2000

Two views of identity development in adolescence: An empirical comparison of the narrative and status approaches

Kathleen Mackey
Wilfrid Laurier University

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

Two Views of Identity Development in Adolescence:

An Empirical Comparison of the Narrative and Status Approaches

by

Kathleen Mackey

B.A., Honours Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University, 1996

THESIS

Submitted to the Department of Psychology

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for

Master of Arts

Wilfrid Laurier University

1999

Abstract

The purpose of the present study was to determine the relationships among personal life stories, identity status development and family climate during late adolescence. The current study examines the parallels between two conceptions of identity: Marcia's interview assessment of identity status development, and McAdams' narrative conception of identity development as revealed through the life story. A sample of 131 high school students, 51 males and 80 females, were asked to recall and discuss a critical incident that had a crucial impact on their beliefs and values. Marcia's interview assessment of identity status was also administered for vocational and religious domains. Participants completed Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch's (1991) perceived parenting style questionnaire, and Byles, Byrne, Boyle, and Offord's (1988) family assessment device (FAD) for family cohesion.

The critical incident narratives were coded for their clarity and coherence. Results indicated that the clarity and coherence of narratives were significantly positively related to the development of vocational identity status on the Marcia measure, as predicted, but not to the development of religious identity status. Neither vocational identity status, nor religious identity status was significantly related to student reports of more authoritative parenting. However, a more cohesive family environment, as assessed by the FAD, was significantly positively related to a more advanced vocational identity status, but not significantly related to religious identity status. A more authoritative family climate was not

significantly related to narrative clarity, or coherence. However, the FAD revealed a significant positive relationship with narrative clarity, but not coherence. These findings suggest that there is only modest overlap between the identity status constructs of Marcia, and the life story narrative construct of McAdams. It appears that these are two reasonably distinct frameworks for studying identity development, at least during this mid-adolescent period.

Acknowledgements

I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to all those involved in the "Futures Project." First, I would like to thank the participants for their cooperation and willingness to share their personal life stories. The schools and teachers that participated should also be complimented for their open attitudes toward the research process. I would like to thank the interviewers for their endless probing and attention to detail. As well, my genuine appreciation goes to Susan Alisat who always goes above and beyond the call of duty.

Special thanks to Dr. Pratt, my advisor, for his time and effort. I would also like to thank Dr. Mike Pratt, Dr. Mark Pancer and Dr. Bruce Hunsberger, not only for their guidance with this particular project, but the many opportunities that they have granted me during my time at Laurier.

Table of Contents

Tables

Appendices

Two Views of Identity Development in Adolescence: An Empirical Comparison of the Narrative and Status Approaches

Identity development over the course of adolescence is a particularly important life marker. The development of a personal identity is a rite of passage that marks the transition to adulthood and can now be studied through at least two important frameworks, which will be presented later in this paper. In many ways this transition is a reflective process and can have many different outcomes for an adolescent who is discovering who he or she really is in the big scheme of things. The current paper will trace out two frameworks of identity development in adolescence and illustrate the connections between these frameworks and family parenting and functioning during this period of adolescent transition.

Most of the recent work in the area of identity development in adolescence has focused on the conceptions of identity articulated by Marcia (e.g., Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, & Orlofsky, 1993) originating from Erikson's (1963) theory. According to Erikson, adolescents go through a period of "identity vs. role confusion" in the process of developing a more integrated sense of selfhood (Erikson, 1963). Erikson believed that adolescence is a period in life when values and personal stances regarding moral, political, and religious beliefs must be constructed and confirmed. Identity development is seen as a maturational process that evolves throughout adolescence and continues into early adulthood. Following Erikson's framework, Marcia and his colleagues (1993) operationalized

identity development through the articulation of four different identity statuses (identity achievement, foreclosure, moratorium and diffusion) based on the extent to which the individual has considered, and chosen, a particular identity from a set of alternatives that have been considered.

Recently, an alternative narrative model of identity has been described (McAdams, 1993), also entailing an important developmental component in adolescence, but based in a conception of the "life story" and its growth and change. McAdams (1996) argues that a sense of self is directly reflected, and in fact constructed, in the ongoing narrative of an individual about his/her "life story." This process is particularly characteristic of modern cultures, where identities are typically open and somewhat fluid, and must be constantly renegotiated by the individual. McAdams (1993) sees the telling of stories as a direct indicator of the development of identity in adolescence, and thus implies that the structure and content of specific life stories should reflect the development of a clearer sense of identity or self. Marcia's and McAdams' two approaches to identity have arisen from different research traditions and have not been related conceptually or empirically (e.g., Marcia & Strayer, 1996). The current descriptive study investigates empirically the possible relations between these two different conceptions of identity development within a sample of high school students.

Also of interest to the present research is how these two conceptions of identity development might be linked to family parenting style and family climate, presuming that more effective parenting might encourage a more advanced

personal and social development in the sphere of identity formation, as measured by both of these systems (e.g., Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, & Fehr, 1980).

Several aspects of the literature will be reviewed. The first area to be discussed will be Eriksonian views of identity status development. The narrative approach to identity formation will then be described, including our expansion and operationalization of it. The final topic to be discussed will be the possible role of parenting style in identity formation, with an emphasis on the authoritative parenting style (e.g., Baumrind, 1991). Lastly, the purpose and hypotheses of the present study will be described.

Identity Status

Identity refers to an individual's sense of a unitary self and role image (Erikson, 1963). In other words, identity gives us an understanding of who we are and where and how we fit into the world. Based on his psychosocial perspective, Erikson stated that adolescents go through a period of 'identity vs. role confusion' that fulfills a need of the adolescent to come to terms with the variety of incomplete "selves" of childhood, and to develop a more integrated sense of self across situations and over time. Erikson believed that this was also a period of time in the adolescent's life when he or she confirmed values and a personal stance regarding moral, political and religious beliefs.

Based on Erikson's theorizing, Marcia et al. (1993) described four identity statuses: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement. The four identity statuses are defined on the basis of two dimensions, crisis (serious consideration

or exploration of alternatives) and commitment (a stable investment in one of these alternatives). These dimensions are markers of identity development which combine to form the 4 statuses: from one who has not considered choices or made any commitment (diffused), to one who accepts a commitment without experiencing any exploration of alternatives (foreclosed), to the individual actively considering alternatives (moratorium), to one who has considered and made choices, and found his/her identity (achievement). The four statuses, as defined by crisis and commitment, can be ordered developmentally in a general way from (1) diffusion to (2) foreclosure to (3) moratorium to (4) achievement (see Appendix A). Thus, an individual who is "diffused" lacks commitment and has not even begun the exploration of a particular aspect of his or her identity, whereas someone who is identity achieved in a life domain has explored possible alternatives and then made a commitment to one of them.

In a cross-sectional study, Archer and Waterman (1983) found that with increasing grade level, from junior high through high school, the frequency of identity achievers and moratoriums increased, while the frequency of foreclosures and diffusions decreased. Taking a developmental perspective, then, the levels of identity development should generally increase from diffusion through to achievement with increasing age, as outlined above. This model has received some empirical validation (Marcia et. al., 1993).

Marcia and his colleagues (1993) argued that identity develops within specific domains and that an individual's identity statuses can differ across domains. For example, a single individual can be "achieved" in the vocational

domain, yet "foreclosed" in the religious domain. Waterman (1982) described 5 core domains for studying identity status: vocation, religion, politics, gender role, and sexual expression. In the present study, we will focus on the domains of vocation and religion. The vocational domain concerns the adolescent's plans for a career or job in adulthood, whereas the religious domain is concerned with the adolescent's personal sense of religious and moral ideology. Data were collected also on political identity in this investigation, but a very large proportion of these high school participants appeared diffused in this domain, so this measure was not included here.

Narrative Identity

Narrative occurs in many different contexts, but for the purposes of the current study we will focus only on the telling of personal life stories. Polkinghorne (1991) described such self-narratives as stories that link "self-identity" or "self-concept" to the "here-and-now." These stories place our lives in a cultural and temporal context that gives distinct meaning to the "self" in the current context. McAdams (1988) defines life narratives more operationally, as "storied autobiographical accounts told in the person's own words (p. 2)." McAdams (1993) tied Erikson's (1963) ideas about identity to the telling of personal life stories in developing his narrative approach to the study of identity development.

McAdams (1996) also presented a general framework for studying personality in "narrative context." This consists of three independent levels which are viewed as "potential components of the self" (McAdams 1996, p. 301).

In this model, level 1 is based on traits that give a broad description of an individual's personality. These "objective" indices compare the individual with others, essentially from the viewpoint of an "outside observer." Level 2, which is called "personal concerns," refers to descriptions of individual endeavors and projects, which could include characteristic motives and roles, such as values, strivings, or strategies that are inherent to the individual. This second level is more interior, but still publicly observable. A third level is described as one, which consists of an "inner," unique, sense of personal identity, and is, for McAdams, based on narrative. Thus, this is the point at which narrative and personality become mutually constitutive. This means that not only does the individual come to define him/herself by a life story, but also the construction of this life story is the process of understanding the self in context. The personal narrative becomes a mirror of an individual.

McAdams (1996) thus argued that, particularly in modern cultures, where identities are typically open and somewhat fluid, a sense of self is directly reflected, and in fact constructed, in the ongoing narrative of an individual's "life story." McAdams (1993) points out that these identity narratives are constructed coherently for the first time during adolescence. Thus, the coherence of life story narratives might be used as an indicator of the development of identity in adolescents. More specifically, through the study of the structure and content of the adolescent's life narrative, the researcher can identify components of the story that specify identity development and identity types (McAdams, 1993).

The present study examines two indices of narrative quality: coherence and clarity. Clarity refers to the expression, to a reader or listener, of an intelligible train of thought that can be readily understood throughout the narrative. The characters and events of an effective story should be clear and intelligible. Coherence refers to the degree to which an individual's personal beliefs and values are exemplified throughout the life story, and are thereby traceable to the person's sense of self. Although these two indices illustrate somewhat different attributes of narratives, there are commonalities between them. Both of these indices are based on the same story, they both include ratings on stylistic aspects of the narrative, and both are qualitative measures. It makes sense, then, that there should be a moderate positive relationship between narrative clarity and coherence. In fact, narrative coherence may be difficult to achieve without at least reasonable levels of clarity, so that the story can be understood. However, some degree of differentiation of these two indices of narrative quality should be apparent in the life narratives as well.

Narrative Quality and Identity Status

Neimeyer and Rareshide (1991) examined the relationship between identity development and the recall of personal memories. Seventy-one university students participated in a computer-interactive memory recall procedure. Specifically, each participant was involved in a 3-stage memory recall procedure, which involved the use of a computer. First the participants rated bipolar constructs (e.g., outgoing vs. shy), and determined how important these constructs would be in developing insight about people. The participants

rated themselves on certain descriptive traits and generated example stories that illustrated their ratings. They then took part in a recall procedure based on Brewer's (1986) procedure for eliciting personal memories. The instructions were as follows, "A trait will be presented on the screen. Your task is to attempt to recall specific incidents in your life when you exemplified or demonstrated that particular trait. Press the red key each time you recall an incident" (p. 565). This study revealed that those participants who were classified as having a committed identity status, in other words either foreclosed or achieved individuals, according to Marcia et al. (1993), showed both more extensive and more fluent recall of personal memories that were cued by specific personal qualities (e.g., the quality "outgoing"). This was assessed by measuring participant reaction time and by the total number of memories generated.

The present study examines the relationship between the "quality" of individuals' narratives about personal development and identity status, as well as the associations between these constructs and parenting and family functioning. While Neimeyer and Rareshide focused upon more cognitive dimensions of multiple incidents, the current study explores the quality of retelling a single critical incident. Neimeyer and Rareshide's (1991) findings indicated that those individuals who are more committed in their status characterization on the Marcia et al. (1993) measures exhibited greater ease of recall of "exemplary" personal memories. Drawing upon these findings, then, the personal narratives in the present study told by such committed individuals should also be clearer and more coherent. Thus, there should be a positive relationship between the

narrative clarity and coherence of personal life stories and a more committed identity status. We reasoned that as people initially grapple more with the issues of identity choice (crisis), and then as they actually fix on personal choices (commitment), they could be expected to become clearer and more coherent in how they access and describe stories of their own personal turning points. The Neimeyer and Rareshide (1991) findings of more fluent and extensive narratives from committed individuals seemed consistent with the current research expectations, but we also predicted that the experience of "crisis" in an identity domain could enhance narrative quality as well.

Parenting Style

The next connection for this research builds upon a consideration of the social interaction that may play a part in helping or hindering the development of identity, specifically parenting characteristics in the family. Baumrind (1971) developed a model of three main styles of parenting. These are "authoritative," "authoritarian," and "permissive." Baumrind (1991) subsequently added a fourth parenting style to this model, "rejecting-neglecting." The greatest wealth of literature has focused upon the authoritative parent; this style has been associated with many positive outcomes for adolescents (e.g., Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 1994). Steinberg et al. (1994) noted that adolescents with more authoritative parents were less involved with problem behaviours, such as delinquency, school misconduct and drug and alcohol use. They also found that these adolescents were more self-reliant, had fewer somatic symptoms and a greater orientation to school than their counterparts. Lamborn,

Mounts, Steinberg and Dornbusch (1991) similarly found that adolescents who rated parents as more authoritative scored highest on measures of psychological competence, and lowest on measures of psychological and behavioral dysfunction.

Combinations of the warmth and strictness expressed by parents define these parenting styles. Baumrind (1991) described two broad, somewhat orthogonal, dimensions of parenting which may be used to characterize the four parenting styles: parental demandingness and parental responsiveness (see Appendix B). The authoritative parenting style illustrates high demandingness, (i.e., high levels of parental expectations for mature behaviors), as well as high responsiveness (i.e., warm, engaged concern about the child's individual needs). The authoritative parent makes demands and is directive without being overly restrictive, and is also encouraging and accepting of the child. In contrast, rejecting/ neglecting (or "disengaged") parents do not show warmth toward their children, nor do they provide household guidelines or rules. The permissive-indulgent parenting style, though high in warmth and affection, is not characterized by an enforcement of rules or any restriction on behavior. The polar opposites of permissive parents are authoritarian parents who are very strict with their children, but do not show warmth or concern for their children's individuality. In general, these latter three styles (permissive, authoritarian, and rejecting/neglecting) are viewed as less effective approaches to socialization. A considerable number of studies of adolescent adjustment have been consistent with this argument, showing that those who perceive their parents as

authoritative report better adjustment (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Parenting Style and Identity Status

An early study by Douvan and Adelson (1966) found that identity-achieved adolescents had parents who were warm, supportive and consistent in rule enforcement, whereas non-achieved adolescents tended to have restrictive or overly permissive parents. Paralleling this evidence, we predict that more authoritative parenting climates, which are warm and supportive, yet also directive, will be predictive of a more advanced level of identity development. Specifically, the present study investigated the relationship between adolescents' questionnaire reports of perceived parenting styles in their families and Marcia et al.'s (1993) approach to the development of identity status. The current study differs from Douvan and Adelson's approach by exploring two different frameworks of identity development. Both Marcia et al.'s (1993) and McAdams' (1993) approaches are explored in the context of authoritative parenting.

Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, and Fehr (1980) also studied potential parental influences upon the development of identity in 7th and 11th grade students. The autocratic parenting style was described as one which inhibits the adolescent's expression of views and self-regulation, leaving ultimate control to the parent. The democratic parenting style allows the adolescent to contribute and discuss relevant issues, although the parents ultimately carry the responsibility for the decisions. The permissive parenting style leaves the role of decisions entirely to the adolescent. The use of autocratic, democratic, and permissive parenting styles in this study appeared to parallel, generally, Baumrind's (1971)

authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parenting styles, respectively. Interestingly, mother's parenting style did not show a significant relationship to identity achievement, but the father's style did, across the 7th and 11th grade age group (Enright et al., 1980). The overall conclusion was that the father's use of a democratic style best facilitated identity development in both males and females. The current study explores the connection between authoritative parenting (comparable to the democratic style) and adolescents' identity during a later point in development.

More recently, Berzonsky (1998) investigated the role of three parental authority patterns (authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive) and various social-cognitive "identity styles" in establishing identity commitments in college students. The three social-cognitive styles were: informational, normative and diffuse/avoidant, but are not specifically relevant to the current paper. Of more relevance to the study topic was that an authoritative parenting style predicted more advanced identity development in Berzonsky's study.

Parenting Style and Narrative

The current study explores not only Marcia et al.'s (1993) approach to identity development, but also looks at identity development through the use of narrative. This section of the paper is devoted to linking personal narratives with parenting. Unfortunately, only work on the stories of quite young children could be found to date. Peterson (1994) examined the narratives of 4-year-old children from different socioeconomic stratas. These children were classified into 3 groups including: middle-class children (Group 1) and children on social

assistance (Group 2). The third group of 4-year-olds involved children from "disorganized" households. These latter children were suggested by social work caseworkers, and typically were from foster care and poor parenting situations. All children participated in a 30-minute interview that asked them to tell a personal experience narrative, for example, "Once I fell when I was running and I skinned my knee. Have you ever fallen and hurt yourself? Tell me about it." The findings indicated that the socioeconomic status of the family was not important, but that the household's organizational pattern was a very important factor for the child's narrative production. The children from the middle and lower socioeconomic status families produced stories that were long and informative. The children from the disorganized households, however, often told stories that were short, and when these narratives were long they tended to be chronologically disorganized and poorly structured. In other words, the children from the disorganized family climates produced narratives that were likely to be relatively poor in clarity. While these results were observed for young children, the current study examines the relationship between family climate and the clarity and coherence of personal narratives produced by adolescents.

Fivush (1991) examined the narratives of 6 mother-child dyads. These dyads were interviewed when the child was 2.5 years of age and then again when the child was 3.5 years of age. During the first interview, the mothers were instructed to ask the child about 10 unusual events, such as a trip to the zoo or an airplane trip. The mothers were encouraged to interact with the child as they normally would on a day-to-day basis. During the second interview, the

interviewer prompted the child to recall 3 to 4 of the novel events from the first interview. The researcher examined the amount of information that the child provided, the organization of the narrative, and the purpose or function of the story. As one might expect, the child tended to mimic the mother's narrative structure.

Fivush found that mothers who provided a context linking the narratives in time, and narratives rich in information at time 1, had children who recounted the "temporally complex" and "informationally-dense" narratives at time 2. The pattern of this research suggests that the children's ability to structure personal narratives may be based upon social interactions with a competent parental figure who uses effective narrative skills. Again, this work suggests that family influences may play an important role in children's narrative skills. In the present study, the relations between family climate and narrative quality are investigated in older adolescent children. The current research will trace out two frameworks of identity development in adolescence and illustrate the connections between these frameworks and authoritative parenting and family functioning through this period of adolescent transition.

Purpose

This study investigates (a) the relationship between two ways of conceptualizing identity development and (b) the connections between identity as assessed by each of these approaches, and family parenting style and family climate. First, with respect to above responses to the relationship between the two ways of conceptualizing identity development, Marcia's identity status

interviews were compared to narratives based on personal life stories, specifically focusing on measures of the coherence and clarity of these stories. It was expected that these two measures of identity development would be moderately compatible across religious and vocational identity domains, so that development through the Eriksonian status levels and measures of narrative quality would be positively correlated. Second, to study the connections between identity as assessed by each of these approaches, parenting style and family climate were considered, to see if there was a connection to more advanced identity development during adolescence. It was expected that more authoritative families, and those that were more cohesive, would promote more advanced identity development in adolescents, following Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, and Fehr (1980). In other words, adolescents from more authoritative and/or more cohesive families were expected to demonstrate more advanced scores on the measure of identity status, and to produce clearer and more coherent stories about important life events.

Hypotheses

1. The clarity and coherence of life stories, conceptualized following McAdams (1993), will be positively correlated with a more advanced identity status as assessed from the Marcia status interviews.

2. a) More authoritative family parenting styles will be reported by those adolescents who have attained a more developmentally advanced level of identity status on the Marcia indices.

b) More cohesive families, as reported on an index of family functioning, will be

reported by those adolescents who have attained a more developmentally advanced level of identity status on the Marcia indices, based on work by Enright, Lapsley, Drivas, & Fehr (1980) reviewed earlier.

3. a) The clarity and coherence of identity narratives will be positively correlated with a more authoritative family parenting style.

b) The clarity and coherence of identity narratives will be positively correlated with a more cohesive family climate, based on work by Peterson (1994) reviewed earlier.

Method

Participants

A sub-sample of 131 students was drawn from a larger sample from "The Futures Project" research conducted by Dr. B. Hunsberger, Dr. M. Pancer, and Dr. M. Pratt. The overall goal of the Futures Project was to study value development during the transition from adolescence to adulthood. The complete sample included 935 participants, drawn from 16 different high schools in the Waterloo region of Ontario, Canada who completed two sets of questionnaires. The students participated on a voluntary basis and completed questionnaires during class time. Of the 935 students who completed the questionnaires, 227 also participated in a follow-up interview. These interviews provided information on each participant's identity status, as well as narrative accounts of "critical moral incidents". Of the 227 participants interviewed, 184 responded to the critical moral incident. The other 43 participants did not respond, due to time pressures or inability to generate a moral incident. Of this sample of 184, 131

told a critical incident that actually involved them as the main character in the story. The other 53 individuals told stories about moral incidents that occurred in the lives of their friends, family members, or other individuals. Only those participants who told a story about themselves were included in the present analyses, because of our particular interest in personal identity issues. There were 51 males and 80 females in the final sample, and the average age of the participants was 17.5 years. The youngest participant interviewed was age 16, and the oldest was age 19. Participants (and their parents if students were under 18) gave written consent for students to participate in the study. Each of the interviewed participants received an honorarium of $8.00 and all schools were provided with a $2.00 honorarium for each student's participation.

Procedure

Students were informed of the "Futures Project" through their school, and interested persons were given information and consent forms which described the nature of the study. Each participant completed two questionnaires which, in total, took approximately 60 to 75 minutes to complete. A few days or weeks later, 227 participants completed a follow-up interview, which took approximately 1 – 2 hours. The first portion of the interview obtained general demographic information and then assessed identity status through Marcia et al.'s (1993) standard interview measure, focusing on vocational, religious, and political domains. A middle portion of the interview asked about self-perception. As part of the final portion of the interview, students described a "critical moral incident" which had a major impact on their personal beliefs and values. Finally,

participants completed Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Interview (Colby & Kohlberg, 1987). Only the "critical incident" narratives from this last section of the interview were analyzed and reported here. Participants who requested feedback received letters in the mail, describing the basic purposes and expectations of the study.

Tasks and Materials

Marcia's Identity Status Assessment. The measure for the assessment of identity status (Marcia et al., 1993) was a standard interview that investigated participants' views on the topics of religion, vocation and politics (see Appendix C). The political domain was assessed, but not scored for identity status, because many of the adolescents appeared to be in the "diffused" status for this domain, producing very low variability for this measure. Each interview topic was scored on two dimensions: level of crisis and level of commitment experienced, following the procedures of Marcia et al. (1993). An advanced score for crisis and commitment on vocational or religious identity status was indicative of an "achieved" identity status. An example of an interview with an identity-achieved participant on vocational issues can be viewed in Appendix D. A high score for crisis, but a low score for commitment, indicates a "moratorium" identity status. A low score for crisis, but a high score for commitment, is indicative of a "foreclosed" identity status. Finally, a low score on both the crisis and commitment dimensions indicates a "diffused" identity status. An example of an individual who was rated as diffused on religious issues can be viewed in Appendix E.

In assessing these protocols, coders used specific criteria in rating each of the two dimensions (crisis and commitment) on a scale of 1 to 4. An example of one criterion for the crisis dimension would be that the participant expresses continued effort in the exploration of the area of interest. An example of one criterion for the commitment dimension was that the participant showed resistance to change in choices that were described as already made. This procedure was adapted from Waterman (1993; in Marcia et al. 1993). The scoring criteria can be viewed in full in Appendix F.

Inter-rater reliabilities, between two independent raters for vocational identity dimensions, indicated scores of r (16) = .71 for crisis, and r (16) = .88 for commitment, with 75% exact agreement for each of these dimensions between raters. Inter-rater reliabilities for religious identity status indicated a correlation of .94 (87% exact agreement) for crisis and .88 for commitment (75% exact agreement).

The two dimensions of identity status were assessed separately, and then combined to determine the participant's particular identity status. Commitment and crisis ratings of 1 or 2 were considered to be "low," and scores of 3 or 4 were considered to be "high," which allowed the coders to determine identity statuses, following Waterman's (1993) recommendations. Each participant's identity status was then classified developmentally from (1) diffusion to (2) foreclosure to (3) moratorium to (4) achievement. This was treated both as a continuous measure of identity development (1 – 4) and as a classification system in the analyses.

OMEIS Identity Measure. All 935 participants of the full study filled out a questionnaire measure of identity status, the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (Adams, Shea, & Fitch, 1979), which assessed the participants on the basis of vocation, religion and politics. This measure included 24 items, of which 8 items assessed each of the three content areas. This measure contained sub-scales of 6 items each (two drawn from each content area), to assess each of the four identity statuses: diffusion, foreclosure, moratorium, and achievement. The participants agreed or disagreed with the items on a nine point rating scale of –4 (very strongly disagree) to +4 (very strongly agree). An example of an item that is indicative of vocational "identity achievement" is, "It took a long time to decide but now I know for sure what direction to move in for a career." The items for the OMEIS can be viewed in Appendix G. This measure was used primarily for construct validity of the interview measures in the present research. Coefficient alphas varied from .52 to .62 for the four sub-scales of 6 items each in the total sample.

Narratives. During the narrative portion of the interview, participants were asked to recall a "critical moral event" that had had an impact on their beliefs and values (see Appendix H; this task was adapted from Barnett, Quackenbush, & Sinisi, 1995). In coding these narratives, the researcher scored two qualities: clarity and coherence. Story coherence refers to the integration of personal beliefs and values with the individual's particular experience as depicted through the critical moral incident. The impact of the experience should be traceable through the story, leaving an impression of the individual's sense of who he or

she is when relating the narrative. Questions that the rater asked him/herself in rating this property were: Does the storyteller make the theme of the story clear? Is the theme related to the story-teller's beliefs and values in a sensible way? Does this seem like a plausible event that could have an impact on the self? and Can the storyteller articulate a connection between the experiences and his or her sense of self as a person?

Story coherence was defined on a 3-point scale, from (1) not coherent, to (2) somewhat coherent, to (3) coherent. For a score of 3, the rater should be left with the impression that the story was well thought-out, and that the teller portrayed an impact on important qualities of the self as a central theme of the experience. This should be apparent in the general flow of the story and in how well the participant connects the events of the story with personal development in responding to the probes (e.g., Why was this event so important to your personal development?). Inter-rater reliability between two independent coders for this coherence rating was $r(16) = .73$ for a sample of 18 transcripts.

The clarity of the narrative refers to the extent to which a story expresses an intelligible train of thought, overall. The narrative should be understandable, and the researcher should be able to determine the circumstances surrounding the participant's experience. The rater should ask him/herself: Are the characters and the situation clear? Is there a readable train of thought present in the story? Does the story flow in a manner that is readily understood by the reader? Does the storyteller jump around from topic to topic, making it hard to

determine a central theme for the story? and Does the storyteller portray a discernable time-line to the reader?

Clarity was defined through a 3-point scale, from unclear (1), to somewhat clear (2), to clear (3). Inter-rater reliability for this measure was, r (16) = .72, between two independent raters on a sample of 18 transcripts. An example of an individual whose score was both high in coherence and clarity can be viewed in Appendix I. In contrast, an example of an individual whose score was low in both coherence and clarity can be viewed in Appendix J. Other narratives can simultaneously be high in coherence and low in clarity, or high in clarity and low in coherence. It should be noted that there must be at least some degree of clarity to achieve coherence. If there were absolutely no clarity then the story would not be understandable. Examples and descriptions of the rationale for these particular ratings can be viewed in Appendix K and L, respectively.

Family Assessments. All questionnaire participants completed a modified version of Lamborn et al.'s (1991) perceived parenting style scale, which assesses separately the demandingness and responsiveness of parents. This measure included 16 items, which were rated on a nine-point response format, from +4 (very strongly agree) to –4 (very strongly disagree). The responsiveness dimension (10 items) had a coefficient alpha = .87, while the demandingness dimension (6 items) had a coefficient alpha = .80. The participant indicated the extent of agreement or disagreement that the statement applies to his or her parents. An example of an item from the responsiveness dimension is, "When I got a poor grade in school, my parents encouraged me to try harder." An item

from the demandingness (strictness) dimension is, "My parents REALLY knew where I went at night." This questionnaire can be viewed in Appendix M. Scores on each of these two dimensions were converted to standard scores and summed to obtain a continuous measure of level of family authoritativeness for each individual, from lowest (neglecting) to highest (authoritative).

Participants were also asked to respond to a 12-item Family Assessment Device General Functioning sub-scale (the FAD; Byles, Byrne, Boyle & Offord, 1988) which assesses family functioning and cohesion. Examples of scale items included: "Making decisions is a problem for our family" (reverse-scored) and " I can count on [my parents] to help me out, if I have some kind of problem." All items were rated on a nine-point response format, from +4 (very strongly agree) to –4 (very strongly disagree). For statistical purposes this was converted to a 1 to 9 scale. The FAD had a coefficient alpha of .92. This measure can be viewed in Appendix N.

Results

The results section begins with some general descriptive information on the measures. Second, information will be presented on preliminary construct validity for the identity status, narrative and parenting measures. Tests of the hypotheses will then be presented.

General Description

The transcripts for the critical moral incident protocol averaged 965 words per narrative (about two single-spaced pages), with a range from 250 words to 2522 words. The content of these narratives was broad-ranging. Focal issues

were categorized descriptively for the current study. Stories concerning the "family" were what participants talked about the most (44.3%), and second to that were stories about "peer groups and friends" (17.6%). Students related critical incidents about "media, books, and film" the least (1.5%). Table 1 shows a complete list of the topic items that were coded and the percentage of participants who focused on each type of content in their stories.

Table 2 provides detailed descriptive information relating to all variables in this study. The narrative indices of clarity and coherence ranged from a minimum score of 1 to a maximum score of 3. The mean of the clarity scores was 2.5; it was 2.3 for the coherence scores. Both scores were thus above the midpoint of these scales, and with standard deviations of .71 and .61 respectively, they also showed at least moderate variability. The frequencies and percentages for coherence and clarity across low, medium and high ratings can be seen in Table 3.

The mean of the scores for vocational identity status was 2.21, with a possible range from 1 to 4. Religious identity status had the same range, with a mean of 2.06. There were no overall significant differences between level of development for the vocational and religious domains on this continuous scale, t (128) = -1.15, ns. However, there were categorical differences for vocation and religion according to identity status (see Table 4). The percentage of adolescents who had attained the two most advanced levels, of identity moratorium or identity achieved status, was 51% of the total for the vocational domain, whereas only 32% of adolescents had reached moratorium or

achievement statuses within the religious domain. Adolescents were more advanced in vocational identity status than in religious identity status according to the McNemar test for related samples on this distribution ($p < .01$). The continuous scores for religious and vocational identity, taken from the interviews, were not significantly correlated, $r(129) = .07$, ns, indicating that these domains were developing quite independently.

The mean of the authoritativeness (parenting style) scores was 108.44, with a possible range from 16 to 160. The FAD measure of family cohesion had a range from 12 to 120, and an average score of 75.74. Both measures of parenting climate had substantial ranges and reasonable means that fell above the scale midpoint (see Table 2).

The current study examined only the critical incident stories of adolescents who told stories about themselves as central characters. There were no significant differences on clarity or coherence between adolescents who told such critical incident stories about themselves versus those who told stories about someone else on the narrative measures (53 of 184 adolescents). The narrative clarity mean for adolescents who told stories about themselves was 2.50 (SD = .61). For those telling about someone else, the mean was 2.38 (SD = .74). This difference was not significant, $t(184) = 1.19$, ns. The narrative coherence mean for adolescents who told stories about themselves was 2.31 (SD = .71), and for those telling about someone else, this was 2.20 (SD = .71). This difference was not significant either, $t(184) = 1.04$, ns.

Preliminary Construct Validity Evidence

Correlations between the OMEIS questionnaire sub-scale of identity achievement of Adams et al. (1989) and Marcia's interview measure of vocational identity status for this sample of 131 participants were r (129) = .35, p < .01, and for religious identity status, r (129) = .22, p < .01. There was a significant negative correlation between scores on the OMEIS identity foreclosure scale and the religious domain identity interview score, r (129) = -.20, p < .05. This same correlation was not significant for the vocational domain, r (129) = .00, ns, however. There was no significant relationship between the OMEIS sub-scale for moratorium and the religious domain identity interview score, r (129) = .00, ns, nor vocational domain identity interview, r (129) = .08, ns. The correlations for the diffusion sub-scale of the OMEIS with vocational identity status from the interview measure were, r (129)= -.23, p < .01, and with religious interview identity status, r (129) = -.34, p < .01. These significant findings, particularly for the achievement and diffusion sub-scales of the OMEIS measure, support the construct validity of our developmental identity index based on the interviews, since the diffusion status is least advanced and the achievement status most advanced, theoretically. To further describe these patterns, Tables 5 and 6 show the associations between the interview measures and the OMEIS measures through their means.

Participant age was not significantly correlated with vocational identity status on the interview overall, r (129) = .11, ns, nor with the vocational identity crisis sub-scale, r (129) = .01, ns. However, age was significantly positively

correlated with the commitment sub-scale for vocational identity status, r (129) = .18, $p < .01$. This indicates that the older an individual is, the more likely it is that s/he has made a clear decision with regard to a career choice. Age was not significantly correlated with overall religious identity status, r (129) = .03, ns, nor was it correlated with the crisis interview measure r (129) = .03, ns, nor the commitment interview measure, r (129) = .03, ns. The participant's gender was not related to vocational identity interview status (male M=2.31, SD = 1.07; female M=2.15, SD = 1.10), biserial r (129) = -.07, ns, nor to religious identity interview status (male M=2.02, SD = 1.17; female M=2.09, SD = 1.10), biserial r (129) = .02, ns.

The FAD correlated strongly with parenting style, r (126) = .76, $p < .001$, as did its two dimensions, warmth, r (128) = .80, $p < .001$, and strictness, r (126)=.39, $p < .001$, as would be expected. There were no significant correlations between gender and the measures of authoritativeness, r (127) = .06, ns, nor between gender and the FAD, r (128) = .02, ns. Age and parenting style were also not significantly correlated, r (127) = -.08, ns. Age was also not significantly correlated with the FAD, r (128) = -.00, ns.

As expected, ratings of narrative coherence and clarity were moderately positively correlated in this sample, r (129) = .48, $p < .01$. It is apparent that there was overlap between these two narrative indices, though they are also somewhat independent, and consequently are analyzed separately below. Age was not significantly correlated with narrative coherence, r (129) = -.00, ns, nor clarity, r (129) = .00, ns.

Gender was significantly related to story coherence in the sample, biserial r (129) = .20, p<.05, indicating greater coherence for the narratives of female participants. Clarity however, was not related to the gender of the participant, biserial r (129) = .07, ns. There were no significant differences in the length of stories for males (M = 854.82, SD = 428.15) and females (M = 1036.41, SD = 501.06), F (1, 113) = .13, ns.

Narrative clarity and coherence were also correlated with the number of words per narrative. Word count was not related to narrative clarity, r (111) = .08, ns. However, word count was significantly related to narrative coherence, r (111) = .26, p < .001. This indicates that shorter narratives tended to be judged as somewhat less coherent.

Unfortunately, the current research did not include measures of participant aptitude or language ability. However, there was self-reported information available on the participants' current average high school grades. The correlations between measures of narrative quality and the participants' grades were examined to see if any relationship existed between them. This analysis revealed that the average grades of the adolescents were not significantly correlated with scores for narrative coherence, r (121) = -.05, ns, or narrative clarity, r (121) = -.05, ns.

Testing the Hypotheses

The first hypothesis stated that narrative clarity and coherence, as conceptualized by McAdams (1993), should be positively related to a more advanced identity status from the Marcia status interviews.

Table 7 displays all correlations for the first hypothesis. Narrative clarity was significantly positively related to vocational identity status, r (129) = .26, p < .001. Thus, the two measures were related as expected, but share only about 6% - 7% of their variance. To test hypothesis 1 further, an analysis of covariance was performed, using Identity Status (4) and Gender (2) as factors, predicting narrative clarity, with participant age as a covariate. There were no significant effects for the covariate of age, F (1,122) = .58, ns. Nor were there any significant effects for the gender of the participant, F (1,122) = .46, ns. There were no significant interaction effects for this hypothesis.

There was a significant effect for vocational identity, F (3,122) = 5.18, p = .002. Table 8 displays the means for narrative clarity across all four vocational identity statuses. Using Tukey's post hoc test, it was evident that these differences occurred between diffusion and moratorium (p < .01) and diffusion and foreclosure (p < .05). Thus, the mean for the diffusion status was lower than the foreclosed and moratorium adolescents, but not for the diffusion group versus the achieved group.

Narrative clarity was not correlated with religious identity status, r (129) = -.00, ns (see Table 7). A 2 (Gender) by 4 (Religious identity) ANCOVA showed that narrative clarity did not differ by religious identity status, F (3,122)= .12, ns. Table 9 shows the means for this analysis. There were no significant effects for the covariate, age, F (1,122) = .05, ns. Nor were there any significant effects for the gender of the participant, F (1,122) = .71, ns.

Narrative coherence was significantly positively related to vocational identity status, r (129) = .17, $p < .05$, as hypothesized (see Table 7). A two-way analysis of covariance, with Gender (2) and Vocational Identity (4) as factors, was used to examine this hypothesis further, with participant's age as a covariate. There were no significant effects for the covariate, age, F (1,122) = .38, ns. Narrative coherence was not significantly related to a more advanced vocational identity status in this analysis, F (3,122) =1.70, ns. Means for this analysis appear in Table 8. There was a significant effect for gender, F (1,122) = 10.15, $p < .01$, indicating that female participants had narratives that were more coherent, as reported above.

Coherence was not significantly related to religious identity status, r (129) = -.03, ns (see Table 7). A 2 (Gender) X 4 (Religious Identity) ANCOVA, using participant age as a covariate, showed that narrative coherence did not differ by religious identity status, F (3,122) = 1.60, ns. There were no significant effects for the covariate, age, F (1,122) = .24, ns. The means for narrative coherence across the religious statuses can be viewed in Table 9.

Hypothesis 2 stated that a more authoritative family parenting style and a more cohesive family climate should be associated with a more developmentally advanced level of identity status. The separate correlations for this hypothesis can be viewed in Table 10. To test this, correlations were separately calculated between authoritative parenting and family cohesion with the vocational and religious identity status scores from the interviews.

Surprisingly, neither vocational identity status, r (127) = .02, ns, nor

religious identity status r (127) = -.01, ns, was significantly related to reports of more authoritative parenting in the family. An analysis of covariance, with Identity Status (4) and Gender (2) as factors, indicated the same non-significant results for authoritative parenting across the vocational identity statuses, F (3,120) = 1.20, ns, as well as across the religious identity statuses, F (3,120) = .80, ns. There were no significant effects for the covariate, age, for vocational identity status F (1,120) = 1.86, ns, or religious identity status, F (1,120) = .05, ns. Nor were there any significant effects for the gender of the participant, F (1,123) = .49, ns, for vocational identity status, and F (1,123) = .31, ns, for religious identity status. There were no significant interaction effects for this hypothesis. The means for authoritative parenting across the vocational and religious statuses can be viewed in Tables 11 and 12, respectively.

A more cohesive family environment, as assessed by the FAD, was significantly positively correlated with a more advanced vocational identity status, r (128) = .17, p<.05, as hypothesized. An analysis of covariance, with Identity status (4) and Gender (2) as factors, and participant age as a covariate, showed that this relationship approached significance, F (3,121) = 2.23, p = .08. Tukey's post hoc test indicated that these identity status differences were not statistically significant for the vocational domain. Table 11 displays the means for the FAD across identity statuses in the domain of vocational issues. There were no significant effects for the covariate, age, F (1,121) = .22, ns. Nor were there any significant effects for the gender of the participant, F (1,121) = .47, ns.

A more cohesive family environment on the FAD was not significantly

related to the religious domain, r (128) = .00, ns. The means for family climate across the religious statuses can be seen in Table 12. Consistent with the correlations, an analysis of covariance with Identity status (4) and Gender (2) as factors, and age as a covariate showed that the FAD did not vary across religious status, F (3,121) = .53, ns. There were no significant effects for the gender of the participant, F (1,121) = .53, ns. Nor was there a significant effect for the covariate, age of the participant, F (1,121) = .81, ns.

Hypothesis 3 stated that narrative clarity and coherence of the life stories should be positively correlated with a more positive family climate. The separate correlations for this hypothesis can be viewed in Table 13. A correlation was calculated between each of the two narrative quality indices (coherence and clarity) and both of the family climate measures (family authoritativeness and cohesion on the FAD). A more authoritative family climate was not significantly related to narrative clarity, r (127) = .13, ns, nor coherence, r (127) = -.04, ns. Interestingly, when the measure of authoritativeness was broken down into its two component parts, however, warmth and demandingness, the warmth component was significantly positively related to narrative clarity, r (129) = .17, p < .05, as predicted, but demandingness was not, r (127) = -.00, ns. This result was consistent with the correlations from the FAD, which revealed a significant positive relationship with clarity, r (128) = .16, p < .05. There was not a significant relationship between the FAD scores and narrative coherence using a simple correlation, r (128) = -.01, ns, however. These results, overall, indicate that a warmer and more cohesive family climate was significantly positively

related to the clarity of the adolescent's narrative, albeit quite modestly. There was no relation between narrative coherence and either measure of family climate, however.

Discussion

The current study explored the descriptive aspects of personal narratives in relation to identity status and parenting style and family climate during mid-adolescence, following hypotheses based in the work of McAdams (1993). A first hypothesis was that narrative clarity and coherence should be positively correlated with identity status, as assessed following Marcia et al. (1993). This was supported for an index of adolescents' vocational identity status, but not for their religious identity status.

This inconsistency in findings across the two domains of vocation and religion could be related to these adolescents' focus on vocational goals at the time of the study. Many of the participants were in their final year of high school and highly focused on their educational and vocational goals. However, they likely had not thought out their religious values to the same degree. In fact, adolescents were somewhat more advanced in vocational identity status than in religious identity status according to the Marcia measures (see Table 4), based on the McNemar test for related samples ($p < .01$).

For the current data set, 51% of the adolescents had attained either moratorium or achieved status for the vocational domain, whereas only 32% of adolescents had reached moratorium or achievement for the religious domain. Specifically, many more adolescents were foreclosed in the religious domain

(see Table 4). Thus, it might be that religious identity development was not yet sufficiently advanced to test this hypothesis very effectively within this high school sample. It is possible that there may have been a sort of "floor effect" for religious identity development. Archer and Waterman (1983) stated that during the course of identity development, identity moratorium and achievement increase throughout adolescence. However, Marcia and his colleagues (1993) also pointed out that identity develops unevenly within specific domains, and that an individual's identity status can differ across domains. This appears to be the case for the religious versus vocational domain for these adolescents, as their levels of development within the two domains were not significantly correlated. Unfortunately, the present research can not tell us whether this unevenness between vocation and religion is a general society-wide trend, or simply a brief developmental lag with regard to thinking about religion. This would be an interesting avenue to pursue longitudinally into adulthood.

In fact, the only significant results for the current investigation were connected with the vocational identity domain, with no significant findings for identity measures from the religious domain. Results indicated that the vocational identity domain was significantly related to the measures of narrative clarity and coherence, but these relationships were not found for the religious domain. The vocational identity domain was also positively related to the measure of family cohesion. The religious domain, however, did not relate to the family climate assessment measures at all. This pattern of non-significant results is evident for religious identity across all measures tested in this

investigation. In the future, it would be interesting to see if this pattern is evident among older age groups, or if relationships with religious identity are clearer among older samples.

An interesting finding for hypothesis 1, appeared for narrative clarity and the vocational identity statuses. The differences in narrative quality existed between diffusion and the foreclosed and moratorium statuses (see Table 8). This indicated that there were significant differences between the diffused and foreclosed adolescents, as well as the diffused and moratorium adolescents, with regard to the clarity of their stories. One possible explanation for this could be that diffused adolescents are known to be fairly apathetic with regard to their choice of vocation. If the participants' lack of interest carries over to their daily life then this could lead to a general lack of interest in the production of stories, or more specifically the clarity or conciseness of these stories.

Overall, it was surprising that there was only one significant relationship for narrative coherence, which was with the interview measure of vocational identity status. It was thought that narrative coherence would be the strongest reflection of identity development. One possible explanation for this is that coherence is much harder to define, and therefore much more difficult to code for within the narratives. Clarity, on the other hand, is much less difficult to define, and therefore easier to rate within the narratives.

Gender was significantly related to story coherence, indicating greater coherence for the narratives of female participants. Coherence, portrays the "self" as central to the narrative. Individuals who score highly on this domain are

comfortable connecting events to personal experiences. One possible explanation for this gender difference is that females are more comfortable expressing themselves in this personal manner.

The second hypothesis was that a more positive family climate would be associated with attaining a more developmentally advanced level of identity status. This hypothesis was only partially supported as well. Although more authoritative parenting styles were not directly related to a more advanced vocational or religious identity status, as had been predicted, the FAD index of family cohesion showed a significant positive relationship with vocational identity status. This indicates that those adolescents who were advanced in vocational identity seemed to perceive a cohesive relationship with parents, and that adolescents who were diffused generally felt less family cohesiveness (see Table 11). Table 11 does suggest that adolescents from more cohesive families were generally somewhat more likely to be vocationally committed, either as identity achievers or as foreclosed individuals. Of course, since these analyses are correlational, we cannot make direct assumptions of a causal relationship.

Hypothesis three, that narrative clarity and coherence would be positively correlated with a more authoritative parenting style and family climate, was also partially supported. Although authoritative parenting was not related to coherence or clarity generally, the warmth component of this measure was positively related to ratings of narrative clarity. The findings for the FAD also supported this finding because it, as well, was related positively to narrative clarity, though not to coherence. One explanation for these findings could be that

greater patience and warmth of parents in more cohesive families may allow children to express themselves more fully in the family earlier in life, thus leading to greater clarity of this expression in the narratives of adolescents later in life. This seems congruent with Steinberg et al.'s (1994) findings that adolescents from more authoritative families (especially those that were warmer) scored highest on measures of positive psychological functioning. More cohesive, responsive families may simply discuss or talk more with their children, thus fostering better linguistic skills in their children. Of course, these correlational data cannot address causality; longitudinal follow-up data would be of interest here, though not decisive in investigating the explanation for such correlations.

In the future it would be desirable to control for adolescents' verbal fluency and skills in studying their narratives, but these measures were not available for the current data set. Because narrative clarity and coherence are assessments of the individual's "spoken word," it would have been helpful to see if verbal ability was an important component underlying these indices. One available variable in the current study, which might be inferred to be connected with verbal ability, was the average grade reported by students. This variable was not significantly related to either clarity or coherence. However, this was a weak proxy measure, and thus shouldn't be relied upon as an adequate index of verbal ability. A true measure of verbal fluency would be more appropriate.

Another drawback of the current study was that there was only one rater coding the interview data. Although the reliabilities for this rater were fair for the coding of the identity statuses and the narrative indices of coherence and clarity,

this could have posed a problem with regard to any individual preferences the coder might have had for any particular narrative style or content. For example, raters could maintain a culturally shared bias throughout the reliability assessments. This drawback was somewhat countered by the reported tests of reliability, but should be taken into consideration with regard to the more qualitative data obtained in this study.

The current data set only included individuals who told critical moral incidents about themselves. This means that the adolescent author of the narrative was also the main character of the turning point story. About 30% of participants from the original sample told critical moral incidents about the lives or experiences of others, and then mentioned how these experiences affected them more indirectly. In the future it would be interesting to see if there are differences associated with this strategy for producing narratives. Why did some choose to talk about someone else's experiences, rather than focusing on their own lives? Was it because the information was too personal to reveal, so that they talked about someone else to avoid exposure? Or was it because they just couldn't think of something critical that happened in their own lives? There are several possibilities that would be interesting to explore.

It would also be useful to collect a more extensive sample of narratives from each participant. The current research only asked for one critical moral incident from each participant. It would be more informative if participants were asked more questions reflecting more diverse aspects of their personal lives. In 44% of cases adolescents told narratives with a focus on their family. In

McAdams' (1993) standard procedures, people tell narratives about early memories, high points, low points and so on, as well as critical "turning points." The collection of a more extensive sample of "life story" narratives from each participant than was done here, would also help to improve validity of the story measures. This limitation in data collection certainly might in part account for the modest size of effects observed here.

In summary, these findings revealed that there was some modest overlap between identity status constructs based in Marcia's view of identity status development and the life story narrative approach of McAdams (1993), accounting for approximately 6% - 7% of shared variance between the two constructs at most. Clearly, however, these are two different frameworks for studying identity development in mid-adolescence, frameworks that seem only weakly related at best. Achieving a more advanced sense of one's personal identity may permit the adolescent to identify important incidents in his/her life somewhat more readily and to think about these in a clearer and more coherent manner. This relation also may become stronger among older adolescents and young adults, whose identity development is more advanced than among the mid-adolescents of the present sample. Thus, in the future it would be of interest to extend this study into young adulthood. This type of extension could provide further information on the development of life narratives into adulthood and how this process might rely upon the continuing construction of a sense of self.

References

Andersson, G. (1996). The benefits of optimism: A meta-analytic review of the Life Orientation Test. Personality and Individual Differences, 21, 719 - 725.

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 - 237.

Adams, G.R., Bennion, L., & Huh, K. (1989). Objective measure of ego identity status: A reference manual. Guelph, ON: University of Guelph.

Archer, S.L., & Waterman, A.S. (1983). Identity in early adolescence: A developmental perspective. Journal of Early Adolescence, 3, 203 - 214.

Barnett, M., Quackenbush, S., & Sinisi, C. (1995). The role of critical experiences in moral development. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17, 137 – 152.

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. Developmental Psychology Monographs, 4.

Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. Encyclopaedia of Adolescence, 746 - 758.

Berzonsky, M. D. (1998, February). Identity commitment, identity style, and parental authority. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research on Adolescence, San Diego, California.

Brewer, W.F. (1986). What is autobiographical memory? In D. Rubin (Ed.). Autobiographical memory. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Byles, J., Byrne, C., Boyle, M.H., & Offord, D.R. (1988). Ontario child health study: Reliability and validity of general functioning subscale of the McMaster family assessment device. Family Process, 27, 97 – 104.

Colby, A., & Kohlberg, L. (1987). The measurement of moral judgment. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context : An integrative model. Psychological Bulletin, 113, 487 - 496.

Douvan, E. & Adelson, J. (1966). The Adolescent Experience. New York : Wiley.

Enright, R.D., Lapsley, D.K., Drivas, A.E., &Fehr, L.A. (1980). Parental influences on the development of adolescent autonomy and identity. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9, 529 – 545.

Erikson, E.N. (1963). Childhood and society. (2nd Ed.). New York : Norton.

Fivush, R. (1991). The social construction of personal narratives. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 37 (1), 59 – 81.

Lamborn, S., Mounts, N.S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S.M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. Child Development, 62, 1049-1065.

Marcia, J., Waterman, A., Matteson, D., Archer, S., & Orlofsky, J. (1993). Ego identity : A handbook for psychological research. New York : Springer-Verlag.

Marcia, J.E., & Strayer, J. (1996). Theories and stories. Psychological Inquiry, 7, 346 - 363.

McAdams, D.P. (1993). The stories we live by : Personal myths and the making of the self. New York : The Guilford Press.

McAdams, D.P. (1996). Personality, modernity, and the storied self: A contemporary framework for studying persons. Psychological Inquiry, 7, 295 - 321.

McAdams, D.P., Diamond, A., de St. Aubin, E., & Mansfield, E. (1997). Stories of commitment : The psychosocial construction of generative lives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 678 - 694.

Neimeyer, G.J. & Rareshide, M.B. (1991). Personal memories and personal identity : The impact of ego identity development on autobiographical memory recall. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 562 - 569.

Peterson, C. (1994). Narrative skills and social class. Canadian Journal of Education, 19 (3), 251 – 269.

Pratt, M.W., Norris, J.E., Arnold, M.L., & Filyer, R. (in press). Generativity and moral development as predictors of value socialization narratives for the young across the adult lifespan: From lessons learned to stories shared. Psychology and Aging.

Polkinghorne, D.E. (1991). Narrative and self-concept. Journal of Narrative and Life History, 1, 135 – 153.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S.D., Darling, N., Mounts, N.S., & Dornbusch, S.M. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among

adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. Child Development, 65, 754 - 770.

Waterman, A.S. (1993). Overview of identity status scoring criteria. In J. Marcia, A. Waterman, D. Matteson, S. Archer, & J. Orlofsky (Eds.), Ego identity: A handbook for psychological research. (pp. 156 – 175). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Table 1

Narrative Content – Critical Moral Incidents

Focus of the Narrative	% of Participants	# of Participants
Family	44.3%	58
Peer Group	17.6%	23
School	9.9%	13
Romantic Relationship	8.4%	11
Church	6.1%	8
Sports environments	5.3%	7
Work situation	4.6%	6
Volunteer environment	1.5%	2
Self (personal change)	1.5%	2
Media, books, movies	0.8%	1
Total	100%	131

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Narrative and Questionnaire Assessments

Variable	Possible Range	Mean	S.D.
Age	16 – 19	17.45	0.82
Word Count	250 – 2522	965.70	480.34
Narrative Clarity	1 – 3	2.50	0.61
Narrative Coherence	1 – 3	2.31	0.71
Vocational Identity Status	1 – 4	2.21	1.09
Vocational Crisis	1 – 4	2.46	0.66
Vocational Commitment	1 – 4	2.18	0.60
Religious Identity Status	1 – 4	2.06	1.13
Religious Crisis	1 – 4	2.42	0.84
Religious Commitment	1 – 4	2.23	0.71
Authoritativeness	18 – 158	108.44	22.18
Parenting Style Warmth	10 – 90	66.86	16.48
Parenting Style Strictness	6 – 54	41.58	9.78
Family Assessment Device	12 – 108	75.74	22.60
OMEIS Identity Achievement	7 – 52	37.33	9.11
OMEIS Identity Diffusion	7 – 52	29.51	9.39

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Low, Medium and High Ratings of Coherence and Clarity

	Coherence		Clarity	
Low (1)	19	(14.5%)	8	(6.1%)
Medium (2)	52	(39.7%)	49	(37.4%)
High (3)	60	(45.8%)	74	(56.5%)
	131	(100%)	131	(100%)

Table 4

Number of Participants across Religious and Vocational Identity Status

	Religious Identity Status		Vocational Identity Status	
Diffused	57	(43.5%)	52	(39.7%)
Foreclosure	31	(23.7%)	13	(9.9%)
Moratorium	21	(16.0%)	52	(39.7%)
Achieved	22	(16.8%)	14	(10.7%)
	131	(100%)	131	(100%)

Table 5

Means for the OMEIS and Marcia's Identity Statuses for Vocational Identity Status

	OMEIS Scales			
	Diffusion	Foreclosure	Moratorium	Achievement
Interview Measure Status Classification:				
Diffusion	32.62	19.81	30.83	33.64
SD	8.72	7.78	8.52	10.29
n	52	52	52	52
Foreclosure	22.31	19.84	27.52	39.92
SD	10.19	11.54	11.36	6.40
n	13	13	13	13
Moratorium	29.71	20.21	30.65	38.40
SD	9.03	7.82	9.02	7.51
n	52	52	52	52
Achievement	23.93	19.11	26.10	44.67
SD	6.66	8.27	10.07	5.61
n	14	14	14	14

Table 6

Means for the OMEIS and Marcia's Identity Statuses for Religious Identity Statuses

	OMEIS Scales			
	Diffusion	Foreclosure	Moratorium	Achievement
Interview Measure Status Classification:				
Diffusion	34.37	20.94	31.19	34.84
SD	7.77	9.15	7.99	9.86
n	57	57	57	57
Foreclosure	24.84	21.69	24.27	38.78
SD	7.48	6.80	10.62	8.78
n	31	31	31	31
Moratorium	25.71	17.48	33.38	39.47
SD	9.29	7.61	8.53	8.76
n	21	21	21	21
Achievement	27.13	17.00	31.32	39.70
SD	10.32	6.89	7.81	6.40
n	22	22	22	22

Table 7

Hypothesis 1: Correlations between Identity Status Interview Measures and Narrative Clarity and Coherence

	Clarity	Coherence
Vocational Identity Status	.26**	.17*
Religious Identity Status	-.01	-.03

Note. * $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 8

Coherence and Clarity across Vocational Identity Status

	Diffusion	Foreclosure	Moratorium	Achievement
Coherence	2.17	2.31	2.40	2.50
SD	.71	.75	.69	.76
n	52.00	13.00	52.00	14.00
Clarity	2.27 **a**	2.77 **b**	2.63 **b**	2.64 **ab**
SD	.66	.44	.56	.50
n	52.00	13.00	52.00	14.00

Note. Means that do not differ share the same subscript.

Table 9

Coherence and Clarity across Religious Identity Status

	Diffusion	Foreclosure	Moratorium	Achievement
Coherence	2.37	2.19	2.38	2.27
SD	.64	.79	.59	.88
n	57	31	21	22
Clarity	2.53	2.48	2.43	2.55
SD	.57	.63	.60	.74
n	57	31	21	22

Table 10

Hypothesis 2: Correlations between Identity Status Interview Measures and Parenting Climate Measures

	Authoritativeness	FAD
Vocational Identity Status	.02	.17*
Religious Identity Status	.01	.00

Note. * $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 11

Means for Parenting Climate across Vocational Identity Status

	Diffusion	Foreclosure	Moratorium	Achievement
FAD	70.98	84.43	76.03	85.71
SD	22.65	18.53	23.87	17.43
n	51	13	52	14
Authoritative	107.50	115.83	106.65	112.14
SD	20.73	22.57	25.32	13.36
n	52	12	51	14

Table 12

Means for Parenting Climate across Religious Identity Status

	Diffusion	Foreclosure	Moratorium	Achievement
FAD	73.22	81.68	77.85	71.95
SD	24.03	19.39	21.82	23.29
n	57	31	20	22
Authoritative	106.61	113.19	111.20	103.91
SD	22.09	15.29	20.83	30.37
n	56	31	20	22

Table 13

Hypothesis 3: Correlations between Parenting Climate Measures and Narrative Clarity and Coherence

	Clarity	Coherence
Authoritativeness	.06	-.05
Warmth	.17*	.01
Strictness	-.00	-.11
FAD	.16*	-.01

Note. * $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Appendix A

Measurement of Identity Status by Crisis and Commitment

		Crisis	
		No	Yes
Commitment	No	*Diffused* (1)	*Moratorium (3)*
	Yes	*Foreclosure (2)*	*Identity Achieved* (4)

( ) Numbers in parentheses refer to developmental orderings according to theory and research. (Marcia et al., 1993).

Appendix B

Dimensions of Parenting Style

		Demandingness	
		High	Low
Responsiveness	High	Authoritative	Permissive
	Low	Authoritarian	Rejecting-Neglecting

Appendix C

Identity Status Interview

Part A: General Opening:

How old are you?

Tell me about your family. Do you have any brothers and sisters?
How many?
Which are older and which are younger than you?

Who do you live with?
[*If appropriate*:] At what age were you when your parents separated?
[*or, if deceased*, at what age were you when your parents died?]

[*If appropriate*:] Has either of your parents remarried?

[*If yes*:] What age were you at that time?

Can you tell me something about your father's educational background?

And what type of work does he do?

And your mother, what was her educational background?

What type of work does she do?

Part B: Vocational Plans - Opening

What courses are you taking? ***{If semestered school, ask about last semester's courses as well.}***

When do you plan to finish high school?

Do you have any ideas about what you'd like to do after graduation from high school in terms of work and/or school?
[Proceed to the appropriate block(s) of questions: university/college and/or work]
further education - go to Part C
work - go to Part D

[*If "don't know"]* Do you think it is more likely that you will continue with your education after high school or that you will seek employment?
further education - Part C
work - Part D

[*If the answer is again "don't know," go to Part E*]

Part C: Vocational Plans - Further Education

[*If appropriate*:] Do you have any plans for what you might take at college or university at this time?
(major/program) (1)

What type of work would you like to do after you finish college or university? (1)

[*If no definite interests*:] What do you hope to gain by attending college or university?
[*Go to Part E*]

How did you come to decide on (1)? [*Ask about future plans, if known; otherwise about major field.*]

When did you first become interested in (1)?

What do you like about (1)?

Is there you dislike about (1)?

[*If several fields mentioned spontaneously, ask about each in turn.*]

Have you ever considered any other fields besides (1)? [*List all fields that were previously mentioned.*]

[*If yes, repeat questions section* ☺]

a. On a scale of 0 to six, where 0 is not seriously at all and 6 is extremely seriously, how seriously were (are) you considering each of the fields? (scale I)

Did you ever feel that you were actively deciding between (1) and _____ *{second choice}*?

Was that a difficult decision to make?

What may have helped you make your choice here?

Do you feel that choosing a career is something that you're trying to work out now, or do you feel that this is where you can let time take its course and just see what happens?

Do you have any ideas as to when you'd like to have this decision made?

How are you going about getting the information you'd like to have to make a decision?

Do you feel that this is an important decision for you to make now, or are you more concerned with other things right now?

Have you ever seriously considered pursuing a career immediately after high school?
[*If yes*:] Could you describe your thinking at that time?

[*If appropriate*:] Why did you decide not to pursue a career?

[Proceed to Part E]

Part D: Vocational Plans - Employment

What type of employment would you like to find? (2)

How did you come to decide on (2)?

When did you first become interested in that type of work?

∞ **What do you like about (2)?**

What do you dislike about this field?

[*If several alternative possibilities are spontaneously mentioned, ask about each in turn.*]

Have you ever considered any type of work besides (2)? [*List all the fields previously mentioned.*]

[*Repeat questions in section ∞ each field mentioned that has not been previously discussed*]

***b*. On a scale of 0 to six, where 0 is not seriously at all and 6 is extremely serious, how seriously were (are) you considering each of these plans? (scale i)**

[*if decision specified*] Do you feel that you were ever actively deciding between (2) and _____?

Was this a difficult decision for you to make?

What may have helped you to make your decision here?

[*if no decision specified*] Do you feel that choosing a career is something that you're trying to work out now, or do you feel that this is something where you can let time take its course and just see what happens?

Do you have any idea as to when you'd like to have this decision made?

How are you going about getting the information you'd like to have to make a decision?

Do you feel that this is an important decision for you to make now or are you more concerned with other things right now?

Have you ever seriously considered continuing your education after high school?
[*If yes*:] Could you describe your thinking at that time?

[*If appropriate*:] Why did you decide not to go on with school?
[Proceed to Part E]

Part E: Vocational Plans - Closing

Most parents have plans for their (sons) (daughters), things they'd like to see them go into, things they'd like to see them do. Did your parents have any plans like that for you?

[*If yes*:] What was their plan for you? (3)

Do you think your parents may have had a preference for one occupation over another?

[If yes:] What was it?

[If yes:] Did you ever consider (3)?

[If appropriate:] How do your parents feel about your plans to go into (1/2)?
{ask about career if they've indicated one, if not, field of interest}

Do you have any hobbies, courses, or a part time job that are related to (1/2)?

[*If yes*:] What would you say is most satisfying or rewarding about (each of) them for you?

Is there anything about these activities that you would consider to be not so good?

(If not spontaneously described, how would you describe your feelings while you are engaged in these activities?)

c. **On a scale of 0 to 6, how willing do you think you'd be to change your plans from (1/2) [*the strongest one or two plans mentioned*], if something better came along? (Scale ii)**
[If asked: "what do you mean by better?" Respond: "whatever might be better by your standards."]

[*If respondent indicates the possibility of change*:] What might you change to?

What might cause you to make such a change?

d. **On a scale of 0 to 6, how likely do you think it is that you will make some change? (Scale iii)**

[*Repeat for all the possibilities mentioned.*]

e. **On a scale of 0 to 6, how important do you see your vocation as being to you in your life? (Scale IV)**

Religious Beliefs

Do you have any religious preference? [I.e., Do you belong to a religion?]
[*prod for specific religion*]

How about your parents: do they have any religious preference?
[*prod for their preference*] (4)

Were both of your parents reared (4)?

f. On a scale of 0 to 6, how important would you say religion is to each of your parents? (Scale iv)

Have you ever been active in your religion?
What type of activities have you been involved in?

How frequently have you engaged in these activities?

How old were you then?

How do you feel while you are doing things related to your religion?

Why do you think you feel that way?

[*If not already evident:*] Do you go to religious services now?

[*If not discussed*:] How frequently do you attend religious services now? (I.e., how many times per month?)

[*If yes*:] What are your reasons for going/not going?

[*If no*:] Did you ever attend religious services fairly regularly?

How frequently did you attend religious services when you were 10 years old? (I.e., how many times a month on average.)

[*If appropriate*:] What led to your attendance at services falling off?

[*If appropriate*:] What led to your attendance at services increasing?

Do you talk about religion with other people?

[*If yes*:] What kinds of things do you talk about? Do you get into arguments or discussions?

[*If appropriate*:] What point of view do you express in these discussions? (I.e., What do you argue for and against?)

Now I'd like to find out something about your ideas in the area of religion.

What are your ideas concerning the existence of God?

What do you think about the importance of organized religion? (i.e., having actual buildings to worship in and a religious group to belong to.)

Was there ever a time when you came to question, to doubt, or perhaps to change your religious beliefs?

[*If yes*:] What types of things did you question or change?

What started you thinking about these questions?

[*If not already in evidence*:] How old were you at the time?

g. On a scale of 0 to 6, how serious were these questions for you? (Scale v)

Do you feel that you've solved these questions for yourself, or are you still working on them?

[*If resolved*:] What has helped you to answer these questions?

[*If not resolved*:] How are you going about trying to answer these questions?

h. On a scale of 0 to 6, how much do your parents know about your present religious beliefs? (Scale vi)

How do your parents feel about your religious beliefs?

[*If parents don't know*:] How do you think they would feel about them if they did know?

Are there any important differences between your beliefs and those of your parents?

i. On a scale of 0 to 6, how well worked out do you think your ideas in the area of religion are? (Scale vii)

Do you think your ideas in the area of religion are very likely to remain the same, or do you believe they may very well change in the future?

[*If they may change*:] In what direction do you think your beliefs might change?

What might bring about such a change?

j. On a scale of 0 to 6, how likely is it that such a change might occur? (Scale iii)

[*If you see evidence of continued thought being given to religious questions*:] How important is it to you to work out your ideas in the area of religion?

Are you actively trying to work out your beliefs now, or are you more concerned with other things?

How would you like to see your own children reared with respect to religion?

k. On a scale from 0 to 6, how important do you see your religious beliefs as being to you in your life? (Scale iv)

[For agnostics and atheists, the last question in this domain should be phrased thus:]
On a scale from 0 to 6, how important do you see your ideas about (agnosticism) (atheism) as being to you in your life? (Scale iv)

Political & Community Involvement Beliefs
Political:
The next part of the interview has to do with your political beliefs and preferences. People often use the term liberal and conservative to describe their ideas about politics. I'm not referring, of course, to how you feel about the Canadian Liberal or Conservative Parties, but how you feel about social and political issues generally. Conservatives tend to be concerned about things such as individual rights and individual initiative, stability, tradition, and the importance of established institutions. They tend to think that government should interfere as little as possible in the lives of its citizens. Liberals, on the other hand, are more interested in change, social reform, equality of all people, the rights of minorities and women, and social welfare. Liberals think that governments should take an active role in dealing with social inequality and injustice, and improving human welfare.

How would you describe yourself in terms of being conservative or liberal. Would you consider yourself to be a conservative or a liberal, or would you say that you are a moderate -- that is, somewhere in between?

Do you support one of the Canadian political parties - the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party, the Reform Party, the NDP or the Bloc Quebecois?

[*If not*:] Have you heard of these parties?

l. At this time, how well worked out do you think your ideas in the area of politics are? (Scale vii)

Do your parents have any political preferences? *{ask these questions for both mother and father.}*

[*If appropriate*:] Do they belong to any political party?

[*If appropriate*:] Where would they fall on a scale from liberal through moderate to conservative?

How important would you say political questions are to your parents?

Are there any political or social issues that you feel pretty strongly about? (5)

[*If asked, "Such as?" Respond*: "Whatever might be important issues for you." If asked again, suggest such issues as the economy, the environment, the Quebec question and so on.]

What would you like to see done about (5)?

[*Repeat for each issue raised.*]

Are there other issues that you have views about? (5b)

What would you like to see done about (5b)?

[*Repeat for each issue mentioned.*]

Have you ever taken any political actions, like joining groups, participating in election campaigns, writing letters to government or other political leaders, signing petitions, participating in demonstrations?

[*If yes, elicit a description of each if necessary.*]
How did you get involved in these activities

[*Repeat for several of the activities mentioned.*]
[*If no issues or activities were discussed*:] Do you feel that you are actively trying to arrive at a set of political beliefs, or do you feel that that area of politics isn't very important to you at present?]

[*If trying to work out ideas*:] Can you tell me something about the types of things you are thinking about?

How are you going about getting the information you need to make a decision?

How important is it for you to work out these ideas?

Was there ever a time when you found your political ideas undergoing change, when you believed one thing on an issue and then, months or years later, you found you had very different ideas on the same issue?

[*If yes*:] Please describe the circumstances.

What led you to make that type of change?

Was there anyone or anything that may have influenced your thinking that the time?

How do you feel while you are engaged in activities related to your political beliefs?

Why do you think you feel that way?

{if political ideas have been indicated} How do your parents feel about your political ideas?
{if no political ideas have been indicated} How do your parents feel about your lack of political ideas?

[*If parents don't know*:] How do you think they would feel about them if they did know?

Are there any important differences between your views and those of your parents?

m. At this time, how likely do you think it is that your political beliefs will change in the future? (Scale iii)

[*If they may change*:] In what direction do you think your beliefs might change?

What might bring about such a change?

How likely is it that such a change will occur?

[*If appropriate*:] Do you feel these changes would occur just on specific issues, or might there be a change in your general political attitude?

n. On a scale from 0 to 6, how important do you see your political beliefs as being to you in your life?
(Scale iv)

Identity Status Interview Scales

Scale i.

not seriously at all			moderately seriously			extremely seriously
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Scale ii.

not willing at all			moderately willing			extremely willing
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Scale iii.

not likely at all			moderately likely			extremely likely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Scale iv.

not important at all			moderately important			extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Scale v.

not serious at all			moderately serious			extremely serious
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Scale vi.

nothing at all			a moderate amount			a great deal
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Scale vii.

not worked out at all			moderately well worked out			extremely well worked out
0	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D

Achieved Identity Status Example

A high score for crisis and commitment on vocational identity status is indicative of an "achieved" identity status. This is an example of an "achieved" high school student who has thoroughly explored alternatives and is now committed to teaching as a career.

"Do you have any ideas as to what you'd like to do after you graduate?"

"Yeah, I want to attend university, in the Honours Arts program and then I want to continue on to teacher's college and become a primary school teacher."

Can you tell me how you first became interested in teaching?

"it's basically been since I've been little, I think, um, initially I did want to be a teacher and then throughout the later part of elementary school and beginning of high school I kind of swayed away from being a teacher because of all the cutbacks and whatnot... then I was kind of focusing on becoming a vet..."

What do you like about teaching?

I think I always learn something from the kids because I do a lot of work with kids, and they just make me happy. They make me smile. It's like a feeling of getting something back from what I'm doing.

Is there anything that you dislike about teaching?

I think the amount of work, like there's so much after hours work. Not much recognition either, but the benefits would outweigh the negatives with it.

What about becoming a vet?

Once I got into high school my marks in math and science weren't well enough to do that so, that's really about the only other thing that I was really interested in. I was doing a practicum in a vet clinic, one afternoon a week. Um, anything to do with people would be interesting.

And how are you going about getting the information you need to make a decision?

We went down and visited the universities, all the universities. Like my

volunteer work and things I've done in the past, I've done a lot of work with kids.

On a scale of 0 to 6, where 0 is not seriously at all and 6 is extremely seriously, how seriously are you considering teaching?

"Six. Definitely six."

On a scale of 0 to 6, how willing do you think you'd be to change your plans from teaching if something better came along?

"Zero, basically. Well, actually maybe not zero, maybe one just because of the lack of jobs.... but that's only if I mean, absolutely necessary, that I couldn't get a job."

Appendix E

Diffused Identity Status Example

A low score for crisis and a low score for commitment indicates an individual who is diffused across a particular domain. The current excerpt is from an individual who has not yet explored, nor has he committed to a particular set of religious beliefs. One key indicator of diffusion is a lack of interest or apathy that is quite apparent in this interview.

Do you have a religious preference?

No.

Do your parents have a religion they belong to, a faith?

My Mom was brought up Catholic, like strict Catholic, and my dad was Anglican.

Were you ever active in religion or in church, even when you were young?

No. I went to Sunday school a couple times I think.

What are your reasons for not attending religious services?

For one thing, it's hard to get the family together. We're only all together on Sunday nights. We don't think it's a big part of our life, you know, we don't think we have to rely on religion, and we can believe in it, but we just don't have to practice it or anything.

What about you personally?

I don't think I need religion. I don't have the time. I don't really have something that I can believe in there. Like I think every religion has their own beliefs and I don't really want to put myself into one of those, you know, I don't think there's a need.

Do you ever get into debates or discussions or arguments about religion?

Not really, no. Not a big topic.

Now I want to ask you a few things about your views about religion. What are your ideas concerning the existence of God?

I believe that maybe there is. I believe sometimes, but then I don't at others. I believe maybe there is a higher being, but not really.

k. Looking at scale number 4, how important do you see your religious beliefs as being to you in your life?

A one.

Appendix F

Criteria for Scoring Identity Status

(from Waterman, 1993)

Crisis Dimension

1) Ability to enumerate alternative choices
2) Generation of advantages and disadvantages
3) Investment in activity to procure knowledge about choices
4) Continued effort in exploration as an important area of concern

Commitment Dimension

1) Can clearly state a choice
2) Can discuss advantages and disadvantages
3) Describes activities engaged in to support commitment
4) Shows resistance to change
5) Can project implications of choice into near future

To what extent have the above criteria been demonstrated for each of the two dimensions ?

1. None/ Limited
2. Some
3. Considerable
4. Extensive

Appendix G

OMEIS Questionnaire of Identity Status

The questions in this scale address a variety of areas including vocation, religion and politics.

You will find that some of the items have more than one part and that you may agree with one part and disagree with another part. You should consider the statement as a whole, without considering the parts separately.

-4 = very strongly disagree
-3 = strongly disagree
-2 = moderately disagree
-1 = slightly disagree
+4 = very strongly agree
+3 = strongly agree
+2 = moderately agree
+1 = slightly agree

1. __ I haven't really thought about politics. It just doesn't excite me much.
2. __ I might have thought about a lot of different jobs, but there's never really been any question since my parents said what they wanted.
3. __ When it comes to religion I just haven't found anything that appeals and I don't really feel the need to look.
4. __ My parents decided a long time ago what I should go into for employment and I'm following through their plans.
5. __ There are so many different political parties and ideals. I can't decide which to follow until I figure it all out.
6. __ I don't give religion much thought and it doesn't bother me one way or the other.
7. __ 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.
8. __ 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.
9. __ A person's faith is unique to each individual. I've considered and reconsidered it myself and know what I can believe.
10. __ It took me a long time to decide but now I know for sure what direction to move in for a career.
11. __ I really have never been involved in politics enough to have made a firm stand one way or the other.
12. __ I'm not so sure what religion means to me. I'd like to make up my mind but I'm not done looking yet.
13. __ I've thought my political beliefs through and realize I can agree with some and not other aspects of what my parents believe.
14. __ It took me awhile to figure out, but now I really know what I want for a career.
15. __ Religion is confusing to me right now. I keep changing my views on what is right and wrong for me.

16. __ I'm really not interested in finding the right job, any job will do. I just seem to flow with what is available.
17. __ 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.
18. __ I've gone through a period of serious questioning about faith and can now say I understand what I believe in as an individual.
19. __ I'm not sure about my political beliefs, but I'm trying to figure out what I can truly believe in.
20. __ I'm still trying to decide how capable I am as a person and what jobs will be right for me.
21. __ I attend the same church as my family has always attended. I've never questioned why.
22. __ I just can't decide what to do for an occupation. There are so many that have possibilities.
23. __ I've never really questioned my religion. If it's right for my parents it must be right for me.
24. __ Politics are 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 believe in.

Appendix H

Narrative Interview Measure

Please try to recall an important situation or experience that you have had that has had a real impact on the kind of values and moral beliefs that you have today. It could be something recent or not so recent. Please describe this event in as much detail as possible. Take as much time as you need, and then we'll turn on the tape recorder.

Narrative Probes:

i) When did this occur?
ii) What led up to this situation or event?
iii) What emotions did you feel at the time?
iv) How do you feel about this, the same or differently?
v) What kinds of things did you consider in dealing with it?
vi) How did things finally turn out?

Identity Probes:

i) How did that event influence the kind of beliefs and values you hold today?
ii) Why was that event so important in your personal development? In making you the person you are now?

Parent and Peer Influence Probes:

i) Did you talk to your parents about this experience?
(if yes) What did your parents think about this situation and the choices you made?
(if no) What do you think your parents would have thought about this situation and the choices you made?

ii) Did you talk with your friends about this experience?
(if yes) What did your friends think about this situation and the choices you made?
(if no) What do you think your friends would have thought about this situation and the choices you made?

Appendix I

Narrative Interview: High in Coherence and Clarity

An example of a critical incident where the participant scored high in both clarity and coherence. This participant's narrative is very readable and his beliefs and values are traceable throughout the story leaving a significant impact on his personal development.

Okay, uh, well, when I was younger, um, I didn't think I was all that smart because like in grade like 3 or 4, I got like average marks and stuff like that, but then when I got into grade five, I had a teacher that um, I liked and I uh... I learned well.... I was grade A's kind of thing and I was in enrichment in um quite a few classes, and so it led me to believe that I could do the work, and that I wasn't... I wasn't not smart kind of thing. Like I wasn't, I knew I was never dumb, but I never thought I was... I thought I was just like an average kid, kind of thing, but after that I knew I could do almost anything that was brought towards me.

How did you feel at the time, when you started getting better marks?

I was feeling better about myself.. I was feeling more confident and happy because I was getting better marks and I was feeling smarter all along because I was improving.

Did you talk to your parents about the way you were feeling about your marks?

Um, yeah ... my mom kind of, was more like, 'I told you, you could'... so I was just... my point that I could do the work if I set my mind to it.

So if I asked you to use a sentence to describe what you learned by the experience, what would it be?

.... I learned that uh, .. I can do work if I set my mind to it and there's no obstacle in my way, it's just me pretty much. Like I've just got to get around um being, uh lazy.. and just doing the work.

Appendix J

Narrative Interview: Low in Coherence and Clarity

An example of a participant's critical incident that was low (score of 1) in both coherence and clarity. This narrative is very hard to read and the rater gets the sense that the individual is floating from topic to topic. The coherence is low because the individual does not connect the various pieces of the story to his personal development.

It's just different friends, so-called friends went against pretty much anything that I was doing, or didn't like what I was doing. Uh, they just wanted me to keep following them, listen to what they were doing. I'm sorry, I didn't feel like sitting down on the floor watching t.v. or playing games all the time. Um, also that year I was pretty involved in skiing. One of them purposely, as a joke, went over the backs of my skis, and I was... jumped.... That's one reason why I do have actually believe in God because at the time my tendons were actually all torn.....
.... And that was the last year that I stayed like.. level of hockey. I actually just missed the cut for the ___ league and then the next year I was the first player chosen. It was just basically strengthened my beliefs, like I'm gonna follow nobody else anymore, just that's what I saw as kept me down.

Okay, and this peer group, you felt that they were putting you down or something?

They were just too sedentary, too, they just wanted to stay there, they were happy with what they were doing but they really couldn't think of anything else they wanted, like just, closer to um I guess, not a robot, just.... Almost to that point where you've just okay. I've achieved my goals right now, why set anything else, if I do anything else, like that, also whenever I just, if I like actually get them out to play hockey and that, they try and bring me down, like physically as well. .....

And do you still hang out with these guys?

No, not at all.

Do you have a new peer group now?

Yeah.

How did these events influence you, in making you who you are today?

Yeah, well, like they were a whole bunch of little events, just little things but like they kept doing it, like this guy's actually trying to do something, but, and they weren't thinking that obviously, like that was almost what it seemed like.

How did this change your beliefs and values?

Oh, I used to go, okay, 'what do you guys want to do?', I'll do that, sort of like well, I think we should do this, you want to go, fine, then... to a point where I'd just go without them.

Appendix K

Narrative Interview: High in Coherence and Low in Clarity

The following narrative is an example of a story that is rated as high in coherence and low in clarity. It is apparent that this event has impacted on the person's life and has touched more than one set of values, but the story is not very readable and tends not to display a clear train of thought.

Probably when my mom divorced my step-dad. It's kind of backward because it's my real dad now, but...

Could you explain a little bit here?

Okay, when my parents.. were young they were going out, my dad's 10 years older plus 'cause he's Protestant and she's Catholic, so they got separated and then uh, my mom moved, like they lived in XX (another province). They grew up there. My mom moved here with her brother and I guess, like she married her first husband and then she had my brother and I and then she married her second husband, but then she was, like she'd always visit her parents and stuff in XX (province), like her family and that. And I guess she met up with him and she was visiting him and then came back and she was pregnant I guess. So, then she got divorced, her second husband and married third husband.

Your dad or your step-dad?

My parents now, they're not married though like,

Umhum..

Usually you have your real parents first and then your step-parents but I had my step-parents and now I've got my real dad, so it's sort of backwards. So I don't know, like when she divorced him 'cause he wasn't, he wasn't bad or anything, I don't know, but just kinda like, I used to be very like scared all the time when I was little, I was so quiet. So, and then it kind of, like her doing that I guess showed me that you know, you don't have to be scared or anything so.

How did this influence the kinds of beliefs and values you have today?

It changed a lot. I don't know, I fi-, I stand up for m-, like if I, I think if I was still, if my mom was still married to him, I'd probably be on the streets now or something. I would have run away. I'd weigh probably 300 pounds. .....

.....Like I always thought I'd be mean if I had a boyfriend, I thought I'd be like..

but I'm not. I don't know. I can be a bit jumpy sometimes, like I might get mad too fast. I think it's because of that. He knows so he understands.
Why was this event so important to your personal development, in making you who you are now?

I don't think I'd be much of, I don't know who I'd be if I was still there. Because he wasn't very, like I'd probably, I wouldn't have a good self-esteem at all.

Appendix L

Narrative Interview: Low in Coherence and High in Clarity

This is an example of a narrative which has been rated as high in clarity and low in coherence. Although this narrative is very easy to understand and follows a clear time-line, there is little connection to how the event impacted on the individual's life.

Okay, well, about a year ago, this May, it was Mother's day and I remember I was gonna go and get some flowers for my mom. I asked one of my brothers to give me a drive. And so we went to get some flowers and um, we got into a car accident and I guess I really didn't get hurt or anything, but it's just, I was really scared. When they all came, and my parents and my sisters and brothers came to see what happened, and like, things really changed. Like I thought about how much, before that happened, I really didn't care about anything.

How did this influence your beliefs and values?

I don't know, I guess I believe more in myself, like, I guess.

How was this event so important to your personal development in making you the person you are now?

Maybe because it was more like a wake-up call, you know, I guess I needed at the time. Something to realize that it could be worse but it wasn't, it was kind of a second chance.

Appendix M

Perceived Parenting Style Questionnaire

Perceived parenting style questionnaire across demandingness and responsiveness dimensions.

To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements as applied to your parents (or the authority figure you live with)?

- 4 = very strongly disagree	4 = very strongly agree
-3 = strongly disagree	3 = strongly agree
-2 = moderately disagree	2 = moderately agree
-1 = slightly disagree	1 = slightly agree
0 = precisely neutral	

Responsiveness

1. I could count on them to help me out, if I had some kind of problem.
2. They kept pushing me to do my best in whatever I did.
3. They kept pushing me to think independently.
4. They helped me with my schoolwork if there was something I didn't understand.
5. When my parents wanted me to do something, they explained why.
6. When I got a poor grade in school, my parents encouraged me to try harder.
7. When I got a good grade in school, my parents praised me.
8. My parents really knew who my friends were.
9. My parents spent time just talking with me.
10. My family did fun active things together.

Demandingness

11. My parents TRIED to know where I went at night.
12. My parents REALLY knew where I went at night.
13. My parents TRIED to know what I did with my free time.
14. My parents REALLY knew what I did with my free time.
15. My parents TRIED to know where I was most afternoons after school.
16. My parents REALLY knew where I was most afternoons after school.

Appendix N

Family Assessment Device

The next section is made up of statements that apply to families. Please rate how these statements apply to your family.

- 4 = very strongly disagree	4 = very strongly agree
-3 = strongly disagree	3 = strongly agree
-2 = moderately disagree	2 = moderately agree
-1 = slightly disagree	1 = slightly agree
0 = precisely neutral	

1. ___ Planning family activities is difficult because we misunderstand each other.
2. ___ In times of crisis, we can turn to each other for support.
3. ___ We cannot talk to each other about the sadness we feel.
4. ___ Individuals are accepted for what they are.
5. ___ We avoid discussing our fears and concerns.
6. ___ We can express feelings to each other.
7. ___ There are lots of bad feelings in the family.
8. ___ We feel accepted for what we are.
9. ___ Making decisions is a problem for our family.
10. ___ We are able to make decisions about how to solve problems.
11. ___ We don't get along well together.
12. ___ We confide in each other.