next, no matter how much you have to do at the moment.  
47. During the past few years I have taken little or no part in clubs or organized group activity.  
48. I have found that people with whom I work or associate, often don't appreciate or seem to understand my abilities.  
49. For some reason, it seems that I have never really gotten to know the people I have worked with, even though I liked them.  
50. I am pretty content to be the way I am.  
51. I can't stand to wait for things I really want.  
52. A person is a lot happier if he/she doesn't get too close to others.  
53. Even though I try, it is usually pretty hard for me to keep my mind on a task or job.  
54. One of the good parts of being an adult is getting together with a group which establishes its own guidelines and does things as a group.  
55. When it comes to working, I never do anything I can get out of.  
56. My way of doing things is apt to be misunderstood by others.  
57. A person who hasn't been a member of a well organized group or club at some time in his/her life has missed a lot.  
58. When I think about my future, I feel I have missed my best chances for making good.  
59. I like to tackle a tough job as it gives me a lot of satisfaction to finish it.  
60. I am always busy but it seems that I am usually spinning my wheels and never seem to get anywhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>It is very important that your parents approve of everything you do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>It doesn't bother me when my friends find out that I can't do certain things as well as other people.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>As a rule, I don't regret the decisions I make.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I feel pretty sure that I know what I want to do in the future and I have some definite goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>I don't have any trouble concentrating on what I am doing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>A person can't be happy in a job where he/she is always competing against others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>I feel I have missed my opportunity to really be a success in life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>If a person wants something worth while he/she should be willing to wait for it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>At home, I enjoyed work or spare time activities where I had to compete against others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>I never make any important decisions without getting help or advice from my family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>It is better to say nothing in public than to take a chance on other people hearing you make a mistake.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>I lose interest in things if I have to wait too long to get them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>19. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>20. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>21. __</td>
<td>39. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>22. X</td>
<td>40. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. X</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>23. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. X</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>24. X</td>
<td>42. X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. X</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>25. X</td>
<td>43. ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. X</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>26. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>27. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. X</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>28. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>29. ___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. X</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>31. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>32. ___</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>33. ___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. X</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>34. ___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. ___</td>
<td>__</td>
<td>35. ___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. ___</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>36. ___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constantinople College Scale

Below are listed several items which students have indicated are goals for them during their university years. Thinking back over your university career and using the following 5 point scale, rate each item on its importance as a goal toward which you have actually been working during your university career. Please be sure to rate each item:

5 = Very important
4 = Important
3 = Average importance
2 = Unimportant
1 = Very unimportant

1. Learning how to learn from books and teachers  5 4 3 2 1
2. Acquiring an appreciation of ideas  5 4 3 2 1
3. Establishing your own moral, personal, and spiritual values  5 4 3 2 1
4. Developing relationships with the opposite sex  5 4 3 2 1
5. Contributing in a distinguished, meaningful manner to some campus group  5 4 3 2 1
6. Developing your ability to understand and get along with persons of other cultures, races, and religions  5 4 3 2 1
7. Becoming self-confident  5 4 3 2 1
8. Personal independence  5 4 3 2 1
9. Finding a spouse  5 4 3 2 1
10. Achieving academic distinction  5 4 3 2 1
11. Having many good friends  5 4 3 2 1
12. Discovering your own strong points and limitations  5 4 3 2 1
13. Preparing for a career which begins right after graduation  5 4 3 2 1
14. Preparing for a career which requires further study beyond the B.A. or B.S.  5 4 3 2 1

Constantinople, 1967
FAMILY SYSTEM QUESTIONNAIRE

VERSION C

BY

Donald S. Williamson, Ph.D., James H. Bray, Ph.D.,
David M. Harvey, Ph.D., Paul E. Malone, Ph.D.

The following questions ask about your CURRENT relationships with your parents and your most significant other (e.g., spouse, steady friend, lover). Please select the answers which best reflect your current relationships with these people. There are no right or wrong answers. Place your answers on the Answer Sheet provided. Do not mark on the Questionnaire. Remember: Give the answer that best applies to you.

If you are not married answer the questions below as they would apply to your relationship with your most important, current significant other (i.e., mate, steady friend, lover). If you do not have a significant other, then answer the questions as they might apply to your most likely or most recent significant other. In all questions that refer to marriage think of your most likely or most recent significant other.

If one or both of your parents are deceased, then answer the questions about your deceased parent(s) in terms of how you remember or imagined your relationship(s) to be.

Please answer all questions as best you can. Place your answer in the appropriate place on the Answer Sheet.

For questions 1 to 8 use the following scales to rate the Quality and Satisfaction with the following relationships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of your relationship with:
1. Your significant other
2. Your mother
3. Your father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Satisfaction with your relationship with:
4. Your significant other
5. Your mother
6. Your father

How satisfied are you with the frequency of contact (letter, phone, in person) which you have with your:
7. Mother
8. Father

How often do you feel you must modify your behavior to meet your parents' expectations concerning your work, marriage, etc.?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all the time</td>
<td>most of the time</td>
<td>half the time</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. To meet my mother's expectations concerning my school/work, I feel I must modify my behavior.

10. To meet my father's expectations concerning my school/work, I feel I must modify my behavior.

11. To meet my mother's expectations concerning my marriage, I feel I must modify my behavior.

12. To meet my father's expectations concerning my marriage, I feel I must modify my behavior.

13. To meet my mother's expectations concerning my appearance, I feel I must modify my behavior.

14. To meet my father's expectations concerning my appearance, I feel I must modify my behavior.

15. To meet my mother's expectations concerning my life style, I feel I must modify my behavior.

16. To meet my father's expectations concerning my life style, I feel I must modify my behavior.

Use the following scale to answer items 17 to 58:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I usually help my parents understand me by telling them how I think, feel, and believe.
18. I sometimes wonder how much my parents really love me.

19. I get together with my mother from time to time for conversation and recreation.

20. I get together with my father from time to time for conversation and recreation.

21. I often get so emotional with my parents that I cannot think straight.

22. I share my true feelings with my mother about the significant events in my life.

23. I share my true feelings with my father about the significant events in my life.

24. I worry that my parents cannot take care of themselves when I am not around.

25. I can trust my mother with things we share.

26. I can trust my father with things we share.

27. I am fair in my relationships with my mother.

28. I am fair in my relationships with my father.

29. I am usually able to disagree with my parents without losing my temper.

30. My parents do things that embarrass me.

31. I openly show tenderness toward my mother.

32. I openly show tenderness toward my father.

33. My mother and I have mutual respect for each other.

34. My father and I have mutual respect for each other.

35. I am fond of my mother.

36. I am fond of my father.

37. My parents say one thing to me and really mean another.

38. My father and I are important people in each other's lives.

39. My parents frequently try to change some aspect of my personality.

40. My mother and I are important people in each other's lives.
41. My present day problems would be fewer or less severe if my parents had acted or behaved differently.

Questions 42-58 have to do with your relationship with your significant other (mate, steady friend, lover). If you do not have a significant other, then answer the questions as they might apply to your most likely or most recent significant other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 strongly agree</th>
<th>2 agree</th>
<th>3 neutral</th>
<th>4 disagree</th>
<th>5 strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

42. My sex life with my significant other is quite satisfactory.

43. My significant other and I have many interests which we choose to share.

44. My significant other and I frequently talk together about the significant events in our lives.

45. My significant other and I like to get together for conversation and recreation.

46. My significant other and I can trust each other with the things that we tell one another.

47. My significant other and I frequently show tenderness with each other.

48. My significant other and I are fair in our relationship with each other.

49. My significant other and I have mutual respect for each other.

50. My significant other and I are fond of each other.

51. I am usually able to disagree with my significant other without losing my temper.

52. My significant other is usually able to disagree with me without losing his/her temper.

53. My significant other worries that I cannot take care of myself when he/she is not around.

54. I worry that my significant other cannot take care of himself/herself when I am not around.

55. I often get so emotional with my significant other that I cannot think straight.

56. My significant other often gets so emotional with me that he/she cannot think straight.
57. I feel my significant other says one thing to me and really means another.

58. My significant other feels that I say one thing to him/her and really mean another.
SCORING KEY FOR PAFS SUBSCALES

SPFUS

51. 6-
52. 6-
53.
54.
55.
56.
57.
58.

Add all items. Subtract from six where indicated. Higher score = more significant other individuation.

SPINT

1.
4.
42.
43.
44.
45.
46.
47.
48.
49.
50.

Add all items for scale. Subtract sum from 66. The different is the scale score. Higher score = more significant other intimacy.

INFUS

17.
18.
21.
24.
29. 6-
30.
37.
39.
41.

Subtract from 6 where indicated. Sum. Higher score = more intergenerational inviduation.

INTIM

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Sum scores. Higher score = less intergenerational intimidation
ININT

2
3
5
6
7
8
19
20
22
23
25
26
27
28
31
32
33
34
35
36
38
40

Sum scores - subtract total from 150. Higher score = more intergenerational intimacy.

Bray, Williamson, & Malone, 1984
Table 1

Crosstabulations of Goal One and High Identity-Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 1.72787  D.F. 2  Significance .4215

Goal 1. "Learning how to learn from books and teachers" (Constantinople, 1969)
### Table 2

Crosstabulations of Goal Two and High Identity Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Identity</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Identity</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Total</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Column Percent</strong></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.17705</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.0276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal 2. "Acquiring an appreciation of ideas" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 3
Crosstabulations of Goal Four and High Identity-Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity (ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity (EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 2.52349  D.F. 2  Significance .2832

Goal 4. "Developing relationship with the opposite sex" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 4
Crosstabulations of Goal Five and High Identity-Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square: 2.71180, D.F.: 2, Significance: .2577

Goal 5. "Contributing in a distinguished, meaningful manner to some campus group" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 5

Crosstabulations of Goal Six and High Identity-Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 3.36462  D.F. 2  Significance .1859

Goal 6. "Developing your ability to understand and get along with persons of other cultures, races, and religions" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 6
Crosstabulations of Goal Seven and High Identity-Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity (ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity (EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square: 5.58950  D.F.: 2  Significance: .0611

Goal 7. "Becoming self-confident" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 7

Crosstabulations of Goal Eight and High Identity-Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 5.62828
D.F. 2
Significance .0600

Goal 8. "Personal independence" (Constantinople, 1967)
### Table 8

**Crosstabulations of Goal Nine and High Identity-Low Identity Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity (ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity (EXPR, UDIF)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square: 0.88313  
D.F.: 2  
Significance: .6430

Table 9

Crosstabulations of Goal Eleven and High Identity-Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity (ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity (EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square 0.91939 D.F. 2 Significance .7315

Goal Eleven. "Having many good friends" (Constantinople, 1967)
Table 10

Crosstabulations of Goal Twelve and High Identity - Low Identity Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>High Importance</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Identity (ANDRO, INST)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Identity (EXPR, UDIFF)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Percent</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square | D.F. | Significance
12.07357 | 2    | .0024

Goal Twelve. "Discovering your own strong points and limitations" (Constantinople, 1967)
The vita has been removed from the scanned document