

































































































































such instances follow-up contrasts were made utilizing Tukey's Studentized Range (Honestly Significant Difference) procedure. There were a couple of important reasons for the selection of this particular multiple comparison method. First, Tukey's HSD procedure was designed specifically for pairwise contrasts, and as such provided the most powerful test for the specific pairwise concerns of this study. Second, given that sample sizes were unequal in this study Tukey's procedure provided a safe, though somewhat conservative method for controlling the type I experimentwise error rate. That is, Tukey's method "is exact when all sample sizes are equal, and it is a conservative method when the sample sizes are unequal with the confidence coefficient of at least  $1-\alpha$ " (Neter, Wasserman, & Kutner, 1985, p. 574).

### Overview of Main Results

The main results are as follows:

1. Both a global and a domain-specific status analysis (in the domain of religion) indicated a

significantly larger proportion of Foreclosures in the religious institutional setting in support of hypothesis one. However, when comparing only the religiously oriented subjects in both institutional settings, the proportion of Foreclosures was not significantly different.

2. An overall global status analysis indicated that Achievers were significantly more Internal on locus of control compared to other identity statuses. This finding supported hypothesis two.

3. Comparing identity statuses on the tolerance of ambiguity variable, resulted in Foreclosed subjects being significantly more Intolerant of Ambiguity compared to other statuses. This finding supported hypothesis three.

4. Hypothesis four involved comparing identity statuses of religiously oriented subjects on Religious Problem-solving style. The only significant findings were seen in the global and the domain-specific measure in the domain of religion. Globally, Diffused subjects were significantly lower than all other statuses on the

Collaboration and Deferring subscales. The domain-specific analysis showed Diffused subjects to be significantly higher than Achievers and Foreclosures on the Self-directing subscale. Consequently, hypothesis four, which expected Achievers to be associated with the Collaborative style and Foreclosures with the Deffering style, was not supported.

5. When religiously Foreclosed subjects were categorized as "open" or "closed" in order to explore differentiation within the Foreclosure status, no significant results appeared. However, there were a couple of important trends approaching significance to lend partial credence to notions expressed in hypothesis five.

This brief overview of the main results will now be followed by a detailed description of the relevant findings in this study.

#### Status Comparisons of the Two Groups

##### Global Status Analysis

A 5 X 2 (status x institution) chi-square analysis, using the global identity measure, resulted in an

overall significant difference between the two institutional settings,  $\chi^2 (4, N=278)=14.79, p < .01$ . However, having obtained a significant difference between the two groups, the question as to which of the statuses were significantly different still remained. Specific status comparisons between the two groups indicated that Achievement and Moratorium statuses were not significantly different. In contrast, there was a significantly larger percentage of Foreclosed individuals in the religious institutional setting, but a significantly larger percentage of Diffused subjects in the secular institutional setting (see Table 1).

Table 1

Global Identity Status Distribution in relationship to the Two Institutional Settings

Identity Status	Institutional Setting				$\chi^2$
	Religious		Secular		
	$n$	%	$n$	%	
Achieved	19	16.38	20	12.35	.912
Moratorium	68	58.62	94	58.02	.010
Foreclosure	16	13.75	10	6.17	4.63*
Diffusion	2	1.75	20	12.35	10.47**
Unclassified	11	9.48	18	11.11	

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$

### Domain-specific Status Analysis

Similarly, the two institutional groups were compared using the Deltas Identity Status Inventory (DISI) which measures identity status in three specific domains: vocation, religion, and politics. Focusing first on the Vocational domain, the two groups were found to be significantly different,  $\chi^2 (4, N=278) = 15.06, p < .01$ . More specifically, two statuses were significantly different between the two groups; Achievement and Moratorium. Although over 33% of Achievers were seen in the secular group, the religious group approached only 19%. The converse was true for the Moratorium status; little over 35% in the religious group compared to approximately 19% in the secular group. Therefore, regarding vocational identity, the religious group had a significantly larger percentage of subjects who were still actively exploring vocational alternatives, not yet having made any firm vocational commitments.

Focusing on the Religious domain, there was an overall significant difference between the two groups,  $\chi^2 (4, N=278) = 35.11, p < .001$ . More specifically, three statuses were significantly different between the two

groups; Identity Achievement, Foreclosure, and Diffusion. While only about 11% were Achieved in the secular group, a little over 24% were Achieved in the religious group. Regarding Foreclosure, a little over 60% were seen in the religious group, but only about 48% in the secular. Furthermore, while only approximately 3% of the subjects were classified as Diffused in the religious group, a little over 27% were Religiously Diffused in the secular group. In contrast to the vocational and religious domains, the political domain did not produce any significant differences between the two groups. (For the results of the Dallas inventory see Table 2).

#### Religious Subjects Compared

Given the considerable disparity of the percentage of Diffused subjects between the two settings, using both the global identity measure and the domain-specific identity measure in the area of religion, a reasonable question to consider was: to what extent were the non-religiously oriented subjects in the secular setting

Table 2

Domain-specific Identity Status Distribution in  
relationship to the two Institutional Settings

Domain	Status	Institutional Setting				$\chi^2$
		Religious		Secular		
		<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
Voc.	Achieved	22	18.97	54	33.33	7.03 **
	Moratorium	41	35.34	31	19.14	9.25 **
	Foreclosure	5	4.31	5	9.88	3.00
	Diffusion	35	30.17	46	28.40	
	Unclassified	13	11.21	15	9.26	
Rel.	Achieved	28	24.14	17	10.49	9.28 **
	Moratorium	8	6.90	9	5.46	.21
	Foreclosure	70	60.34	77	47.53	4.45 *
	Diffusion	3	2.59	44	27.16	29.06 ***
	Unclassified	7	6.03	15	9.26	
Pol.	Achieved	12	10.34	24	14.81	1.20
	Moratorium	29	25.00	30	18.32	1.70
	Foreclosure	13	11.21	10	6.17	2.26
	Diffusion	49	42.24	86	53.09	3.18
	Unclassified	13	11.21	12	7.41	

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$     \*\*\*  $p < .001$

contributing to the magnitude of this disparity? Consequently, to differentiate among those subjects in the secular institution who were professing or not professing religious commitments, two groups were formed; those who regarded their religion as being very important or moderately important being placed together in one group, and those in another group who regarded religion as of no importance in their lives.

The status comparisons were then made on all three groups: those in the religious institutions; the religious in the secular institution; and the nonreligious in the secular institution. A 5 X 3 chi-square analysis using the global identity measure resulted in an overall significant difference among the three groups,  $\chi^2 (8, N=278)=59.53, p < .001$ . There were 42 nonreligious subjects, 120 religious subjects in the secular institutional setting, and 116 subjects in the religious setting.

The following results show the proportional status distribution for the nonreligious subjects: Achievement, 9.52%; Moratorium, 38.10%; Foreclosure, 2.38%; Diffusion, 35.71%; Unclassified, 14.29%. Furthermore, there was a

noticeable difference in the number of Diffused subjects when comparing the nonreligious and religious subjects in the secular institution. The latter had only 4.17% in the Diffusion status as opposed to 35.71% for the non-religious subjects. Eliminating the 42 subjects that were classified as nonreligious in the secular institution and focusing on a more specific comparison of the religious subject in both types of institutions, there were no significant differences between the two groups using the global identity measure (see Table 3).

Table 3

Global Identity Status Distribution of Religious Subjects in the Two Institutional Settings

Identity Status	Institutional Settings			
	Religious		Secular	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Achieved	19	16.38	16	13.33
Moratorium	68	58.62	78	65.00
Foreclosure	16	13.79	9	7.50
Diffusion	2	1.75	5	4.17
Unclassified	11	9.48	12	10.00

However, using the domain-specific identity measure produced significant results and some interesting findings as religious subjects of the two different institutional settings were compared. In the Vocational domain the two groups were found to be significantly different,  $\chi^2 (4, N=236)=14.95, p < .01$ . More specifically, three statuses were significantly different; Achievement, Moratorium, and Foreclosure.

While there were approximately 19% of Achievers in the religious institution there were 35% in the secular institution. Similarly, a little over 4% of subjects in the religious setting were in the Foreclosure status as opposed to almost 11% in the secular institution.

However, a larger percentage of subjects were found to be in Vocational Moratorium in the religious institutions (35%) than in the secular one (21%). Therefore, subjects with a religious orientation in a secular institution appear to be more decided and committed to their vocational goals, since they tend to be more Vocationally Achieved or Vocationally Foreclosed than those attending religious institutions (see Table 4).

Table 4

Domain-specific Identity Status Distribution of Religious Subjects in the Two Institutional Settings

Domain	Status	Institutional Setting				$\chi^2$
		Religious		Secular		
		<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
Voc.	Achieved	22	18.97	42	35.00	7.67 **
	Moratorium	41	35.34	25	20.83	6.17 **
	Foreclosure	5	4.31	13	10.38	3.56 *
	Diffusion	35	30.17	32	26.67	
	Unclassified	13	11.21	8	6.67	
Rei.	Achieved	28	24.14	12	10.00	8.38 **
	Moratorium	8	6.90	8	6.67	.005
	Foreclosure	70	60.34	73	60.83	.006
	Diffusion	3	2.59	17	14.17	10.20 **
	Unclassified	7	6.03	10	8.33	
Poi.	Achieved	12	10.34	20	16.67	2.01
	Moratorium	29	25.00	24	20.00	.847
	Foreclosure	13	11.21	7	5.83	2.20
	Diffusion	49	42.24	59	49.17	1.14
	Unclassified	13	11.21	10	8.33	

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$

The identity analysis in the domain of religion was also very revealing and significant,  $\chi^2(4, N=236)=16.73$ ,  $p < .005$ . Approximately 24% were Achieved in the religious institutional setting compared to only 10% in the secular. Conversely, only about 3% of the subjects in the religious institutions were Diffused in contrast to approximately 14% in the secular environment (see Table 4). Therefore, even though the religiously oriented subjects in both institutional settings had an almost identical proportion of Religiously Foreclosed subjects ( a little over 60% in both), there was a significantly larger proportion of Religiously Diffused subjects in the secular institutional setting, but a larger proportion of Religiously Achieved subjects in the religious setting.

Consistent with the previous analysis of 278 subjects, this analysis of 236 religious subjects also indicated no significant differences in the domain of politics between the two institutional settings (see Table 4).

Gender differences

Further analysis of the data was carried out to see if there were any gender differences in the distribution of the identity statuses. Of the 278 subjects in this study 98 were male, while 180 were female. Identity status distributions according to gender were not significantly different using the global identity measure. However, the domain-specific identity measure did show significant differences. A chi-square analysis showed a significant gender difference in all three domains: Vocation,  $\chi^2$  (4  $N=278$ )=17.09  $p < .01$ ; Religion,  $\chi^2$  (4  $N=278$ )=10.78  $p < .05$ ; and Politics,  $\chi^2$  (4  $N=278$ )=22.98,  $p < .001$ , respectively.

The results of this study indicate that females, compared to males, appear to be more Vocationally Achieved, less Vocationally Diffused, more Religiously Foreclosed, and more Politically Diffused. For status by gender comparisons within domains, see Table 5.

Table 5

Domain-specific Identity Status Distribution between Males  
and Females

Domain	Status	Gender				$\chi^2$
		Male		Female		
		<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	
Voc.	Achieved	19	19.39	57	31.67	4.82 *
	Moratorium	19	19.39	53	29.44	3.34
	Foreclosure	6	6.12	15	8.33	.44
	Diffusion	38	38.78	43	23.89	6.81 **
	Unclassified	16	16.33	12	6.67	
Rel.	Achieved	19	19.39	26	14.44	1.14
	Moratorium	6	6.12	11	6.11	
	Foreclosure	44	44.90	103	57.22	3.87 *
	Diffusion	15	15.31	32	17.78	.28
	Unclassified	14	14.29	8	4.44	
Pol.	Achieved	10	10.20	26	14.44	1.01
	Moratorium	26	26.53	33	18.33	2.55
	Foreclosure	9	9.18	14	7.78	.17
	Diffusion	35	35.71	100	55.56	10.00 **
	Unclassified	18	18.37	7	3.89	

\*  $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .01$

## Identity Status and Locus of Control

### Global Status Analysis

In looking at how the various identity statuses relate to the locus of control variable, as specified by the notions of Internality, Powerful Others, and Chance, the results support the second hypothesis. The analysis of variance procedure, using the identity statuses as the independent variable and Internality as the dependent variable, produced a significant finding,  $F(4,273)=5.56, p < .0005$ .

Follow-up contrasts utilizing Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) procedure showed that the mean of the Identity Achieved status was significantly higher than all the other statuses. This comparison was significant at the .05 level. The status means and standard deviations are shown in Table 6.

The Powerful Others subscale of the locus of control variable also produced a significant finding,

Table 6

Global Identity Status Distribution in relationship to  
Locus of Control

Status	<u>N</u>	Locus of Control					
		Internal		Powerful Others		Chance	
		<u>M</u>	<u>(SD)</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>(SD)</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>(SD)</u>
A. Ach.	39	35.13	(6.45)	15.82	(8.23)	15.56	(6.38)
B. Mor.	162	30.35	(6.54)	18.22	(7.02)	19.51	(7.09)
C. Fore.	26	28.96	(5.28)	19.23	(7.19)	21.00	(7.19)
D. Diff.	22	29.82	(4.96)	18.46	(5.99)	20.73	(5.99)
E. Uncl.	29	30.45	(6.12)	21.52	(6.03)	21.03	(7.51)
<u>F</u> value		5.56 ***		2.83 *		3.90 **	
Post hoc comparisons		A > all		A < E		A < all	

NOTE. Post hoc comparisons (HSD) at .05 level

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$     \*\*\*  $p < .001$

$F(4,273) = 2.83, p < .05$ . However, the follow-up contrast showed no significant differences among the statuses except that the Unclassified group had a mean that was significantly higher than the Identity Achieved status (see Table 6).

A significant finding was also indicated regarding the Chance subscale,  $F(4,273) = 3.90, p < .005$ . As would be expected, given that the Identity Achieved status had the highest mean on Internality, it comes as no surprise that this status has the lowest mean on the Chance subscale. The follow-up contrast showed the Identity Achieved status to be significantly different from all the other statuses including the Unclassified group at the .05 level (see Table 6).

This global analysis of identity statuses in relationship to the three measures of locus of control clearly shows that the Identity Achieved status is the most Internal-control oriented and least Chance-control oriented of all the statuses.

Domain-specific status analysis

The three measures of locus of control were also analyzed in terms of identity statuses within specific domains. Within the domain of Vocation the Identity Achieved subjects were significantly more Internal-control oriented than were subjects that were Vocationally Diffused.

Similarly, in the domain of Religion the Religiously Diffused subjects, in contrast to the Religiously Achieved subjects, were more External-control oriented as shown by their significantly larger mean values on the Powerful Others and the Chance subscales.

In the domain of Politics the only significant finding was seen on the Internality subscale. The Politically Achieved subjects were significantly more Internal than the Politically Foreclosed and Diffused subjects (see Table 7).

Table 7

Domain-specific Identity Status Distribution in  
relationship to Locus of Control

Domain		Locus of Control					
		Internal		Power.	Others	Chance	
Status	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )
Vocation							
A. Ach.	76	32.38	(5.83)	17.33	(6.77)	17.87	(6.38)
B. Mor.	72	31.32	(6.50)	17.33	(6.29)	18.53	(7.17)
C. For.	21	31.76	(7.54)	18.62	(7.32)	17.43	(6.86)
D. Dif.	81	29.28	(5.97)	19.16	(7.75)	20.73	(6.66)
E. Uncl.	28	29.39	(7.75)	21.11	(7.70)	22.93	(8.66)
<u>F</u> (4,273)		2.87 *		2.09		4.16 **	
Post hoc comparisons		A > D			E > A,B,C		
Religion							
A. Ach.	45	31.60	(6.60)	15.51	(6.77)	16.36	(6.62)
B. Mor.	17	33.24	(5.03)	19.88	(8.42)	19.53	(6.61)
C. For.	147	30.80	(6.61)	17.89	(6.89)	19.11	(6.79)
D. Dif.	47	30.11	(5.72)	20.85	(7.33)	21.26	(7.42)
E. Uncl.	22	29.46	(7.65)	20.55	(6.02)	22.86	(7.79)
<u>F</u> (4,273)		1.14		4.27 **		4.43 **	
Post hoc comparisons		A < D,E			A < D,E		

Table continues....

Table 7 (continued)

Domain		Locus of Control					
		Internal		Power.Others		Chance	
Status	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )
Politics							
A. Ach.	36	33.97	(4.74)	18.61	(7.50)	17.58	(6.50)
B. Mor.	59	32.12	(5.27)	17.14	(6.93)	18.19	(6.78)
C. For.	23	29.22	(6.37)	17.48	(6.39)	18.49	(8.34)
D. Dif.	135	30.04	(6.58)	18.51	(6.84)	20.18	(6.68)
E. Uncl.	25	29.28	(8.88)	20.68	(9.10)	20.96	(9.15)
	<u>F</u> (4,273)		4.08 **		1.21		1.83
Post hoc comparisons		A > C,D,E					

NOTE. Post hoc comparison (HSD) at .05 level

\*  $p < .05$     \*\*  $p < .01$

Religious Subjects Compared

The religious subjects in both institutional settings were also compared on the three measures of locus of control. The two groups were significantly different on all three measures, with the religious subjects in the secular setting having the highest mean values on all three measures. This would suggest that these subjects were not only more Internal-control oriented but, paradoxically, also significantly more External-control oriented in terms of Powerful Others and Chance factors (see Table B).

Table B

Religious Subjects in the Two Institutional Settings in relationship to Locus of Control

Religious Subjects By Institution	N	Locus of Control		
		Internal	Powerful Others	Others
Religious	116	29.21	16.65	17.69
Secular	120	31.87	19.19	20.25
E (1,234)		9.55 *	5.18 *	5.38 *

\* Significant at .05 level or better

## Identity Status and Tolerance of Ambiguity

### Global Status Analysis

When comparing the identity statuses to the Tolerance of Ambiguity variable a statistically significant difference was seen between the statuses,  $F(4,273)=4.47$ ,  $p < .005$ . Follow-up contrasts utilizing Tukey's Studentized Range (HSD) procedure indicated that the Foreclosure status was significantly different from the Identity Achieved and Moratorium statuses at the .05 level.

In other words, the Foreclosed subjects were found to be significantly more intolerant of ambiguity when compared to Achievers and those in the Moratorium status. This finding supports the third hypothesis of this study. However, it is not clear why the Diffusion status was not included as being significantly different from Foreclosure, given that it's mean value is slightly smaller than the Moratorium status, other than the sample size differential having a possible influence. See Table 9.

Table 9

Global Identity Status Distribution in relationship to  
Tolerance of Ambiguity

Identity Status	Tolerance of Ambiguity		
	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
A. Achieved	39	45.31	6.42
B. Moratorium	162	47.62	6.06
C. Foreclosure	26	51.39	4.08
D. Diffusion	22	47.59	4.48
E. Unclassified	29	48.83	6.16
$\bar{E}$ (4,273)		4.47 *	
Post hoc comparisons		C > A,B	

Note. The higher the mean, the greater the intolerance of ambiguity. Post hoc comparisons at the .05 level

\*  $p < .01$

### Domain-specific Status Analysis

A domain-specific analysis of the statuses in relationship to the Tolerance of Ambiguity variable indicated a significant finding in all three domains. In the domain of Vocation the subjects who were in Vocational Moratorium were significantly more tolerant of ambiguity than the Vocationally Diffused subjects. Similarly, in the religious domain the subjects in Religious Moratorium were significantly more tolerant of ambiguity than the Religiously Foreclosed subjects. Regarding the domain of politics, subjects classified as Politically Achieved or Moratorium were significantly more tolerant of ambiguity than the Politically Foreclosed or Diffused subjects (see Table 10).

### Religious Subjects Compared

The Tolerance of Ambiguity variable was also used in comparing the religious subjects in both institutional settings. The mean values for the two groups were not significantly different.

Table 10

Domain-specific Identity Status Distribution in  
relationship to Tolerance of Ambiguity

Domain	Status	Tolerance of Ambiguity		
		<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Voc.	A. Achieved	76	47.42	6.46
	B. Moratorium	72	45.83	6.42
	C. Foreclosure	21	48.33	4.49
	D. Diffusion	81	49.00	5.17
	E. Unclassified	28	49.71	5.66
	<u>F</u> (4,273)		3.71 *	
	Post hoc comparisons		B < D,E	
Rel.	A. Achieved	45	46.02	6.04
	B. Moratorium	17	44.00	8.00
	C. Foreclosure	147	48.68	5.80
	D. Diffusion	47	47.60	5.36
	E. Unclassified	22	48.55	5.33
	<u>F</u> (4,273)		3.72 *	
	Post hoc comparisons		B < C	

Table continues...

Table 10 (continued)

Domain	Status	Tolerance of Ambiguity		
		<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Pol.	A. Achieved	36	45.64	5.74
	B. Moratorium	59	45.90	6.49
	C. Foreclosure	23	49.87	6.50
	D. Diffusion	135	49.01	5.48
	E. Unclassified	25	46.64	5.48
	<u>E</u> (4,273)		5.23 **	
	Post hoc comparison		A,B < C,D	

NOTE. Post hoc comparison (HSD) at .05 level

\*  $p < .01$     \*\*  $p < .001$

## Status and Religious Problem-solving Style

### Global status analysis

In comparing the identity statuses to the Religious Problem-solving Style variable, only subjects that considered themselves religious and actually filled-out this particular questionnaire were included in the analysis. This reduced the overall number of subjects from 278 to 230. Each of the three Religious Problem-solving Style subscales were analysed separately using the analysis of variance procedure with the identity statuses as the independent variable. There were no significant differences among the statuses for the Self-directing style. However, there were significant differences for the Collaborative and the Deferring styles;  $F(4,225)=6.13, p < .001$  and  $F(4,225)=5.20, p < .001$  respectively. Follow-up contrasts of these two latter styles showed that Diffused subjects had the smallest means compared to all other statuses including the Unclassified group, in both instances (see Table 11).

Table 11

Global Identity Status Distribution in relationship to  
Religious Problem-solving Style

Status	N	Religious Problem-solving Style		
		Collab. M (SD)	Self-dir. M (SD)	Deferring M (SD)
A. Ach.	35	19.00 (4.62)	17.03 (3.73)	15.83 (5.57)
B. Mor.	136	17.60 (4.55)	17.63 (4.24)	14.49 (5.10)
C. For.	23	20.48 (3.49)	15.70 (2.44)	17.35 (2.67)
D. Dif.	11	12.55 (5.61)	19.82 (6.42)	9.55 (4.99)
F. Uncl.	25	18.40 (5.58)	17.68 (4.53)	15.48 (4.98)
<u>F</u> (4,225)		6.13 *	2.06	5.20 *
Post hoc comparisons		D < all		D < all

NOTE. Post hoc comparisons (HSD) at .05 level. \*  $p < .001$

### Domain-specific Status Analysis

A domain-specific analysis of the statuses in relationship to Religious Problem-solving Style produced no significant differences in the Political domain, and no really meaningful significant differences in the Vocational domain. However, the domain of religion did produce significant results on all three measures of Religious Problem-solving Style (see Table 12).

In both the Collaborative and Deferring styles the Diffusion status had the significantly lowest mean compared to all other statuses. This would suggest that the Religiously Diffused have the least internalized form of religion, but at the same time show the least reliance on external rules. This result appears to be consistent with the general conceptualization of the Religiously Diffused individual, that is, one who is neither seriously exploring religious identity issues nor forming any kind of religious commitments.

In contrast, on the Self-directing measure, the Religiously Diffused subjects have a significantly

Table 12

Domain-specific Identity Status Distribution in  
relationship to Religious Problem-solving Style

Domain		Religious Problem-solving Style					
		Collab.		Self-dir.		Deferring	
Status	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>(SD)</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>(SD)</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>(SD)</u>
Vocation							
A. Ach.	63	17.38	(4.76)	18.37	(4.05)	14.51	(5.35)
B. Mor.	63	18.94	(3.66)	17.03	(3.48)	14.92	(4.51)
C. For.	16	18.56	(5.05)	18.13	(4.05)	15.69	(5.50)
D. Dif.	67	17.72	(5.04)	17.58	(4.48)	15.21	(5.24)
E. Uncl.	21	16.91	(6.98)	15.10	(5.29)	13.86	(6.03)
<u>F</u> (4,225)		1.21		2.73 *		.45	
Post hoc comparisons				A > E			
Religion							
A. Ach.	40	19.58	(4.96)	16.70	(4.27)	16.28	(5.66)
B. Mor.	16	17.13	(3.26)	19.31	(2.77)	13.31	(3.54)
C. For.	131	18.79	(4.13)	16.65	(3.76)	15.92	(4.64)
D. Dif.	26	11.81	(3.36)	21.19	(5.45)	8.77	(3.14)
E. Uncl.	17	17.77	(5.95)	18.00	(3.00)	14.00	(4.69)
<u>F</u> (4,225)		16.00 **		8.42 **		14.44 **	
Post hoc comparisons				D < all		D > A,C	
				D < all			

Table continues...

Table 12 (continued)

		Religious Problem-solving Style					
Domain		Collab.		Self-dir.		Deffering	
Status	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )	<u>M</u>	( <u>SD</u> )
Politics							
A. Ach.	29	17.79	(4.07)	18.83	(4.05)	13.66	(5.03)
B. Mor.	53	17.72	(4.88)	17.42	(3.97)	14.30	(5.47)
C. For.	18	19.67	(4.52)	16.28	(4.14)	16.44	(4.76)
D. Dif.	111	17.66	(5.18)	17.43	(4.49)	14.87	(5.24)
E. Uncl.	19	18.90	(4.01)	16.74	(3.38)	16.58	(3.78)
	<u>F</u> (4,225)		.88		1.26		1.52

NOTE. Post hoc comparisons (HSD) at .05 level. Total N=230

\*  $p < .05$  \*\*  $p < .001$

larger mean than the Religiously Achieved and Foreclosed subjects. This would suggest that the Religiously Diffused subject tends to rely on his or her own personal resources more than on religious resources, in contrast to the Religiously Achieved and Religiously Foreclosed subject.

#### Religious Subjects Compared

When comparing the religious subjects of both institutional settings on Religious Problem-solving Style, no significant differences were found on the Self-directing subscale.

However, both the Collaborative and Deffering subscales produced significant differences between the two groups. In both instances the religious subjects in the secular institutional setting had significantly lower mean values (see Table 13).

Table 13

Religious Subjects in both settings compared on  
Religious Problem-solving Style

Religious Subjects by Institution	Religious Problem-solving Style			
	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>M</u>
Religious	116	19.92	15.52	16.85
Secular	120	13.58	15.73	11.04
<u>F</u> (1,234)		61.38 *	.17	59.93 *

\*  $p < .001$

Foreclosure Status Differentiation

Procedure for "open" and "closed" groups

Subjects that were Foreclosed in the religious domain now became the population of interest in order to differentiate within the Foreclosure status and to test the fifth hypothesis. All Religiously Foreclosed subjects showing exploratory skills, as indicated by a

status of Achievement or Moratorium in either of the other two domains (vocation or politics), were labelled "open". Conversely, if no such skills were indicated in the other domains they were labelled "closed".

However, an unanticipated problem arose when subjects were Foreclosed in the domain of religion but "unclassified" in one or both of the other domains. In such instances, in order to minimize the loss of subjects, a closer examination of each protocol was undertaken. If the "unclassified" subject indicated a predominantly low identity showing (e.g., Foreclosure-Diffusion) in that particular domain in which they were labeled "unclassified", they were included in the "closed" category. If, on the other hand, they appeared to have predominantly high identity characteristics (e.g., Achievement-Moratorium) they were labelled "open".

Furthermore, the categorization of the subject in this manner was generally confirmed by the subject's overall identity status as indicated by the global identity measure. For example, a Foreclosed subject was Diffused in Politics but Unclassified in Vocation. A

closer look at the vocational protocol indicated a greater combination of high-identity responses as opposed to low. The indication of high-identity standing was further confirmed when the subject was shown to be classified as high identity on the global identity measure (e.g., Achievement or Moratorium). Therefore, such a subject was labelled "open" in spite of being Diffused in Politics and Unclassified in Vocation, simply because the unclassified category covered a predominantly high-identity protocol.

#### Comparisons of "Open" and "Closed" Groups

Following the above procedure resulted in 132 subjects that were Foreclosed in the domain of religion. Of these 132, 94 were "open" and 38 were "closed". The two categories of subjects were then compared on locus of control, tolerance of ambiguity, and religious problem-solving style. Because the sample sizes for the two groups were relatively small, no significant differences were seen below the .05 level. However, meaningful trends were seen when comparing the two groups on the locus of control and the tolerance of ambiguity variables. For example, even though not

significant, the "open" group had a higher mean on Internality, a lower mean on Chance, and a lower mean on Tolerance of Ambiguity, when compared to the "closed" group (see Table 14).

#### Gender Differences

In comparing Religiously Foreclosed males and females in terms of being "open" and "closed" a significant difference was seen,  $\chi^2(1, N=132)=11.91$ ,  $p < .05$ . Only 48.57% of males were classified as "open" compared to 79.38% of females. Conversely, 51.43% of males were classified as "closed" compared to only 20.62% of females. Therefore, it appears that Religiously Foreclosed females tend to be more "open" than Religiously Foreclosed males.

Table 14

Differentiating Subjects within the Foreclosure Status

Religiously Foreclosed Subjects					
Dependent Measure	"Open"		"Closed"		F (1,130)
	M	(SD)	M	(SD)	
<u>Locus of Control</u>					
Internality	31.43	(6.61)	30.66	(6.19)	.38
Powerful Others	18.18	(6.57)	16.66	(5.97)	1.53
Chance	18.20	(6.12)	20.53	(6.00)	3.94 *
<u>Tol. of Ambig.</u>	47.94	(6.03)	50.00	(5.75)	3.25 *
<u>Rel.Prob-sol.Style</u>					
Collaborative	16.43	(6.77)	16.63	(7.96)	.02
Self-directing	14.90	(6.00)	14.87	(7.29)	.00
Deferring	13.85	(6.33)	13.82	(7.48)	.00

Note. "Open" (n=94), "Closed" (n=38)

\* approaching the .05 level of significance

## CHAPTER IV

## DISCUSSION

This study attempted to look at religious identity formation as part of the overall identity formation processes. Subjects were compared from ideologically homogeneous (religious) and ideologically heterogeneous (secular) academic environments. A global status analysis was accompanied by a domain-specific approach in order to provide more accurate and meaningful identity status profiles. This domain-specific analysis also provided an opportunity to enable a differentiation within the Foreclosure status for subjects classified as Religiously Foreclosed.

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis expected to find a significantly greater percentage of identity Foreclosed subjects in the religious setting as opposed to subjects in the secular institutional setting. The rationale

being that the religious institutional setting would provide a relatively homogeneous environment, ideologically speaking, that would tend toward maintaining rather than challenging existing beliefs and commitments.

In contrast, an ideologically heterogeneous academic environment is more likely to stimulate an identity crisis because it provides greater exposure to new and different perspectives. This forces the subject to re-evaluate his or her original commitments.

Developmentally, Identity-status theorists would also predict that once an identity crisis has begun it is likely to end with the individual either forming personally meaningful commitments (i.e., movement toward Achievement), or renouncing the challenge as unresolvable (i.e., becoming Identity Diffused).

The significant finding that 13.75% of subjects in the religious setting were in the Foreclosure status, as opposed to only 6.17% in the secular institutional setting, provides support for the first hypothesis. The first hypothesis was also clearly supported by the

domain-specific approach in the domain of religion; 60.34% were religiously Foreclosed in the religious setting compared to 47.53% in the secular setting.

Furthermore, given that enrollment within a specific religious institutional setting would involve considerable deliberation followed by choice and commitment, it comes as no surprise when comparing the religious and secular settings that almost twice as many subjects in the religious setting were in the committed statuses (Achievement and Foreclosure). Approximately 30% in the religious setting compared to 18% in the secular setting.

Consistent with identity-status theory and research on late adolescents, the status containing the largest proportion of subjects was the Moratorium status. This was true for both institutional settings. That is, in spite of the ideological differences in the academic environments, the proportion of subjects in the Moratorium status were almost identical; a little over 58% in both institutional settings (Table 1). This would imply that the bulk of the subjects in the religious setting are just as active in exploring

identity issues as their counterparts in the secular institution.

In looking further at these results, a major concern has to be the large proportion of Diffused subjects in the secular institutional setting. Whereas, in the religious setting the proportion of Diffused subjects approached only 2%, the secular setting had a little over 12% (Table 1).

This finding is not surprising and is consistent with the finding of three longitudinal studies (Adams & Fitch, 1982; Waterman, Geary & Waterman, 1974; and Waterman & Goldman, 1976) that traced identity development through the college years. One finding in these studies that is particularly relevant here was the discovery that colleges often undermine traditional religious beliefs without necessarily helping students develop meaningful alternative belief systems.

However, a finding in this study that seems to go contrary to theoretical expectations resulted when only the religiously oriented subjects were compared from both academic settings. In this instance the domain-

specific approach in the domain of religion showed that the proportion of religiously Foreclosed subjects was almost identical in both settings; 60.34% compared to 60.83% (Table 4). Such a large percentage of Foreclosed subjects are expected in the religious setting where peers and adults reinforce and accept the subject's commitments, but not in the secular setting where such commitments are frequently challenged.

A possible explanation for this finding is that the subjects in the secular setting were, generally, first year students. A religiously Foreclosed subject in his or her first year is still likely to have a circle of friends with similar beliefs, a situation that is likely to change over time. Another possibility for sustaining religious Foreclosure in a secular institutional setting is the increased activity of religiously sponsored groups on campus. These groups may provide the necessary peer reinforcement to sustain Foreclosure commitments.

Furthermore, it is quite possible that, at least for adolescents, being Foreclosed in a particular domain is functionally adaptive. It can provide some continuity

and stability to the ego while at the same time enabling energy to be expended on a great deal of exploration in a currently more salient identity domain.

Perhaps this can be seen when comparing subjects in the religious institutional setting (Table 2). More than 84% are in the high commitment classification in the domain of Religion (Achievement, 24.14% and Foreclosure, 60.34%). Being highly committed in the religious domain allowed for greater exploration and noncommitment in the domain of vocation, more than 65% (Moratorium, 35.34% and Diffusion, 30.17%), without the negative effects of an overall identity diffusion scenario setting in.

That is to say, Religious Foreclosure could be providing a safe ego anchorage that enables these adolescents to focus on more pressing identity concerns. Perhaps this is quite dramatically seen when comparing religious subjects in the religious setting and nonreligious subjects in the secular setting. The proportion of subjects classified as globally diffused among the religious subjects was 1.72% compared to 35.71% among non-religious subjects. Therefore, it

appears that being highly committed in one domain, even Foreclosed, can provide a temporary anchorage while sorting through identity elements in another domain.

### Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis in this study looked at the identity statuses in terms of locus of control. It was hypothesized that Achievers would be more Internal compared to other identity statuses. This hypothesis was clearly supported.

A glimpse of the rank ordering of the means of each status on the three measures of locus of control is interesting:

1. Internality: Ach > Mor > Dif > For
2. Powerful Others: For > Dif > Mor > Ach
3. Chance: For > Dif > Mor > Ach

Therefore, in regard to externality (Powerful Others and Chance) Foreclosed subjects ranked the highest followed by Diffused subjects. Furthermore, the rank order duplication on the external dimension seems to confirm the robust nature of Rotter's original, dichotomous,

Intrinsic-Extrinsic dimension, at least according to the way the identity statuses are ranked in this study.

From these findings there is no indication to support the notion that belief in Powerful Others is similar "to Rotter's conceptualization of internality" (Lenenson, 1973, p.15), given that Foreclosures and Achievers appear to be at opposite ends on each measure of locus of control.

Previous results relating statuses to locus of control were somewhat equivocal, some studies associating high internality with the identity status criteria of exploration (Achievement and Moratorium) while others showed the commitment criteria to be important (Achievement and Foreclosure). The rank ordering of identity statuses in this study would associate the exploration criteria with high internality.

### Hypothesis Three

In the third hypothesis it was predicted that the Foreclosure status would be significantly more intolerant of ambiguity than the other statuses. This hypothesis was also supported by this study. The finding suggests that Foreclosures are actively involved in seeking to impose a meaningful structure on ambiguous situations in order to avoid the discomfort brought on by such ambiguity.

The discomfort toward ambiguity among Foreclosed subjects is probably reflective of the fact that they have been satisfied with a conferred identity and have not been personally involved in the construction of an identity. Construction implies a sorting through of previously acquired childhood identifications and the synthesizing and fashioning of a "unique" self.

The construction of an identity presupposes the imposition of an active decision-making process which results, not only in a "self" that is more constant across situations and less dependent on external

support, but also in the development of skills useful for adapting and handling ambiguity in the environment.

The construction and use of identity decision-making processes is most fully experienced in Identity Achieved subjects, which probably explains why it is the most tolerant of ambiguity among the statuses. For example, the rank ordering of the mean values of the global status analysis on Tolerance of Ambiguity (see Table 9) reveals: For > Mor > Dif > Ach. The greater the mean value, the more intolerant the status is of ambiguity.

#### Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis, relating identity statuses to Religious Problem-solving style, expected identity Achievers to be associated with the Collaborative problem-solving style and Foreclosures with the Defferring style. Hypothesis four was not supported. This finding is, perhaps, indicative of the fact that the two constructs, one involving identity problem-solving styles (statuses) and the other religious

problem-solving styles, are only an approximate parallel.

However, by collapsing statuses on the commitment criteria the results appear to be more meaningful. That is, by first summing the mean values for Achievers and Foreclosures, and then contrasting this value with the summed means of the Moratorium and Diffused statuses (see Table 12, religious domain), the results show that on the Collaborative style the high commitment mean equals 38.37 compared to the low commitment mean of 28.94. This gives a 10-point difference between the two. A similar differential is seen for the Deferring style: high commitment (32.20) compared to low commitment (22.08). The Self-directing style, on the other hand, goes in the opposite direction with a smaller spread: high commitment (33.35) compared to low commitment (40.50).

Given that the high commitment statuses are associated with higher mean values on the Collaborative and Deferring styles would lend support to the notion that these two styles are associated significantly with higher levels of involvement and commitment in religion.

Conversely, low commitment statuses in the religious domain are associated more with the Self-directing style, which is synchronous with a more humanistic type of religion that leans on its own resources.

Furthermore, given the pervasive humanistic presence in the secular institutional setting, it is not surprising that on both the Collaborative and Deferring religious problem-solving styles, the religious subjects in the religious settings score significantly higher than the religious subjects in the secular institutional setting.

#### Hypothesis Five

The expectations of the fifth hypothesis, in attempting to differentiate between "open" and "closed" religiously Foreclosed subjects, were not confirmed with significant findings. A possible reason why the Religious Problem-solving style failed to discriminate between the "open" and "closed" groups is suggested by the findings in the previous hypothesis. Given that the religious problem-solving measure was found to be more

helpful in discriminating along the status commitment criteria, and the "open" and "closed" groups were separated on the basis of the exploratory criteria, it is no surprise that this measure did not discriminate between the two groups.

However, trends in a number of important areas were in the expected direction, with differences on Internality and Tolerance of Ambiguity approaching the .05 level of significance. These trends give partial support to the notions and rationale behind this particular hypothesis.

The basic idea being that if, indeed, the "open" Foreclosed subjects had experienced identity-exploratory skills, as manifested in high identity standing in other domains, then they should manifest a greater degree of internality and tolerance compared to "closed" Foreclosed subjects that give no such evidence of employing these skills. The notion of "open" Foreclosed contrasted with "closed" Foreclosed subjects implies a slightly greater degree of flexibility and less defensive rigidity on the part of "open" subjects, and also a greater degree of tolerance of differing view-points.

It would also imply a greater likelihood for successful resolution should the environmental support configurations change and an identity crisis be initiated.

#### Contributions and Future Considerations

This study looked at religious identity formation, generally, as part of the overall identity formation process, and specifically, through the identity status paradigm. It compared late adolescent subjects in religious and secular academic institutional settings. After comparing identity status characteristics on Locus of Control, Tolerance of Ambiguity, and Religious Problem-solving Style, it attempted to use these measures in further differentiating within the religious Foreclosure status.

The findings of this study have contributed to our knowledge by providing more information regarding religious identity formation, an area that has been somewhat neglected by identity-status researchers. This study has also contributed to the very few attempts at

discriminating within a status, and probably the first attempt at discriminating within the religiously Foreclosed status.

However, there are a couple of things that could be considered in future research in this area. First, increasing the sample sizes, particularly from religious institutions, would enable a further comparison between religious institutions themselves. It would be interesting to see how "content" affects "process" more clearly by discriminating among religious institutions along the liberal-conservative dimension.

Furthermore, increasing sample sizes would not only enable more effective gender comparisons, but also facilitate a more effective comparison between religiously oriented subjects in religious settings, religiously oriented in secular settings, and non-religious in secular settings.

Second, where feasible longitudinal studies covering the college years on ideologically differing campuses could be compared. Furthermore, a description of the quality and the nature of religious support systems on

these campuses could be explored in relationship to identity status shifts over the given period.

## References

- Adams, G. R., & Fitch, S. A. (1982). Ego stage and identity status development: a cross-sequential analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 574-583.
- Adams, G. R., & Gullotta, T. (1983). Adolescent Life Experience. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Adams, G. R., & Shea, J. A. (1979). The relationship between identity status, locus of control, and ego development. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8, 81-89.
- 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, 8, 223-228.
- Bourne, E. (1978a). The state of research on ego identity: A review and appraisal, Part I. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 8, 371-392.

- Bourne, E. (1979b). The state of research on ego identity: A review and appraisal, Part II. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 7, 371-392.
- Budner, S. (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. Journal of Personality, 30, 29-50.
- Dellas, M., & Jernigan, L. P. (1981). Development of an objective instrument to measure identity status in terms of occupation crisis and commitment. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 41, 1029-1050.
- Dellas, J., & Jernigan, L. P. (1986). Relationship of occupational, religious, and political statuses to personality. Unpublished data.
- Erikson, E. H. (1980). Identity and the life cycle. New York: Norton.
- Erikson, E. H. (1974). Dimensions of a new identity. New York: Norton.

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

Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1958) Young man Luther. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1956). The problem of ego identity. Journal of the American Psychoanalytical Association, 4, 56-121.

Getz, I. R. (1984). Moral Judgment and Religion: A Review of the Literature. Counseling and Values, 28, 94-116.

Ginsburg, S. D., & Orlofsky, J. L. (1981). Ego identity status, ego development, and locus of control in college women. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 10, 297-307.

Grotevant, H. D., & Adams, G. R. (1984). Development of an objective measure to assess ego identity in adolescence: validation and replication. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13, 419-438.

Grotevant, H. D., & Thorbecke, W. L. (1982). Sex differences in styles of occupational identity formation in late adolescence. Developmental Psychology, 18, 396-405.

Grotevant, H. D., Thorbecke, W., & Meyer, M. L. (1982). An extension of Marcia's identity status interview into the interpersonal domain. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11, 33-47.

Howard, M. R. (1975). Ego identity status in woman, fear of success, and performance in a competitive situation. Unpublished manuscript. State University of New York at Buffalo.

Levenson, H. (1981). Differentiating among internality, powerful others, and chance. In H. M. Lefcourt

(Ed.), Research with the Locus of Control Construct. New York: Academy Press.

Levenson, H. (1973). Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 41, 397-404.

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

Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego identity status. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3, 551-558.

Marcia, J. E. (1964). Determination and construct validity of ego identity status. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Marcia, J. E., & Miller, E. C. (1980). Ego identity in mature women. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association meeting, Hartford, Connecticut.

Marcia, J. E., Waterman, A. S., Matteson, D. R., Archer, S. L., & Orlofsky, J. L. (1987). Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Matteson, D. R. (1977). Peer support for adolescent identity formation. Unpublished manuscript. Governors State University, Park Forest South, Illinois.

Matteson, D. R. (1975). Adolescence today: Sex roles and the search for identity. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.

Neter, J., Wasserman, W., & Kutner, M. H. (1985). Applied Linear Statistical Models, 2nd Edition. Homewood, IL: Irwin.

Newman, B. M., & Newman, P. r. (1978). The concept of identity: Research and theory. Adolescence, 13, 157-166.

Pergament, L. I., Kennell, J., Hathaway, W., Grevengoed, N., Newman, J., & Jones, W. (1988). Religion and

the Problem-Solving process: Three Styles of Coping.  
Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, 27, 90-  
104.

Rotter, J. B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for  
internal versus external control of reinforcement.  
Psychological Monographs, 80, No. 1 (Whole No. 609).

Rotter, J. B., Seeman, M., & Liverant, S. (1962).  
"Internal versus external control of reinforcement:  
A major variable in behavior theory": In N. F.  
Washburne (Ed.), Decisions, values and groups. (Vol.  
2). London: Pergamon.

Waterman, A. S. (1988). Identity Status Theory and  
Erikson's Theory: Communalities and Differences.  
Developmental Review, 8, 185-208.

Waterman, A. S. (1985). Identity in the context of  
adolescent psychology. In A. S. Waterman (Ed.),  
Identity in Adolescence: Processes and Contents.  
(New Directions for Child Development, No. 30). San  
Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Waterman, A. S. (1982). Identity development from adolescence to adulthood: An extension of theory and a review of research. Developmental Psychology, 18, 341-358.

Waterman, A. S., & Archer, S. L. (in press). A Lifespan perspective on identity formation: Developments in form, function, and process. In P. B. Baltes, D. L. Featherman, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), Lifespan development and behavior. (Vol. 11). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Waterman, A. S., Geary, F. S., & Waterman, C. K. (1974). Longitudinal study of changes in ego identity status from the freshman to the senior year at college. Developmental Psychology, 10, 387-392.

Waterman, A. S., & Goldman, J. A. (1976). A longitudinal study of ego identity development at a liberal arts college. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 5, 361-369.

Waterman, C. K., Beubel, M., & Waterman, A. S. (1970).

Relationship between resolution of the identity crisis and outcomes of previous psychosocial crises. Proceedings of the 78th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 467-468.