

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1998

Living arrangement as a predictor of identity achievement and adjustment to college

Mark Joseph Mach

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mach, Mark Joseph, "Living arrangement as a predictor of identity achievement and adjustment to college" (1998). *Theses Digitization Project*. 1564.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/1564>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

LIVING ARRANGEMENT AS A PREDICTOR OF IDENTITY ACHIEVEMENT
AND ADJUSTMENT TO COLLEGE

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
Psychology

by
Mark Joseph Mach

June 1998

LIVING ARRANGEMENT AS A PREDICTOR OF IDENTITY ACHIEVEMENT
AND ADJUSTMENT TO COLLEGE

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Mark Joseph Mach
June 1998

Approved by:


Eugene Wong, Chair, Psychology

5/20/98
Date


Jodie Ullman


David Chavez

ABSTRACT

Past research has not established empirical links between living arrangement, identity achievement, and adjustment to college. This study examined the associations of living arrangement on the identity achievement and adjustment to college of first-year college students. Additionally, peers and faculty were expected to influence identity development and adjustment to college in late adolescent college students. It was hypothesized that students living independently, away from home, would have higher scores on identity achievement than students living at home. These students living away from home were furthermore expected to report more peer and faculty support, and this was also expected to be associated with identity achievement and adjustment to college. It was found that social adjustment was significant for the students living away from the parental home, while ego-identity status was significant for the students living at the parental home. Significance was not found for academic and personal-emotional adjustment. Strengths and weaknesses of the present design, as well as future directions for research, are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to Eugene Wong for his guidance, assistance, encouragement, and patience from day one, in helping me to formulate what was once just an idea, into the fulfilling reality of a completed thesis project; Jodie Ullman for her statistical wizardry, without whom the analyses in this project would have proved a severe hardship; and David Chavez, for his support and encouragement in enabling me to see the "applied" part of my project. I would also like to thank the Associated Students Incorporated of California State University, San Bernardino for their grant contributing to my professional development. Finally, I wish to acknowledge all of my former professors in the Department of Psychology at California State University, San Bernardino with whom I had the privilege of being a student in their enlightening classes, and without whom, there would be no project. Thank you: Eugene, Jodie, David, Joanna, Chuck, Bob C., Ken, Stacy, and Jan P.--and a special thanks also goes out to Bob R. for having enough faith in me back in the spring of 1996 to welcome me into the life-span program. Thank you all--it has been quite a memorable journey.

To my family, both near and far

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
INTRODUCTION	1
Identity Development	2
Social Interaction	5
Faculty Contact	8
The Influence of Living Arrangement	10
The Current Study	14
METHOD	16
Participants	16
Measures	16
Procedure	18
RESULTS	20
Descriptive Statistics	20
Assumptions and Analysis	22
Outliers and Normality	23
Treatment of Missing Data	24
Main Analysis	24
DISCUSSION	30
Confirmed Findings	30
Unexpected Findings	30
Strengths of the Study	35

Improvements and Future Directions	39
APPENDIX A: Living Arrangement and Amount of Time Spent On-Campus, with Friends, and with Faculty	44
APPENDIX B: Informed Consent Form	45
APPENDIX C: Demographic Questionnaire	46
APPENDIX D: Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire	47
APPENDIX E: My Friends Questionnaire	51
APPENDIX F: Teacher Interactions Questionnaire	53
APPENDIX G: Eom-Eis Questionnaire	55
APPENDIX H: Debriefing Statement	58
ENDNOTES	59
REFERENCES	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Gender and Ethnic Diversity of Sample	20
Table 2.	Gender, Ethnicity, and Living Arrangement	21
Table 3.	Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables	22
Table 4.	Univariate and Stepdown Tests of Significance	27
Table 5.	Pooled-Within Cell Correlations Among Dependent Variables with Standard Deviations On Diagonal	29

INTRODUCTION

Issues of college student adjustment have been extensively reviewed in recent literature (e.g., Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994; Panori, Wong, Kennedy, & King, 1995) and a well-validated and replicable measurement of college student adjustment has been with us for more than a decade (Baker & Siryk, 1984). Identity issues are also thoroughly reviewed in the literature (e.g., Erikson, 1968; Chickering, 1969; Bennion & Adams, 1986). Late adolescence is a critical time in the establishment of a mature, coherent, and well-integrated identity. Therefore, it follows that identity development will be important in the lives of traditional first-year college students, who are themselves in late adolescence. Erikson (1968) examined the identity processes of adolescents and young adults, and he described them as struggling to form a sense of purpose, values, and beliefs. Chickering (1969) stated that establishment of an identity is one of seven vectors of college student development and in order to explore this issue, Bennion & Adams (1986) have developed a comprehensive ego identity measurement scale that assesses ego identity status specifically in a college student population.

The criticism of previous research lies in that although there has been an empirical link made between the

reciprocal influences of identity and adjustment on college student development (e.g., Lapsley, Rice, & Fitzgerald, 1990), researchers have not investigated other possible empirical links. For example, little research has examined associations among identity achievement, specific living arrangements (e.g., living by oneself or with non-relatives versus living with parents or relatives), and adjustment to college. The purpose of this project is to examine this association among first-year college students. Further, this project considers group differences in social interactions and faculty support among those students living at home versus those students not living at home.

Identity Development

Erikson (1959, 1968) believed that identity issues become salient in adolescence, as individuals attempt to make a successful transition from childhood to the responsibilities of adulthood. He suggested that individuals progress through four stages of ego identity development, all of which include both social and personal identity aspects (Cheek & Briggs, 1982). According to Erikson (1959, 1968), the four stages of identity development are particularly salient during late adolescence (i.e., the first year of college for many individuals). A foreclosed individual has obtained an identity based solely

on commitment to a choice but no exploration of alternatives; an example is a student who decides to major in a certain subject only because his father majored in it and told his son that he should also major in it. A diffused individual does not experience identity achievement due to a lack of identity exploration; thus, a student who is an undeclared major and who has no plans to search for a possible major can be considered diffused. Moratorium results in lack of identity formation due to exploration of possible choices, but no commitment; an example is a student who is undeclared but actively trying to decide on a major by taking classes in a variety of subject areas, consulting their academic advisor on a regular basis, and taking career assessment tests. Finally, an individual who has obtained identity achievement has explored alternatives and made a commitment based on these alternatives; an example is a student who decides to major in a certain subject after taking classes from many disciplines, consulting with their academic advisor, and taking career assessment inventories. Erikson (1959, 1968) believed that an individual can only reach identity achievement through the active exploration of alternatives found in the moratorium stage.

While Erikson (1959, 1968) did not stipulate that foreclosure was indicative of lower identity achievement

than diffusion, researchers have empirically demonstrated that a foreclosed individual is on the lowest level, followed by diffusion, then moratorium, and finally identity achievement. A study of 86 college students by Marcia (1966, 1980), who devised a questionnaire using Erikson's (1959, 1968) conceptualization of ego identity formation, found that of all the groups, the identity foreclosed group demonstrated the most vulnerable self-esteem and weakest ego strength. On the other hand, the identity achieved group demonstrated the most ego strength of all four groups.

Identity achievement in college seems to parallel Erikson's (1959, 1968) stages of ego identity development. According to Lapsley, Rice, & FitzGerald (1990), freshmen scored higher on measures of personal identity than did upperclassmen; this may indicate that most freshmen are identity foreclosed, meaning that they have made a premature commitment to identity formation, while most upperclassmen are in moratorium, meaning that they are starting to explore alternative life choices and are closer to obtaining identity achievement than freshmen are. Lapsley, Rice, & FitzGerald (1990) believe that this result is a product of exposure to college life, with prior beliefs and values being challenged and demanding further exploration.

Bennion & Adams (1986) recognized the value of Marcia's

identity status interview (1966, 1980) in assessing ego identity status in a college student population, but felt that these interview methods were too time consuming to conduct and did not provide enough objectivity in assessment. Furthermore, self-report questionnaires that measured ego identity status (e.g., Adams, Shea, & Fitch, 1979) were not comprehensive enough to ensure adequate reliability across many replications. Therefore, Bennion & Adams (1986) developed a more comprehensive, empirically validated and replicable 64-item self-report measure of ego identity status for use with late adolescent college students. Using factor analysis, these researchers found that identity achievement and foreclosure loaded on two separate factors; however, moratorium and diffusion merged on the third factor. Bennion & Adams (1986) reported that this latter finding has been observed in past research results, basing this rationale on the possibility of an absence of clearly diffused students in a college sample. The researchers point out the benefit of using this self-report measure based on ease of scoring and coding data.

Social Interaction

According to numerous researchers, the social interactions of college students is fast becoming an important predictor of subsequent adjustment to the college

environment and identity development (e.g., Mallinckrodt, 1988; Pantages & Creedon, 1978). Included in social adjustment is the formation of a new social support network and managing new social freedoms, implying that these social factors revolve primarily around friendship and peer support (Gerdes & Mallinckrodt, 1994). Hays & Oxley (1986) found that social support networks are an extremely important component of college student adjustment. They found an increase in the intimacy of the social networks of freshmen who had moved away from home into an on-campus residence, although initially these campus residents' social networks were less intimate than students who lived at home. This illustrates the potential benefits of on-campus residential living for the formation of social support networks and as a subsequent predictor of adjustment to college. Although on-campus residents may initially have a lower social support network, lower identity achievement, and a difficult time in adjusting to college, the long-term benefits for these students may be very positive in terms of identity achievement and adjustment to college.

One of the possible reasons behind the seemingly positive benefits of on-campus living may be the continuous exposure to the social elements of college life. This exposure also might help to explain why initial social

support in a college residence hall may be detrimental to the identity achievement and adjustment of the college student. That is, the social contacts that freshmen make during the first few months of college may either be consolidated into friendship later on in college, or these social contacts may be only temporary exposures to the types of friendships these freshmen may later decide to pursue. Hays (1985) found that there are both costs and benefits in friendship development. Implied here is the possibility that initial friendship development will not always be a good predictor of subsequent formation of a social support network. In other words, friends are not necessarily always going to be considered a social support system. In fact, Hays (1985) found that as a social support system such as a friendship developed, the more likely it was that the members of the friendship would report increased emotional aggravation. Other researchers (e.g., Heller, 1979) have also found that interpersonal relationships such as friendships are not only sources of potential support, but also of potential stress. Hays' (1985) study and the work of Heller (1979) implies that stressful friendships may have deleterious consequences for identity achievement and adjustment to college in first-year college students.

Faculty Contact

In addition to friendships, faculty support may also be a potentially positive source of support for college freshmen. Lampert (1993) reviewed studies that have shown the many positive benefits associated with student-faculty interactions. These interactions have shown to be predictive of increases in personal identity in college students (Bowen, 1977). Likewise, Newman and Newman (1978) found that the amount of interaction between students and faculty directly influences identity formation in college students. According to Feldman and Newcomb (1969), the influences of students and faculty complement and reinforce each other. That is, as students develop high quality relationships with faculty, the students become more influenced by the faculty in terms of both faculty attitudes and socialization mechanisms; correspondingly, faculty also become more influenced by students as the student-faculty relationship improves and progresses. Indeed, this reciprocal beneficial relationship may form the basis for future high quality faculty-student interactions. Pascarella, Terenzini, & Hibel (1978) have found that informal interaction with faculty may override negative peer influences. That is, faculty might serve as a social support network that may compensate for any possible

negative effects that the general peer culture has on the college student. For example, a student who feels uncomfortable at a university may develop a compensating strategy for dealing with such adversity by bonding with a faculty member who is able to serve as a mentor, advisor, and even a friend. Thus, these students may be able to experience more optimal adjustment to their new college environment, as well as the further identity achievement that friendship from faculty can bring.

However, Endo and Harpel (1981) have stressed that formal interactions between faculty and students might not necessarily have a positive outcome on the resiliency of students during the initial period of adjusting to the college environment. In their study, the results of friendly interaction positively affected nine of fourteen student outcomes, but formal interactions positively affected only two of fourteen outcomes, while having neither positive or negative outcomes for the other twelve outcomes. According to Endo & Harpel (1981), friendly interactions cover a broader range of issues than do formal contacts. For example, these interactions focus on conversation topics that are not limited to classroom etiquette, projects, tests, papers, etc. Formal interactions consist of the traditional "barrier" between faculty and students, meaning

that the dividing line between faculty and students is sharply drawn and defined. There is no real possibility of friendship with formal interactions, since this type of interaction between the faculty and students is never congruent; students are considered subordinates to the superiority of a faculty member in a formal interaction situation. The authors further indicate that formal interactions between students and faculty are much more common in professional versus liberal arts programs. Therefore, the type of program that a first-year student is enrolled in, or the academic philosophy of the college, could have negative consequences for identity achievement and subsequent adjustment to college.

The Influence of Living Arrangement

Relatively little research has examined how living arrangement influences adjustment to college, and no known literature has investigated the effects of living arrangement on corresponding identity achievement in college students. Hays & Oxley (1986) have come the closest to investigating one of these empirical links. They found that while freshmen students living in on-campus dormitories initially had difficulty adjusting to college, by the end of the quarter (12 weeks), the overall adjustment of these students had improved and superseded those of their commuter

classmates. Conversely, while commuter students living at home with their parents also initially experienced poor adjustment to the new college environment, the overall adjustment of these commuter students was still low by the end of the quarter. Hays & Oxley (1986) attributed this to the possibility that the decision to live at home while attending college may reflect a lessor commitment to college life. The authors infer that the social networks of commuter students, comprised mainly of friends and relatives not attending college, do not provide the new college student with adequate social support because its members are uninvolved in college life and therefore do not have empathy for the adjustment issues that new college students face. Further, Hays & Oxley (1986) found that interactions with social networks in work settings were negatively correlated with college student adjustment. That is, a primary social network that consists only of family and work friends may compete or devalue the role requirements of students adjusting to college (Hays & Oxley, 1986).

In related work examining the possible negative consequences for college students who continue to rely solely on parental support, Hoffman (1984) found that college students who deliberately tried to obtain complete psychological independence from their parents exhibited

better personal adjustment to college. Female students who exhibited greater conflictual independence from both parents, meaning that they obtained independence out of overt parent-child conflict, were found to have obtained optimal personal adjustment to college. However, the results for male students were less clear and not statistically significant. Male students' over-reliance on parental emotional support seemed to lead to a more difficult time in adjusting to college. Some studies (e.g., Lapsley, Rice, & Fitzgerald, 1990) have found that optimal adjustment to college may be predicted by strong parental attachment. That is, late adolescent college students who can use their family as a secure base for social and emotional support when they need it, may actually be more successful in accomplishing the transition to college. However, Lapsley, Rice, & FitzGerald (1990) did not specify whether or not these students were necessarily living at home with their parents. That is, this study did not clearly state whether or not a specific living arrangement influenced adjustment to college.

It is also possible to draw a casual connection between the living arrangement of students and their subsequent identity achievement. For example, freshmen living at home may represent Erikson's (1959, 1968) concept of identity

foreclosure; these students may be unwilling to submit their forming identity to uncertainty and anxiety by living in the unknown environment of a residential college campus. On the other hand, freshmen living away from home may be closer to establishing Erikson's concept of identity achievement based on the possibility that they are more willing to trade the known security and comfort at home for the uncertainty and strangeness of college residential life. This premise makes sense when based on Erikson's (1959, 1968) belief that identity foreclosure occurs when the adolescent unquestionably accepts and incorporates parental input into their own personal identity; perhaps by accepting a parental invitation to continue living at home, the adolescent is in fact foreclosing on their identity. Identity achievement is only possible through struggling with many alternative options and involves considerable struggle and uncertainty. This process of identity achievement therefore seems more likely to occur outside of the adolescent's parental home. Although the process toward identity achievement is far more likely to cause anxiety and insecurity in the immediate future, it is also more likely to result in less anxiety and insecurity in the long-term future, as the adolescent passes into adulthood.

The Current Study

The effects of different living arrangements on the subsequent identity achievement and corresponding adjustment to college among first-year college students will be examined. First, it is expected that first-year college students who are living away from home, off-campus with other non-relatives, in addition to on-campus residents, will score higher on measured levels of identity versus students living at home with their parents. Second, it is expected that students who are living away from home will score higher on measured levels of adjustment to college versus their counterparts who are living at home. Students who are living off-campus with non-relatives or in on-campus dormitories are expected to score higher on measured levels of identity and adjustment because their living arrangement encourages independence, due to less reliance solely on parental support and more on peer and faculty support, which fosters a mature identity achievement. Successful identity achievement might be related to the students' selection of a compatible program of study and his/her performance; therefore measures of academic adjustment could be higher for this particular group. Students who have successfully achieved a mature identity should also be able to better balance the often times conflicting demands of academic and

social life, thereby contributing to optimal social adjustment. The acceptance by the identity achieved individual of their own strengths and weaknesses should furthermore contribute to a strong sense of personal adjustment. Living arrangement is therefore expected to be associated with identity achievement and adjustment to college. There are also expected to be group differences in social interactions and faculty support among students in various living arrangements.

METHOD

Participants

During winter quarter, first-year college students were informed about the proposed study by recruitment flyers posted around the campus, in addition to announcements made in lower-division psychology courses. All students who signed up for the proposed study were asked to come into the laboratory at the specified time on the recruitment flyer. Data collection took place between mid-January and mid-April 1998. There were 77 participants. Students were 18-26 years old ($M=18.84$, $S=1.37$).

Measures

Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ; Baker & Siryk, 1984). Adjustment to college was measured by students' score on the SACQ. Using Cronbach's alpha (1951), Baker & Siryk (1984) reported reliability indices of .92-.94 for the full scale. Cronbach's alpha for the academic adjustment subscale ranged from .82-.87; the social adjustment subscale ranged from .83-.89; personal emotional subscale ranged from .73-.79; and the general subscale ranged from .84-.88 (Baker & Siryk, 1984). The advantage of using this particular measurement was that it is divided into four subscales (e.g., academic, social, and personal adjustment to college), therefore making it more

generalizable in assessing adjustment to college, since the domains evaluate several components of adjustment. The SACQ is a 67-item self-report measure. Participants responded to the statements in this questionnaire with a 9-point Likert scale format (e.g., "applies very closely to me" to "doesn't apply that me at all"). Higher scores on the scales represented better overall adjustment to college.

Revised Version of the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Status (EOM-EIS; Bennion & Adams, 1986). This scale was developed to assess ego identity formation in a college student population. Cronbach's alphas indicated marginal internal consistency for the ideological and interpersonal subscales; alphas ranged from .62-.75 on the ideology subscale and .60-.80 on the interpersonal subscale (Bennion & Adams, 1986). Participants responded to the statements in this questionnaire on a 6-point Likert scale format (e.g., "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"). This assessment measured the self-reported ego identity status of late adolescent college students and classified them as having obtained identity achievement, identity foreclosure, identity moratorium, or identity diffusion.

Extra-Class Communication Inventory (ECC; Fusani, 1994). The ECC was used to measure faculty support. Using a self-report survey, students responded to 18 items on a 5

point scale, ranging from strongly disagree (1), to strongly agree (4), and not applicable (5). The inventory assessed the frequency and number of interactions students have with faculty. The items focus on visits related or unrelated to course work, personal problems, and socialization with the faculty and exhibiting positive affect for the instructor. Cronbach's alphas indicated that the student inventory achieved a total alpha of .83 with immediacy, satisfactory, and shyness subscales achieving reliabilities of .80, .85, and .85, respectively.

My Friends (Wiest, 1992). This 23-item, 4-point Likert scale was used to measure peer support. Wiest (1992) originally developed the scale for measuring friendship in high school. Students responded to the statements based upon their own beliefs about what their friends think about them. This scale had not been adapted as a measure of peer support at the college level, so preliminary analyses determined its reliability for a college sample. Cronbach's alpha for this measure of peer support was .64.

Procedure

Data collection commenced in mid-January and continued through mid-April 1998. Data collection prior to this time period would not have allowed for the effects of living arrangement to be apparent. Data collected after

this time period was expected to introduce a number of problems into the study. For example, since adjustment to college is affected by time lapsed between initial college enrollment and subsequent adjustment assessment, it was imperative that the data for the study be collected relatively early during the school year.

Participants arrived at the laboratory or classroom at the appointed time to fill out the set of questionnaires. The total time allotted to complete the questionnaires was 60 minutes. Participants were instructed by the researcher to have a seat in one of the available chairs. The instructions were delivered orally to the students. The instructions informed the participants that they had up to 60 minutes to complete the questionnaires and should use only the materials that have been provided for them (i.e., the questionnaires and pencil). Each participant was told that they would be allowed to leave the experiment only after they had checked out with the experimenter.

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic information regarding gender and the ethnic makeup of this sample is given in Table 1. As depicted in Table 1, women represented an overwhelming majority in this study. The breakdown on ethnicity shows a well balanced and representative sample.

TABLE 1

GENDER AND ETHNIC DIVERSITY OF SAMPLE

Total N = 77

Gender

Male:	n = 15 (19.5%)
Female:	n = 62 (80.5%)

Ethnicity

Latino:	n = 22 (28.6%)
White:	n = 15 (19.4%)
African-American:	n = 14 (18.2%)
Asian-American:	n = 12 (15.6%)
Declined to state:	n = 8 (10.4%)
Other:	n = 6 (7.8%)

In Table 2, the distributions of gender, ethnicity, and living arrangement are provided. As shown in Table 2, women represented 78.8% of the students living at their parent's home, and 84.0% of the students living away from their parent's home. About 21% of White students and 19% of Asian-American students resided at their parent's home, while 20% of African-American students and 32% of Latino students lived away from their parent's home.

TABLE 2

GENDER, ETHNICITY, AND LIVING ARRANGEMENT

Total N = 77

Gender:

<u>Parent's Home (n = 52)</u>		<u>Away from Parent's Home (n = 25)</u>	
Female:	n = 41 (78.8%)	Female:	n = 21 (84.0%)
Male:	n = 11 (21.2%)	Male:	n = 4 (16.0%)

Ethnicity:

<u>Parent's Home (n = 52)</u>		<u>Away from Parent's Home (n = 25)</u>	
Latino:	n = 14 (26.9%)	Latino:	n = 8 (32.0%)
White:	n = 11 (21.2%)	African-Am.:	n = 5 (20.0%)
Asian-Am.:	n = 10 (19.2%)	White:	n = 4 (16.0%)
African-Am.:	n = 9 (17.3%)	Declined:	n = 4 (16.0%)
Declined:	n = 4 (7.7%)	Asian-Am:	n = 2 (8.0%)
Other:	n = 4 (7.7%)	Other:	n = 2 (8.0%)

As shown in Table 3, the overall mean for ego-identity status was higher for the group of students living at their parent's home. Students living at their parent's home were more likely to be classified as identity achieved vs. students living away from their parent's home. The overall mean for social adjustment was higher for the group of students living away from their parent's home. Similarly, students living away from the parental home scored higher on personal and academic adjustment than did students living with their parents.

TABLE 3

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Living at Parent's Home (n = 52)

DV:	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Range
-----	------	-----------	------	------	-------

Ego-identity status	55.33	8.63	28	75	47
---------------------	-------	------	----	----	----

Academic Adjustment	143.04	29.56	52	193	141
---------------------	--------	-------	----	-----	-----

Personal Adjustment	82.73	22.89	18	126	108
---------------------	-------	-------	----	-----	-----

Social Adjustment	115.06	22.11	77	170	93
-------------------	--------	-------	----	-----	----

Living Away from Parent's Home (n = 25)

DV:	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Range
-----	------	-----------	------	------	-------

Ego-identity status	49.56	10.81	26	66	40
---------------------	-------	-------	----	----	----

Academic Adjustment	151.76	25.76	94	206	112
---------------------	--------	-------	----	-----	-----

Personal Adjustment	86.32	20.54	41	123	82
---------------------	-------	-------	----	-----	----

Social Adjustment	130.64	20.46	92	162	70
-------------------	--------	-------	----	-----	----

Assumptions and Analysis

A between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance was performed on four dependent variables: ego-identity status and three levels of adjustment to college (academic adjustment, social adjustment, and personal adjustment). The independent variable was living arrangement with two

levels (living at parent's home and living away from parent's home). All students living away from home (whether on campus or off campus) were collapsed into one category.

Prior to the main analysis, the ego-identity status variable and the three levels of adjustment were examined through SPSS 7.5 for accuracy of data entry, missing values, and evidence of support for the assumptions of multivariate analysis within each level of the independent variable. The total N of 77 was examined in two separate groups for the 52 students who lived at their parent's home and the 25 students who lived either in on-campus dormitories or off-campus housing away from their parent's home.

Outliers and Normality

One case in the group of participants who were living at the parent's home was found to be a significant univariate outlier on faculty support, raw score = 1.00, $z = -4.926$, $p < .001$. This participant had an extremely low raw score for the item on faculty support. Analyses were run with and without the outlier. Using Mahalanobis distance with a critical probability of $p < .001$, no significant multivariate outliers were found. Results of evaluation of assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices, linearity, and multicollinearity were satisfactory (Tabachnick & Fidell,

1996).

Treatment of Missing Data

Because most of the participants in this sample lived at home with parents, the majority (67.5%) did not answer two items on the SACQ as they pertained to living in dormitories or with a roommate. The authors of the SACQ Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire Manual (Baker & Siryk, 1989) recommend that if missing responses on a given subscale total two or less, the value of the missing response should be prorated by inserting the mean of the response in the given subscale. This recommendation was adhered to in this project. Missing data did not total more than two items on any given subscale.

There were no missing data on the demographic questionnaires, the faculty support (ECC; Fusani, 1994), peer support (My Friends; Wiest, 1992), or the Ego-Identity Status questionnaire (EOM-EIS; Bennion & Adams, 1986). However, it should be pointed out that a majority of students chose the "not applicable" response option for at least one item on the "Extra-Class" Communication Inventory (ECC; Fusani, 1994). These responses were coded as missing data.

Main Analysis

Using Wilks' criterion, the combined dependent

variables of ego-identity status and three levels of adjustment to college (academic adjustment, social adjustment, and personal adjustment) were significantly affected by living arrangement (living at parent's home vs. living away from parent's home), $F(4, 72) = 3.36, p < .05^1$. The results reflected an association between living arrangement and the combined dependent variables, $\eta^2 = .16$, partial $\eta^2 = .08$.

In order to examine the impact of living arrangement on the individual dependent variables, univariate F's and a Roy-Bargman stepdown analysis was performed on the prioritized dependent variables. All of the dependent variables were judged to be sufficiently reliable to warrant stepdown analysis. A reliability check of Cronbach's alphas for the respective adjustment subscales used in this study indicated marginal reliability and were as follows: .70 for academic adjustment; .62 for social adjustment; .67 for personal adjustment. For the full-scale of ego-identity status used in this study, Cronbach's alpha indicated strong reliability at .93.

In the stepdown analysis each dependent variable was analyzed in turn, with higher-priority dependent variables treated as covariates and with the highest-priority dependent variable tested in a univariate analysis of

variance (ANOVA). Homogeneity of regression, an additional assumption required for stepdown analysis, was achieved for all components of the stepdown analysis, $F(3, 76) = .71$, $p > .05$.

A unique contribution to predicting differences between those students living at the parent's home and those living away from the parent's home was made by ego-identity status, stepdown $F(1, 75) = 6.38$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$ ². This variable significantly differentiated the two living arrangement groups. After the pattern of differences measured by ego-identity status, academic adjustment, and personal adjustment were entered, a difference was also found on social adjustment, stepdown $F(1, 72) = 6.54$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .09$ ³. Univariate tests on ego-identity status revealed $F(1, 75) = 6.38$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$ ⁴. Univariate tests on social adjustment revealed $F(1, 75) = 8.79$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .12$ ⁵. Univariate and stepdown tests revealed non-significance for academic adjustment and personal-emotional adjustment. For academic adjustment, stepdown $F(1, 74) = 0.12$; univariate $F(1, 75) = 1.59$. For personal-emotional adjustment, stepdown $F(1, 73) = 0.09$; univariate $F(1, 75) = 0.44$. A summary of the univariate and stepdown tests of significance is shown in Table 4. As depicted in this table, ego-identity status and social adjustment both significantly differentiated between

the two living arrangement groups. This was still the case when the dependent variables were hierarchically entered, as shown in the significance of the stepdown F tests for both ego-identity status and social adjustment.

TABLE 4
UNIVARIATE AND STEPDOWN TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Univariate Tests of Significance:

DV:	Univariate F	df:	α	η^2
Ego-identity status	6.38*	1/75	.05	.08
Academic Adjustment	1.59	1/75	.05	
Personal Adjustment	0.44	1/75	.05	
Social Adjustment	8.79**	1/75	.05	.12

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Roy-Bargman Stepdown Tests of Significance:

DV:	Stepdown F	df:	α	η^2
Ego-identity status	6.38*	1/75	.05	.08
Academic Adjustment	0.12	1/74	.05	
Personal Adjustment	0.09	1/73	.05	
Social Adjustment	6.54*	1/72	.05	.09

* $p < .05$

Two dependent variables, ego-identity status and social adjustment to college, made unique contributions to the composite dependent variable that best distinguished between those subjects living at their parent's home and subjects living away from their parent's home. As already pointed out in Table 3, students who were living at their parent's home tended to have higher scores on ego-identity status (mean ego-identity status = 55.33, std. dev. = 8.63) vs. those students who were living away from their parent's home (mean ego-identity status = 49.56, std. dev. = 10.81). This indicated that students who were living at their parent's home tended to be more likely to be identity achieved vs. the students who were living away from their parent's home. Concerning social adjustment, those students who were living away from their parent's home tended to have higher scores on social adjustment (mean social adjustment = 130.64, std. dev. = 20.46) vs. those students who were living at their parent's home (mean social adjustment = 115.06, std. dev. = 22.11). There was a statistically significant difference for living arrangement between the means for ego-identity status and social adjustment. Academic adjustment and personal-emotional adjustment did not significantly differ with living arrangement.

Pooled within-cell correlations among dependent

variables are shown in Table 5. As seen in this table, the diagonal elements are pooled standard deviations. The correlations among the dependent variables show that stepdown analysis was appropriate (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

TABLE 5

POOLED WITHIN-CELL CORRELATIONS AMONG DEPENDENT VARIABLES
WITH STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON DIAGONAL

	Ego-identity status	Academic Adjust.	Personal Adjust.	Social Adjust.
Ego-identity status	9.383			
Academic Adjustment	-0.365	28.398		
Personal Adjustment	-0.274	0.642	22.165	
Social Adjustment	-0.288	0.575	0.549	21.595

DISCUSSION

Confirmed Findings

As expected, the results clearly indicate that students who are living away from the parental home gain in terms of their social adjustment to college. This finding makes sense in that new college freshmen who are socially adjusted to the college environment are more likely to have relevant social networks that revolve around college life. On the other hand, students living at their parent's home may have socially maladaptive existing social networks from their secondary school experience, or may in fact still receive a great deal of extensive, frequent social support from their parents. Many students who are living away from their parent's home may be pushed to make new social contacts more relevant to college life, since they can no longer rely exclusively upon parental support or social support from old social networks. It follows that social adjustment to college would be most optimal in situations that are congruent with both personal and environmental characteristics and demands (i.e., taking on the role as a new college student and having a social support network that is suited to meet those demands).

Unexpected Findings

The identity findings are more difficult to explain.

It was expected that students who were living away from the parental home would have higher scores on identity achievement. However, the results of this study showed just the opposite: students who were living at the parental home actually tended to have higher scores on identity achievement. A few speculations concerning this issue are needed. First, it is possible that students living at home were more likely to have a higher ego-identity status due to presumed frequent parental support and encouragement for exploration of identity issues. In fact, many studies have found that the influence of parents on late adolescents is strongest in the area of school and career (Meeus & Dekovic, 1995). Since the experience of many traditional first-year college freshmen is heavily invested as full-time students, and in exploring career issues in such areas as deciding upon a college major, it may not be too surprising to expect that parents might exert a large effect upon ego-identity formation in late adolescents. Based upon the presumed frequent contact with parents, this expectation might be especially salient among first-year college students who continue to live with their parents.

Another reason why it was found that students living at their parent's home tended to have higher ego-identity scores, and thus more likely to be classified as identity

achieved, may be due to the fact that college students who are living away from their parent's home may be forced to actively explore identity related issues for an extended period of time vs. their peers living at the parental home. As a result, many students who are living away from the parental home may struggle in the moratorium stage of identity development longer than students living at their parent's home.

It is also possible that there is more to Erikson's (1959, 1968) and Marcia's (1966, 1980) ego-identity statuses than we have commonly given credence. That is, it may be possible that there are different types of identity achievement and that students who are initially slower in reaching the stage of identity achievement (i.e., students living away from their parent's home) may, in fact, possess a different type of identity achievement when this stage is finally realized. That is, it may be possible to speculate that being identity achieved is not necessarily indicative of having a mature, coherent, and integrated identity. Perhaps late adolescents who spend more time in the moratorium stage are more likely to achieve such an integrative and healthy identity vs. those adolescents who quickly progress through the stages. This speculation would seem to benefit students living away from their parent's

home, and presumably spending a longer time in the moratorium ego-identity stage.

The findings for academic adjustment and personal-emotional adjustment to college were not statistically significant. It had been expected that students living away from their parent's home vs. students living at their parent's home would benefit in terms of both academic and personal-emotional adjustment to college. Concerning academic adjustment to college, it was anticipated that students who were living away from their parent's home, due to presumed fewer demands upon family life and a social network comprised mainly of the college community, would utilize faculty support more and this would have a positive impact on academic adjustment to college. As shown in Appendix A, students living away from the parental home did, in fact, report considerably more contact with the faculty in terms of hours spent per day, vs. their peers who resided at the parental home. However, they did not demonstrate greater academic adjustment. Concerning the insignificant findings for academic adjustment, a couple of possibilities may be speculated upon. First, perhaps faculty support per se is a better indicator of social adjustment to college, especially given the benefits that informal contact with faculty has been shown to provide students (Lampert, 1993).

Academic adjustment may be more of an adaptation to increased, and more demanding course work changes from secondary school to college, that may have very little to do with the amount of time actually spent in interaction with faculty. Second, perhaps better academically adjusted students have less of a need to seek out faculty support, so that these students having less than optimal academic adjustment may, in fact, indicate more of a willingness to seek out faculty support. These possibilities deserve attention in future related work.

Another unexpected finding was that personal-emotional adjustment was not statistically associated with students' living arrangements. It was expected that personal-emotional adjustment would be greatest amongst the students who were living away from their parent's home, due to a reliance upon more relevant social support networks. Such networks might more adequately fulfill important emotional needs that could arise in college. Exclusive reliance upon old social networks comprised of friends not in college, or reliance upon parents to fulfill emotional needs might not be optimal, due to both a need for increased autonomy in the adolescent to fulfill identity needs, and due to the possibility that non-college friends or parents may not be able to easily relate to some of the issues that college

students currently face. Perhaps the students who were residing at their parent's home were able to gather support from their parents to fulfill their emotional needs, and this support was great enough to offset the discrepancy between the students' home life and a reliance upon more college-related social support networks.

Strengths of the Study

Considering that this population was drawn from a primarily commuter school, the diversity of the living arrangements students reported was a definite strength. At some colleges, schools require that all first-year students live on-campus; at other schools, there may be no on-campus or nearby off-campus housing in which to reside, and students may primarily live at their parent's home. While over two-thirds of the sample did, in fact, reside at their parent's home, considering the type of institution surveyed, this was nonetheless a fairly remarkable outcome.

An optional demographic question on the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ; Baker & Siryk, 1984) asked for students to report their ethnicity. Of the students who did respond to this question, there were found to be students from many ethnic backgrounds, namely African-American, Asian-American, and Latino, who participated in this project. This is indicative of a more balanced sample

than is frequently reported in research on college students. This also enables us to glimpse a more realistic portrait of the identity and adjustment issues that a diverse college student population faces.

In addition to finding support for living arrangement as a predictor of ego-identity status and social adjustment to college, this study contributes in several important ways to the related literature. Prior to this investigation, no known work had looked at living arrangement as a predictor of identity achievement in a college population, and only a handful of studies had examined living arrangement as a predictor of college student adjustment (e.g., Hays & Oxley, 1986). There is a wealth of information on identity achievement in college students. Freshmen students remain an interesting population for studying identity achievement, since they are at the threshold of Erikson's (1959, 1968) and Marcia's (1966, 1980) belief in the salience of ego-identity development during late adolescence. Traditional freshmen college students represent the pinnacle of what is considered to be late adolescence.

Living arrangement holds a special interest for this population of traditional freshmen college students, since many have recently grappled with, or are currently still struggling with, a new living environment, one that would be

expected to have a tremendous impact on an adolescent's identity development and adjustment to college. Living arrangements often provide the scope for social interaction and often times determines the types of social networks that freshmen students will form. For students who are living at the parental home, social networks may consist more of family and non-college peers, and this discrepancy between home life and college life networks may cause considerable turmoil, especially, as the results of this study found, with social adjustment to college. On the other hand, students who are living away from the parent's home, and would be expected to be away from home at least during most of the week, would need to form new social support networks that are consistent with their living arrangement as a first-year college student. While there may be an initial struggle in terms of socially adjusting to college among students who are experiencing independent living arrangements, probably for the first time in their lives, the longer term implications seem clear: freshmen students in this sample who were living away from the parental home showed statistically significant higher scores on the social adjustment to college subscale after 1-2 academic quarters of living away from home. It is certainly plausible, then, that during the initial first quarter of enrollment,

students living away from home might have been at a disadvantage in terms of short-term social adjustment to college, but that during subsequent terms, these first-year students living away from their parent's home are endowed with an ability to successfully adapt to their new social environment in college.

The findings of living arrangement in regards to ego-identity status sheds light on the possibility that identity achievement may be a more complex construct than we have previously given credence. The fact that the results showed a statistically significant difference among students who were living at their parent's home vs. students living away from their parent's home, in terms of higher ego-identity status scores, calls for further investigation as to the complexities of determining ego-identity achievement. Perhaps a parallel can be drawn with the findings in regards to living arrangement and social adjustment, and living arrangement and ego-identity status. Just as social adjustment may be initially lower in students living away from their parent's home, but may be reversed later during the school year, so too might identity achievement initially reach a peak sooner among the group of students living at their parent's home, but also may be reversed later on. Therefore, the identity achievement of the group of students

living away from the parental home might ultimately be more optimal. Perhaps a longer amount of time spent in the moratorium stage, which seems to be the case for this group of students who are living away from their parent's home, may in the final analysis, be beneficial in terms of ego-identity achievement.

Improvements and Future Directions

It is possible that the marginal reliabilities for the personal-emotional adjustment and academic adjustment subscales from the SACQ could be responsible for the nonsignificant findings associated with these dependent variables. The small sample size of this project might have contributed to such marginal reliabilities.

Second, this study also did not highlight possible gender differences in students' identity achievement and adjustment to college. The feasibility of studying this, due to the difficulty in obtaining a large enough sample of male students to ensure adequate statistical power, was a critical issue. It is easy to speculate that there may be very real differences in the way young men and young women incorporate and respond to their living arrangement, and this incorporation of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, may very well contribute to identity achievement and adjustment to college. Women may relate to forming a new social

support network in college differently than men; in turn, this may have ramifications for such issues as social adjustment and personal-emotional adjustment to college. Women may also attribute more importance to their living environment for their identity achievement than men. Many speculations are possible, and future research should investigate whether there are significant gender differences in living arrangement as a predictor of identity achievement and adjustment to college.

Third, the nature of this particular college population needs to be considered when interpreting the current findings. The ethnic makeup of the current sample was unique in that no one ethnic group constituted a majority. As a result, the conclusions from this project may be more generalizable to college students (in general) than other studies with less ethnically balanced samples. Further, because many of the participants in this study also resided at their parent's home, it may be important to consider parent-student relations when examining identity development and adjustment to college. Relations with their parents for students living at the parental home may have a significant impact on these students' identity development and adjustment to college. Finally, economic factors may influence living arrangement, and this may have

ramifications for identity and adjustment for students living at the parental home and students living away from the parental home. The regionality of the campus from which a sample is drawn needs to be considered when looking at the influence of economic factors on living arrangement. This sample was drawn from a regional university, and therefore a large percentage of students resided at their parent's home while beginning work on their bachelor's degree.

It would be interesting to assess differences among the various living arrangements in greater detail. While this study did collect demographic information in regards to the various living arrangements, a weakness is that statistical analyses were performed only among two major groups of students: living at their parent's home vs. all other living arrangements. Certainly, it is quite possible that off-campus living arrangements differ in terms of their respective contributions to identity achievement and adjustment to college. For example, it would be valuable to investigate whether or not dormitory students report better or worse social adjustment to college vs. students living off-campus with a non-relative roommate; or, if the identity achievement scores of students living in the on-campus dormitories are higher or lower than students living off-campus alone. Again, a small sample size, especially in

regards to the group of students who lived away from their parent's home, prohibited such an investigation. Future researchers, with a larger sample size at their disposal, especially with larger numbers in various living arrangements away from the parental home, should certainly consider assessing group differences among students living away from their parent's home.

Fourth, as previously speculated, ego-identity does seem to be more complex than previously thought. Specifically, it may be possible to conceptualize ego-identity formation in freshmen college students as reflecting a process and not a product. As a result of this assumption, data for this project was collected somewhat later in the school year to allow for the students' identity to evolve. Also, continual changes in experiences during college implies that identity development may evolve as a result of college experiences. For example, freshmen college students who have not yet been fully exposed to more rigorous upper-division coursework that might throw into question their previous values and commitments to obtaining academic and personal goals, who have yet to decide upon not only a college major but also a career, and who have yet to truly and fully experience life outside of the school context (e.g., continuous full-time employment and living

continuously away from the parental home with no financial assistance), may be classified as "identity achieved" alongside a college senior who has struggled through academic, professional, and personal issues, has come to terms with, and has obtained these foundations. A classification of identity "achievement", in other words, seems to imply that achievement is the product, and not a process, of growth and development. It also implies that once a student is identity achieved, no further growth is possible, or even desirable. The product of identity achievement seems contrary to a developmental perspective of growth and change throughout the life span.

Finally, there is an increasingly common call for further longitudinal research on most studies. In developmental research, longitudinal designs are definitely useful. Studies such as the current project demand follow-up longitudinal work. Assessing students throughout their college career would be an excellent approach for looking at identity development and adjustment to college as a process, not merely an event, among first-year college students.

APPENDIX A: LIVING ARRANGEMENT AND AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT ON-CAMPUS, WITH FRIENDS, AND WITH FACULTY

Hours Spent On-Campus Per Day:

Parent's Home (N = 52)	n	(%)	Away from Parent's Home (N = 25)	n	(%)
Under 2 hours:	0	(0.0%)	Under 2 hours	0	(0.0%)
2-4 hours:	10	(19.2%)	2-4 hours	2	(8.0%)
5-7 hours:	28	(53.9%)	5-7 hours	4	(16.0%)
8-10 hours:	10	(19.2%)	8-10 hours	5	(20.0%)
Over 10 hours:	4	(7.7%)	Over 10 hours:	14	(56.0%)

Hours Spent On-Campus Interacting with Friends Per Day:

Parent's Home (N = 52)	n	(%)	Away from Parent's Home (N = 25)	n	(%)
Under 2 hours	34	(65.4%)	Under 2 hours:	9	(36.0%)
2-4 hours:	7	(13.4%)	2-4 hours:	5	(20.0%)
5-7 hours:	8	(15.4%)	5-7 hours:	6	(24.0%)
8-10 hours:	3	(5.8%)	8-10 hours:	1	(4.0%)
Over 10 hours:	0	(0.0%)	Over 10 hours:	4	(16.0%)

Hours Spent On-Campus Interacting with Faculty Per Day:

Parent's Home (N = 52)	n	(%)	Away from Parent's Home (N = 25)	n	(%)
Under 2 hours:	37	(71.2%)	Under 2 hours:	9	(36.0%)
2-4 hours:	10	(19.2%)	2-4 hours:	10	(40.0%)
5-7 hours:	4	(7.7%)	5-7 hours:	4	(16.0%)
8-10 hours:	1	(1.9%)	8-10 hours:	2	(8.0%)
Over 10 hours:	0	(0.0%)	Over 10 hours:	0	(0.0%)

APPENDIX B: FOR YOUR INFORMED CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY

You are being asked to participate in a study designed to investigate the relationships between living arrangement, identity achievement, and adjustment to college. This study is being conducted by Mark Mach under the supervision of Dr. Eugene Wong, assistant professor of psychology. This study has been approved by the Psychology Department Human Subject Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino. The university requires that you give your consent before participating.

In this study you will fill out 5 questionnaires: a demographic questionnaire, an adjustment to college questionnaire, an identity achievement questionnaire, a friends' support questionnaire, and a teacher interaction questionnaire. This study requires approximately 45-60 minutes to complete.

Please be assured that any information you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researcher. At no time will your name be reported along with your responses. All data will be reported in group form only. At the conclusion of this study, you may receive a report of the results, by contacting Mark Mach at (909) 880-5573.

Please understand that your participation in this research is totally voluntary and you are free to withdraw at any time during this study without penalty, and to remove any data at any time during this study.

Any questions about this study or your participation in the research should be directed to Mark Mach. If you have any questions about research subjects' rights or in the event of a research-related injury, contact the university's Institutional Review Board (880-5027).

By placing a check mark in the space below I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I also acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Place a check mark here: _____ Today's date: _____

APPENDIX C: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the following items and choose the one response that best fits you. THERE IS ONLY ONE RESPONSE PER ITEM!

1. Age: _____
2. Gender: (circle) Male Female
3. Year in school: (circle) Freshman Soph Junior Senior Grad
4. Full-time or part-time student: (circle) Full-time Part-time
(Full-time=6.1 or more units; Part-time=0-6 units)
5. Major: (check one only)

Business Administration _____ (all concentrations) Psychology _____ Liberal Studies _____ (all concentrations) Biology _____ Chemistry _____ Health Sciences _____ Human Development _____ English _____ Political Science _____ Sociology _____ Communication _____ Art _____ Theatre Arts _____ Social Sciences _____ Undeclared _____ Other (specify) _____	6. <u>Current residence--</u> <u>Sept. 1997-June 1998</u> (check one only) Parent's home _____ On-campus dorms _____ Off-campus with _____ <u>non-relative</u> roommate _____ Off-campus alone _____ Off-campus with _____ other relatives (not parents) _____ Other (specify) _____
---	--
7. Number of hours you spend on-campus per day: (check one only)

Under 2 hours	_____
2-4 hours	_____
5-7 hours	_____
8-10 hours	_____
Over 10 hours	_____
8. Number of hours you spend on-campus per day, interacting with your classmates and friends here at CSUSB: (check one only)

Under 2 hours	_____
2-4 hours	_____
5-7 hours	_____
8-10 hours	_____
Over 10 hours	_____
9. Number of hours you spend on-campus per day, interacting with your professors here at CSUSB: (check one only)

Under 2 hours _____	8-10 hours _____
2-4 hours _____	Over 10 hours _____
5-7 hours _____	

APPENDIX D: STUDENT ADAPTATION TO COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions:

The 67 statements on this questionnaire describe college experiences. Read each one and decide how well it applies to you at the present time (within the past few days). For each statement, circle the asterisk at the point in the continuum that best represents how closely the statement applies to you. Circle only one asterisk for each statement. To change an answer, draw an X through the incorrect response.

	Applies Very Closely to Me	Doesn't Apply to Me at All
	←-----	-----→
1. I feel that I fit in well as part of the college environment.	* * * * *	* * * * *
2. I have been feeling tense or nervous lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
3. I have been keeping up to date on my academic work.	* * * * *	* * * * *
4. I am meeting as many people, and making as many friends as I would like at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
5. I know why I'm in college and what I want out of it.	* * * * *	* * * * *
6. I am finding academic work at college difficult.	* * * * *	* * * * *
7. Lately I have been feeling blue and moody a lot.	* * * * *	* * * * *
8. I am very involved with social activities at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
9. I am adjusting well to college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
10. I have not been functioning well during examinations.	* * * * *	* * * * *
11. I have felt tired much of the time lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
12. Being on my own, taking responsibility for myself, has not been easy.	* * * * *	* * * * *
13. I am satisfied with the level at which I am performing academically.	* * * * *	* * * * *
14. I have had informal, personal contacts with college professors.	* * * * *	* * * * *
15. I am pleased now about my decision to go to college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
16. I am pleased now about my decision to attend this college in particular.	* * * * *	* * * * *
17. I'm not working as hard as I should at my course work.	* * * * *	* * * * *

APPENDIX D: STUDENT ADAPTATION TO COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

		Applies Very Closely to Me	Doesn't Apply to Me at All
		<-----	----->
18.	I have several close social ties at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
19.	My academic goals and purposes are well defined.	* * * * *	* * * * *
20.	I haven't been able to control my emotions very well lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
21.	I'm not really smart enough for the academic work I am expected to be doing now.	* * * * *	* * * * *
22.	Lonesomeness from home is a source of difficulty for me now.	* * * * *	* * * * *
23.	Getting a college degree is very important to me.	* * * * *	* * * * *
24.	My appetite has been good lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
25.	I haven't been very efficient in the use of study time lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
26.	I enjoy living in a college dormitory. (Please omit it you do not live in a dormitory; any university housing should be regarded as a dormitory.)	* * * * *	* * * * *
27.	I enjoy writing papers for courses.	* * * * *	* * * * *
28.	I have been having a lot of headaches lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
29.	I really haven't had much motivation for studying lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
30.	I am satisfied with the extracurricular activities available at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
31.	I've given a lot of thought to whether I should ask for help from the Psychological/Counseling Services Center or from a psychotherapist outside of college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
32.	Lately I have been having doubts regarding the value of a college education.	* * * * *	* * * * *
33.	I am getting along very well with my roommate(s) at college. (Please omit if you do not have a roommate.)	* * * * *	* * * * *
34.	I wish I were at another college or university.	* * * * *	* * * * *
35.	I've put on (or lost) too much weight recently.	* * * * *	* * * * *

APPENDIX D: STUDENT ADAPTATION TO COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Applies Very Closely to Me ←-----	Doesn't Apply to Me at All -----→
36. I am satisfied with the number and variety of courses available at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
37. I feel that I have enough social skills to get along well in the college setting.	* * * * *	* * * * *
38. I have been getting angry too easily lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
39. Recently I have had trouble concentrating when I try to study.	* * * * *	* * * * *
40. I haven't been sleeping well lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
41. I'm not doing well enough academically for the amount of work I put in.	* * * * *	* * * * *
42. I am having difficulty feeling at ease with other people at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
43. I am satisfied with the quality or caliber of courses available at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
44. I am attending classes regularly.	* * * * *	* * * * *
45. Sometimes my thinking gets muddled up too easily.	* * * * *	* * * * *
46. I am satisfied with the extent to which I am participating in social activities at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
47. I expect to stay at this college for a bachelor's degree.	* * * * *	* * * * *
48. I haven't been mixing too well with the opposite sex lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
49. I worry a lot about my college expenses.	* * * * *	* * * * *
50. I am enjoying my academic work at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
51. I have been feeling lonely a lot at college lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
52. I am having a lot of trouble getting started on homework assignments.	* * * * *	* * * * *
53. I feel I have good control over my life situation.	* * * * *	* * * * *
54. I am satisfied with my program of courses for this semester/quarter.	* * * * *	* * * * *

APPENDIX D: STUDENT ADAPTATION TO COLLEGE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Applies Very Closely to Me	Doesn't Apply to Me at All
	<-----	----->
55. I have been feeling in good health lately.	* * * * *	* * * * *
56. I feel I am very different from other students at college in ways I don't like.	* * * * *	* * * * *
57. On balance, I would rather be home than here.	* * * * *	* * * * *
58. Most of the things I am interested in are not related to any of my course work at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
59. Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to transferring to another college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
60. Lately I have been giving a lot of thought to dropping out of college altogether and for good.	* * * * *	* * * * *
61. I find myself giving considerable thought to taking time off from college and finishing later.	* * * * *	* * * * *
62. I am very satisfied with the professors I have now in my courses.	* * * * *	* * * * *
63. I have some good friends or acquaintances at college with whom I can talk about any problems I have.	* * * * *	* * * * *
64. I am experiencing a lot of difficulty coping with the stresses imposed upon me in college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
65. I am quite satisfied with my social life at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
66. I'm quite satisfied with my academic situation at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *
67. I feel confident that I will be able to deal in a satisfactory manner with future challenges here at college.	* * * * *	* * * * *

APPENDIX E: MY FRIENDS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the following items and circle the number which corresponds with your answer based on the scale below.

	Always	Most of the time	Sometimes	Never
1. My friends pressure me to do things that I do not want to do.	1	2	3	4
2. My friends listen to what I have to say.	1	2	3	4
3. My friends are supportive of my decisions.	1	2	3	4
4. My friends try to influence and control my decisions.	1	2	3	4
5. My friends think it is OK if we do different activities.	1	2	3	4
6. My friends make a lot of demands of me.	1	2	3	4
7. My friends respect my right to be an individual.	1	2	3	4
8. My friends make fun of me if I do well in school.	1	2	3	4
9. My friends try to solve problems by giving people choices.	1	2	3	4
10. My friends encourage me to try my best.	1	2	3	4
11. My friends express their viewpoints without trying to control me.	1	2	3	4
12. My friends demand that we do things their way.	1	2	3	4
13. My friends try to boss me around and dominate me.	1	2	3	4
14. My friends listen to my complaints and concerns but believe that I can solve my own problems.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX E: MY FRIENDS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the following items and circle the number which corresponds with your answer based on the scale below.

	Always	Most of the time	Sometimes	Never
15. My friends ignore and avoid me if I make them mad.	1	2	3	4
16. My friends make me do things that I don't want to do.	1	2	3	4
17. My friends make me feel bad if I disagree with them.	1	2	3	4
18. My friends can be counted on to help me at any time.	1	2	3	4
19. My friends like me regardless of what I think or say.	1	2	3	4
20. My friends take turns making decisions about what activities we are going to do.	1	2	3	4
21. My friends get jealous or mad when I spend time with other people.	1	2	3	4
22. My friends think that it is important to talk and discuss things.	1	2	3	4
23. My friends care what I think and feel.	1	2	3	4

APPENDIX F: TEACHER INTERACTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the following items and circle the number which corresponds with your answer based on the scale below.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
1. I have a good relationship with my instructors.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have spoken with my instructors before class.	1	2	3	4	5
3. When I run into my instructors they often stop to talk.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I feel comfortable approaching my instructors outside of class.	1	2	3	4	5
5. My instructors encourage students to drop by the office.	1	2	3	4	5
6. My instructors seem more like friends than superiors.	1	2	3	4	5
7. My instructors seem more like "regular people" in the office.	1	2	3	4	5
8. My instructors seem to have limited time for my concerns outside of class.	1	2	3	4	5
9. When I visit my instructors' office, they let me talk about anything I want.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I usually don't discuss my personal life with any instructor.	1	2	3	4	5
11. When speaking to my instructors, I keep statements about my personal life brief.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Sometimes my instructors talk about their personal life during office visits.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Most office visits are useful educational experiences.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX F: TEACHER INTERACTIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Not Applicable
14. After talking with my instructors outside of class, I like them better.	1	2	3	4	5
15. After talking with my instructors outside of class, I like my classes more.	1	2	3	4	5
16. Visiting with my instructors outside of class has improved my motivation in my courses.	1	2	3	4	5
17. Visiting with my instructors outside of class has improved my confidence in my courses.	1	2	3	4	5
18. How many times have you visited your instructors' offices this quarter?_____					

APPENDIX G: EOM-EIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please read the following items and indicate to what degree it reflects your own thoughts and feelings. If a statement has more than one part, please indicate your reaction to the statement as a whole. Write in the number next to the number of the question which corresponds with your answer based on the scale below.

Strongly Agree 1	Moderately Agree 2	Agree 3	Disagree 4	Moderately Disagree 5	Strongly Disagree 6
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------------------	----------------------------------

- ___1. I haven't chosen the occupation I really want to get into, and I'm just working at whatever is available until something better comes along.
- ___2. When it comes to religion, I just haven't found anything that appeals to me and I don't really feel the need to look.
- ___3. My ideas about men's and women's roles are identical to my parents'. What has worked for them will obviously work for me.
- ___4. There's no single "life style" which appeals to me more than another.
- ___5. There are a lot of different kinds of people. I'm still exploring the many possibilities to find the right kind of friends for me.
- ___6. I sometimes join in recreational activities when asked, but I rarely try anything on my own.
- ___7. I haven't really thought about a "dating style". I'm not too concerned whether I date or not.
- ___8. Politics is something that I can never be too sure about because things change so fast. But I do think it's important to know what I can politically stand for and believe in.
- ___9. I'm still trying to decide how capable I am as a person and what jobs will be right for me.
- ___10. I don't give religion much thought and it doesn't bother me one way or the other.
- ___11. There's so many ways to divide responsibilities in marriage, I'm trying to decide what will work for me.
- ___12. I'm looking for an acceptable perspective for my own "life style" view, but I haven't really found it yet.
- ___13. There are many reasons for friendship, but I choose close friends on the basis of certain values and similarities that I've personally decided on.
- ___14. While I don't have one recreational activity I'm really committed to, I'm experiencing numerous leisure outlets to identify one I can really get involved in.
- ___15. Based on past experiences, I've chosen the type of dating relationship I want now.
- ___16. I haven't really considered politics. It just doesn't excite me much.
- ___17. I might have thought about a lot of different jobs, but there's never really any question since my parents said what they wanted.
- ___18. A person's faith is unique to each individual. I've considered and reconsidered it myself and know what I can believe.
- ___19. I've never really seriously considered men's and women's roles in marriage. It just doesn't seem to concern me.

APPENDIX G: EOM-EIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Strongly Agree 1	Moderately Agree 2	Agree 3	Disagree 4	Moderately Disagree 5	Strongly Disagree 6

20. After considerable thought, I've developed my own individual viewpoint of what is for me an ideal "life style" and don't believe anyone will be likely to change my perspective.					

21. My parents know what's best for me in terms of how to choose my friends.					

22. I've chosen one or more recreational activities to engage in regularly from lots of things and I'm satisfied with those choices.					

23. I don't think about dating much. I just kind of take it as it comes along.					

24. I guess I'm pretty much like my folks when it comes to politics. I follow what they do in terms of voting and such.					

25. I'm really not interested in finding the right job, any job will do. I just seem to flow with what is available.					

26. I'm not sure what religion means to me. I'd like to make up my mind but I'm not done looking yet.					

27. My ideas about men's and women's roles come right from my parents and family. I haven't seen any need to look further.					

28. My own views on a desirable life style were taught to me by my parents and I don't see any need to question what they taught me.					

29. I don't have any real close friends, and I don't think I'm looking for one right now.					

30. Sometimes I join in leisure activities, but I really don't see a need to look for a particular activity to do regularly.					

31. I'm trying out different types of dating relationships. I just haven't decided what is best for me.					

32. There are so many different political parties and ideals. I can't decide which to follow until I figure it all out.					

33. It took me a while to figure it out, but now I really know what I want for a career.					

34. Religion is confusing to me right now. I keep changing my views on what is right and wrong for me.					

35. I've spent some time thinking about men's and women's roles in marriage and I've decided what will work best for me.					

36. In finding an acceptable viewpoint to life itself, I find myself engaging in a lot of discussions with others and some self-exploration.					

37. I only pick friends my parents would approve of.					

38. I've always liked doing the same recreational activities my parents do and haven't ever seriously considered anything else.					

39. I only go out with the type of people my parents expect me to date.					

40. I've thought my political beliefs through and realize I can agree with some and not other aspects of what my parents believe.					

41. My parents decided a long time ago what I should go into for employment. I'm following through their plans.					

42. I've gone through a period of serious questions about faith and I can now say I understand what I believe as an individual.					

APPENDIX G: EOM-EIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Strongly Agree 1	Moderately Agree 2	Agree 3	Disagree 4	Moderately Disagree 5	Strongly Disagree 6
<hr/>					
___43. I've been thinking about the roles that husbands and wives play a lot these days, and I'm trying to make a final decision.					
___44. My parent's views on life are good enough for me, I don't need anything else.					
___45. I've tried many different friendships and now I have a clear idea of what I look for in a friend.					
___46. After trying a lot of different recreational activities I've found one or more I really enjoy doing by myself or with friends.					
___47. My preferences about dating are still in the process of developing. I haven't fully decided yet.					
___48. I'm not sure about my political beliefs, but I'm trying to figure out what I can truly believe in.					
___49. It took me a long time to decide but now I know for sure what direction to move in for a career.					
___50. I attend the same church my family has always attended. I've never really questioned why.					
___51. There are many ways that married couples can divide up family responsibilities. I've thought about lots of ways and now I know exactly how I want it to happen for me.					
___52. I guess I just kind of enjoy life in general, and I don't see myself living by any particular viewpoint to life.					
___53. I don't have any close friends. I just like to hang around with the crowd.					
___54. I've been experiencing a variety of recreational activities in hopes of finding one or more I can enjoy for some time to come.					
___55. I've dated different types of people and now know exactly what my own "unwritten rules" for dating are and who I will date.					
___56. I really have never been involved in politics enough to have made a firm stand one way or the other.					
___57. I just can't decide what to do for an occupation. There are so many that have possibilities.					
___58. I've never really questioned my religion. If it's right for my parents it must be right for me.					
___59. Opinions on men's and women's roles seem so varied that I don't think much about it.					
___60. After a lot of self-examination I have established a very definite view on what my own lifestyle will be.					
___61. I really don't know what kind of friend is best for me. I'm trying to figure out exactly what friendship means to me.					
___62. All of my recreational preferences I got from my parents and I haven't really tried anything else.					
___63. I date only people my parents would approve of.					
___64. My folks have always had their own political and moral beliefs about issues like abortion and mercy killing and I've always gone along accepting what they have.					

APPENDIX H: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

The goal of this project is to determine what effect living arrangement has on contributing to identity achievement and adjustment to college in the freshmen student population (ages 18-20) at CSUSB.

The responses that you gave in the questionnaires will help to determine the effect that living arrangement has on contributing to identity achievement and adjustment to college among traditional-age CSUSB freshmen. This will be done by interpreting the data in the questionnaires by means of a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). You may contact Mark Mach at (909) 880-5573 if you have any questions or concerns as a result of your participation in this study.

Please do not reveal the nature of this study to other CSUSB students. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. Thank you for participating in this study.

ENDNOTES

1. Analysis was also performed without the outlier, using Wilk's criterion
 $\underline{F}(4, 71) = 3.19, \underline{p} < .05, \eta^2 = .15, \text{partial } \eta^2 = .08.$
2. Without the outlier, the stepdown \underline{F} was significant for ego-identity status,
 $\underline{F}(1, 74) = 5.82, \underline{p} < .05, \eta^2 = .08.$
3. Without the outlier, the stepdown \underline{F} was significant for social adjustment,
 $\underline{F}(1, 71) = 6.45, \underline{p} < .05, \eta^2 = .09.$
4. Without the outlier, the univariate \underline{F} was significant for ego-identity status,
 $\underline{F}(1, 74) = 5.82, \underline{p} < .05, \eta^2 = .08.$
5. Without the outlier, the univariate \underline{F} was significant for social adjustment,
 $\underline{F}(1, 74) = 8.16, \underline{p} < .01, \eta^2 = .11.$

REFERENCES

Adams, G. R., & Bennion, L. D. (1989). Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status: A Reference Manual (2nd ed.)

Adams, G. R., Shea, J., & Fitch, S. A. (1979). Toward the development of an objective assessment of ego-identity status. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9, 223-237.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1984). Measuring adjustment to college. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31(2), 179-189.

Baker, R. W., & Siryk, B. (1989). SACQ: Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire Manual. Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

Bennion, L. D., & Adams, G. R. (1986). A revision of the extended version of the objective measure of ego identity status: An identity instrument for use with late adolescents. Journal of Adolescent Research, 1(2), 183-198.

Bowen, H. R. (1977). Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cheek, J. M., & Briggs, S. R. (1982). Self-consciousness and aspects of identity. Journal of Research in Personality, 16, 401-408.

Chickering, A. W. (1969). Education and identity. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.

Endo, J. J., & Harpel, R. L. (1981). The effect of student-faculty interaction on students' educational outcomes. Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research, Minneapolis, MN, May 17-20, 1981.

Erikson, E. H. (1959). The problem of ego identity. Psychological Issues, 1(1), pp. 101-164.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton.

Feldman, K., & Newcomb, T. (1969). The impact of college on students. (2 Vols.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Fusani, D. S. (1994). "Extra-class" communication: Frequency, immediacy, self-disclosure, and satisfaction in student-faculty interaction outside the classroom. Journal of Applied Communication Research, 22, 232-255.

Gerdes, H., & Mallinckrodt, B. (1994). Emotional, social, and academic adjustment of college students: A longitudinal study retention. Journal of Counseling and Development, 72, 281-288.

Hays, R. B. (1985). A longitudinal study of friendship development. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48(4), 909-924.

Hays, R. B., & Oxley, D. (1986). Social network development and functioning during a life transition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(2), 305-313.

Heller, K. (1979). The effects of social support: Prevention and treatment implications. In A. P. Goldstein & F. H. Kanfer (Eds.), Maximizing treatment gains (pp. 353-382). New York: Academic Press.

Hoffman, J. A. (1984). Psychological separation of late adolescents from their parents. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31(2), 170-178.

Lamport, M. A. (1993). Student-faculty informal interaction and the effect on college student outcomes: A review of the literature. Adolescence, 28(112), 971-990.

Lapsley, D. K., Rice, K. G., & FitzGerald, D. P. (1990). Adolescent attachment, identity, and adjustment to college: Implications for the continuity of adaptation hypothesis. Journal of Counseling and Development, 68, 561-565.

Mallinckrodt, B. (1988). Student retention, social support, and dropout intention: Comparison of Black and White students. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 60-64.

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego

identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.

Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), Handbook of adolescent psychology (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.

Meeus, W., & Dekovic, M. (1995). Identity development, parental and peer support in adolescence: Results of a national Dutch survey. Adolescence, 30(120), 931-944.

Newman, P. R., & Newman, B. M. (1978). Identity formation and the college experience. Adolescence, 13(50), 311-326.

Pantages, T. J., & Creedon, C. F. (1978). Studies of college attrition: 1950-1975. Review of Education Research, 48, 49-101.

Panori, S. A., Wong, E. H., Kennedy, A. L., & King, J. R. (1995). A pilot project on college students' satisfaction and self-concept. Psychological Reports, 77, 255-258.

Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Hibel, J. (1978). Student-faculty interactional settings and their relationship to predicted academic performance. Journal of Higher Education, 49, 450-463.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1996). Using Multivariate Statistics (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.

Wiest, D. J. (1992). Intrinsic motivation in high school: A look at regular education, learning disabled, and continuation students. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.