

## **Identity Status on Career Decision Making**

**Michael Balogh,**

**Ryan Jarrell,**

**Diana Koop,**

**Jesica Ronca,**

**Natalie Serwotka, and**

**Meghan Witherspoon**

University of Guelph HROB\*4100

### **Abstract**

Career Indecision is becoming a common problem with today's university students. This is a problem commonly studied in adolescents who are in early stages of forming their identities. There is very little research on university students relating to these fields. This study reports the relationship between the four identity statuses and the level of career indecision of today's university students (Generation Y). This information is derived from two measures; the Career Decision Scale (CDS, Osipow, 1976) and the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOM EIS, Adams, 1998) in University students. Results showed that there was a significant correlation between identity status and career indecision.

### **Introduction**

Career indecision is an important topic that is becoming increasingly apparent in people who are in the Generation Y age range. Generation Y is defined as "the generation

born 1978 to 1990” (Tulgan, 2012). People in Generation Y have experienced different lives than those in the past. “Many Millennials have grown up with parental support and encouragement and have experienced relatively comfortable lifestyles” (Sappanen,2009). The difference in how the generations were raised has been shown to delay the identity formation stages that typically were achieved earlier on in life in the past. “Important aspects of identity formation, one of the pillars of human development, take place during the transition to adulthood, and the transition to adulthood is now taking far longer than in the past, delayed until the late 20s for a significant proportion of the population.”(Côté,2012).

According to Marcia, the statuses, Ego identity and identity diffusion refer to polar outcomes of the psychosocial crisis which typically occurs in late adolescence. (Marcia, 1966). This psychosocial crisis results in identity formation. Identity formation is an important aspect of career decision making. This idea was originally invented by Erik Erikson and was refined by James Marcia. Vondracek suggests that during the identity formation stage, many individuals go through periods of indecision. “The findings [of the relationship of identity status to career indecision during adolescence] clearly indicate that membership in a given identity status group significantly relates to the nature and amount of career indecision for adolescents.” (Vondracek, 1995). Much of the research that has been done on this stage of identity formation in relation to career decision making which links to identity formation was done on adolescents.(Skorikov, n.d, Vondracek, 1995). This study is interested in relating the previous research done on adolescents to today’s University students which are a part of Generation Y The goal of this study is to investigate the relationship between identity status and career indecision.

## Hypothesis and Research Question

What is the relationship between the four identity statuses and the level of career indecision in Generation Y students?

This question was created based on the theme of "Career Exploration and Decision Making in Today's University Students". Many university students changes their major or program at some point in their university career. This makes career indecision an interesting study.

The main focus in this study was on the relationship between the four different identity statuses and career indecision, there were other components analyzed that will be included in the results and discussed, but the main hypothesis has to do with the big relationship.

The main hypothesis states that there will be a strong correlation between the level of career indecision and the different identity statuses. In the identity diffusion state, there will be a trend of high levels of career indecision. Moratorium and Foreclosure will be a median value of career indecision compared to the other groups. Finally, the achievement to identity status will have the lowest level of career indecision.

Relating to the generation studied, the hypothesis is that Generation Y will have a higher overall level of career indecision caused by more population not having fully formed identities based off of the changes in living styles from past generations. This hypothesis cannot be concluded in this study, only can the results be used to imply a conclusion.

## Literature Review

### Generation Y

Although Generation Y is defined multiple ways according to different sources; a common theme throughout most sources is that Generation Y is mainly compiled of people born during the 1980s and the 1990s, with some sources including the early 2000's as well. They are also commonly known as the echo boomers as the majority of them are children of parents born during the baby boom.

This new generation has been analyzed and studied quite diligently due to their differences in how they grew up compared to previous generations. This has put potential Generation Y employers in a tough spot as they have to come up with way to entice new candidates to apply, make Generation Y employees work with purpose, and retain their employees that are a completely different style of thinking compared to the rest of previous generation employees. There are many factors that are specific to Generation Y that employers will have to deal with, some examples of these factors are as follows; Generation Y are said to have high expectations of themselves. They have high expectations of their employers, they seek to find new challenges, and they seek to have a large impact immediately after entering the workforce. They are also highly goal oriented (Armour, 2009). These changes can challenge an organization as there are very many young adults working next to people old enough to be their parents, and since these two different generations were brought up very differently it poses issues with an employer trying to satisfy both groups.

The changes in expectations and attitudes of Generation Y individuals mentioned above have given researchers a reason to study this change. Research suggests that there is a much higher dependence on parents in a developing Generation Y individual compared to the previous generations. This can be explained by looking at a meta-analysis done on college students looking at the level of attachment they have to their caregivers. In this study, the variable *attachment* was divided into two categories: secure attachment, which is people comfortable with having intimacy with others, low in neuroticism, emotionally stable, and extroverted and insecure attachment, which are the people not able to have an intimate relationship, they have low self-confidence, low levels of independence, and are distrustful. These two variables did change over the different timelines, the secure attachment decreased by 15% and the insecure attachment increased by 14% (Konrath, Chopik, Hsing, and O'Brien, 2014).

These results provided more than enough reason to believe that generationally young people have changed and the process of forming an identity has slowed down as individuals rely much more heavily on their caregivers. It also suggests that if identity formation takes longer to form, then the level of career indecision may be higher in Generation Y compared to previous generations. This is why it was valid and intriguing to conduct our research on the relationship of Identity Statuses and Career Indecision in Generation Y.

### **Identity Formation**

Erikson's psychosocial model of identity has eight developmental stages which individuals progress through overtime. During each different stage the individual

encounters a crisis which must be overcome to continue developing. Throughout the identity versus identity confusion stage individuals develop an identity based on past childhood experiences and the development of these past experiences. Throughout this stage individuals explore different identities and commitment to one final identity. According to Erikson the main task is to develop an identity, however, during this period there is variation regarding career indecision. Research has shown that individuals with achievement statuses scored lower on career indecision than other identity status categories (Campbell, 2007).

Marcia primarily focuses on adolescent development, extending on the work of Erikson's life span theory. According to Marcia there are two distinct forms of an adolescent's identity: crisis and commitment. Based on crisis and commitment Marcia categorizes individuals into one of four identity statuses.



Figure 1

The identity statuses include achievement, diffusion, moratorium, and foreclosure. Adolescents who have an achievement status are committed to one identity and adolescents in the diffusion category have not committed to an identity. Furthermore

adolescents who are categorized into the moratorium identity are exploring alternative identities. Lastly adolescents in the identity foreclosure stage have committed to one identity but have not explored other identities (Campbell, 2007)

## **Career Indecision**

Career indecision has a variety of different definitions, but the most prevalent description and the one used for this report is of being in a state of indecision in regards to one's career path (Germeijs et al, 2002). There are many factors at work when looking at career indecision, such as a person's personality traits, their decision-making styles, their self-efficacy beliefs, their level of ego identity, and family and peer interaction to highlight a few examples (Germeijs et al, 2002). Because of all of these factors, it can be difficult to pinpoint the exact causes of career indecision and how they affect a person's level of decisiveness. Some other causes that must be taken into consideration are contextual factors, psychological processes, and intra-(individual and interpersonal factors). The way that we measured career indecisiveness was with the Career Decision Scale (CDS):

“Students indicate on a scale of 1 to 4 how closely each statement describes their own thinking process regarding their educational and occupational plans. The CDS is composed of 19 items. The Certainty scale (items 1 and 2) measures the degree of a certainty a student feels about his/her decision about a college major and/or a career. The Indecision scale (items 3-18) provides a measure of career indecision. Item 19 is open-ended, allowing the student to clarify or provide

additional information about his or her career decision making.” (Career Decision Scale, 2014)

Career indecision has been found to be highly linked to “neuroticism/negative affectivity, choice/commitment anxiety, lack of readiness, and interpersonal conflicts” (Hacker, Jason, et al.). However, most of the research about indecision is done with adolescents because those are the years where people are forming their identities and need to make important decisions (Campbell, J. 2007). This survey was directed at students attending university in order to better understand indecision within this demographic.

### **Methods (Sample , measures, analysis procedures)**

The identity statuses were measured using a survey with questions from two scales. The Career Decision Scale (CDS, Osipow, 1976) and the Objective Measure of Ego-Identity Status scale (EOM- EIS, Adams, 1998).are the scales that were used. The CDS is measured using a four point Likert scales, ranging from “Not at all like me” to “exactly like me”, those questions were relating to certainty and indecision. The EOM-EIS scale is a five point scale ranging from “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree”, these questions were related to Achievement, Moratorium, Foreclosure and Diffusion.

The survey contained all the items in the above scales with additional demographics questions. It was administered online by Qualtrics. It was sent out by e-mail, Facebook and word of mouth. There was a response of 140 people, with 91 valid surveys returned.



## Results/ Discussion

### Statistical Analysis

1. What is the overall trend of career indecision in today's generation of university students?

To address the question of the current trend of career indecision, a comparative analysis was performed to measure the trend in different age groups of university students. In regards to career indecision, the results can be interpreted as a large level of career indecision based upon the results. Furthermore, based upon the series of participants that ranged from those in first year all the way to doctoral programs, there appears to be some correlation with the advancement of studies in regarding programs such as doctorates but these could be classified as outliers based upon the lack of participants in the sample group size in each respective area.

The mean indecision score are presented in table 1 which is as follows:

	What is your age?							
	18 and under				19-21			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty	5.50 <sub>a</sub>	1.73	4		6.21 <sub>a</sub>	1.11	30	
CDS_Indecision	41.25 <sub>a</sub>	9.74	4		35.45 <sub>a</sub>	8.53	30	
achievement	3.47 <sub>a,b</sub>	0.23	4		3.48 <sub>a,b</sub>	0.42	30	
Moratorium	3.02 <sub>a</sub>	0.35	4		2.98 <sub>a</sub>	0.42	30	
foreclosure	2.19 <sub>a</sub>	0.19	4		2.16 <sub>a</sub>	0.51	30	
diffusion	3.01 <sub>a</sub>	0.57	4		2.77 <sub>a</sub>	0.53	30	
Identity_Status								
Achievement			3 <sub>a</sub>	75.00%			21 <sub>a</sub>	70.00%
Moratorium			2	0.00%			6 <sub>a</sub>	20.00%
Foreclosure			2	0.00%			2	0.00%
Diffusion			1 <sub>a</sub>	25.00%			3 <sub>a</sub>	10.00%
Tied statuses			2	0.00%			2	0.00%
Total			4	100.00%			30	100.00%
	22-24				25 and over			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %

CDS_Certainty	5.96 <sub>a</sub>	1.69	28		6.85 <sub>a</sub>	1.28	13	
CDS_Indecision	36.64 <sub>a</sub>	11.03	28		31.00 <sub>a</sub>	9.86	13	
achievement	3.28 <sub>a</sub>	0.62	28		3.77 <sub>b</sub>	0.56	13	
Moratorium	2.82 <sub>a</sub>	0.5	28		2.58 <sub>a</sub>	0.54	13	
foreclosure	1.93 <sub>a</sub>	0.47	28		1.77 <sub>a</sub>	0.84	13	
diffusion	2.71 <sub>a</sub>	0.53	28		2.56 <sub>a</sub>	0.76	13	
Identity_Status								
	Achievement		17 <sub>a</sub>	60.70%			10 <sub>a</sub>	76.90%
	Moratorium		6 <sub>a</sub>	21.40%			1 <sub>a</sub>	7.70%
	Foreclosure		2	0.00%			2	0.00%
	Diffusion		5 <sub>a</sub>	17.90%			2 <sub>a</sub>	15.40%
	Tied statuses		2	0.00%			2	0.00%
	Total		28	100.00%			13	100.00%

	What is your age?			
	Total			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty	6.19	1.43	75	
CDS_Indecision	35.43	9.94	75	
achievement	3.46	0.54	75	
Moratorium	2.85	0.49	75	
foreclosure	2.01	0.57	75	
diffusion	2.72	0.57	75	
Identity_Status				
	Achievement		51	68.00%
	Moratorium		13	17.30%
	Foreclosure		0	0.00%
	Diffusion		11	14.70%
	Tied statuses		0	0.00%
	Total		75	100.00%

These results indicate that there is a significant difference between age groups based upon the t-test results. This means that each particular age group is not equal in the population measured. The t-tests also signified that male and female respondents in each group did not differ significantly statistically from each other in all areas based on the same age group. The one exception was achievement status in 19-21 year olds sharing a different subscript with p>348.

2. *What is the overall trend of identity statuses (which one is most common) in today's generation of university students?*

In regards to today's generation of university students, the trend is that the majority of students identify with the achievement aspect of identity status based on the highest identity status scores across the spectrum of the four possible statuses. Of the 91 valid responses, 66 (72.5%) were categorized as being in the achievement status, 13 (14.3%) were categorized as being in moratorium, and 12 (13.2%) were categorized as being in diffusion status. These results indicate that the majority of university students have committed to a sense of identity having gone through some form of identity crisis previously based upon numerous aspects that could include: religion, parents, and other numerous aspects asked within the survey. This is compared against the remaining 27.5% in moratorium and diffusion with issues of creating an identity or choosing not to identify with one. So to simplify, the trend of identity statuses in today's university students appear to be stationed in the achievement-based aspects and less towards the other identity statuses based on the results in the frequency table presented below:

**Identity\_Status (Highest Category)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Achievement	66	72.5	72.5	72.5
	Moratorium	13	14.3	14.3	86.8
	Diffussion	12	13.2	13.2	100.0
	Total	91	100.0	100.0	

3. *What is the relationship between career indecision and age?*

**Correlations**

Pearson  
Correlation

	age?	Gender (1=male, 2=female)	CDS_Certainty	CDS_Indecision	achievement	Moratorium	foreclosure	diffusion
What is your age?	1	-.273*	0.156	-0.174	0.096	-.292*	-.259*	-0.168
Gender (1=male, 2=female)	-.273*	1	0.092	0.07	0.026	0.098	0.056	0.012
CDS_Certainty	0.156	0.092	1	-.702**	.479**	-.341**	-0.097	-.382**
CDS_Indecision	0.174	0.07	-.702**	1	-.492**	.274*	0.026	.351**
achievement	0.096	0.026	.479**	-.492**	1	0.16	.221*	-0.01
Moratorium	-.292*	0.098	-.341**	.274*	0.16	1	.499**	.479**
foreclosure	-.259*	0.056	-0.097	0.026	.221*	.499**	1	.206*
diffusion	0.168	0.012	-.382**	.351**	-0.01	.479**	.206*	1

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

\*\*.. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based upon the correlations table, there appears to be a relationship between career indecision and age. Based on the correlations table, there appears to be a negative correlation between one's age and their career indecision. This means that this is statistically significant relative to the sample size with  $p < .05$ . In measuring the relationship between career indecision and age, these results could actually have a no bearing based on a larger sample however as the table indicates a \* next to that particular figure meaning that even though the correlation appears large in magnitude, confidence in that number is questionable.

#### 4. What is the relationship between identity statuses and career indecision?

	Identity_Status		
	Achievement	Moratorium	Foreclosure

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Standard Deviation	Count	Mean
CDS_Certainty	6.65 <sub>a</sub>	1.05	66	5.17 <sub>b</sub>	1.59	13		0	5.18 <sub>b</sub>
CDS_Indecision	32.84 <sub>a</sub>	9.36	66	40.25 <sub>b</sub>	8.9	13		0	42.18 <sub>b</sub>
achievement	3.65 <sub>a</sub>	0.45	66	2.95 <sub>b</sub>	0.43	13		0	3.14 <sub>b</sub>
Moratorium	2.75 <sub>a</sub>	0.49	66	3.32 <sub>b</sub>	0.23	13		0	2.96 <sub>a,b</sub>
foreclosure	2.02 <sub>a</sub>	0.58	66	2.02 <sub>a</sub>	0.35	13		0	1.92 <sub>a</sub>
diffusion	2.56 <sub>a</sub>	0.51	66	2.78 <sub>a</sub>	0.23	13		0	3.44 <sub>b</sub>

	Identity_Status								
	Diffussion			Tied statuses			Total		
	Standard Deviation	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	
CDS_Certainty	1.78	12	0.1		0	6.19	1.43	91	
CDS_Indecision	9.11	12	0.1		0	35.43	9.94	91	
achievement	0.25	12	0.1		0	3.48	0.51	91	
Moratorium	0.33	12	0.1		0	2.86	0.49	91	
foreclosure	0.66	12	0.1		0	2.01	0.56	91	
diffusion	0.34	12	0.1		0	2.71	0.55	91	

Based upon the results, the relationship between career indecision is that they are significantly different from one another based upon the data presented. With all mean values being equal, the sample size represented indicates a large relationship between career indecision identity statuses.  $P < .05$  was present in all measurable data fields signifying a large relationship between identity status and career indecision.

### **Indecision and Status by Year of Study**

Indecision based upon the year of study appears to have a direct relationship in all measureable fields as they share a common subscript meaning they are related to one another categorically. Furthermore, all values of p are greater than 0.05 indicating that there is a high level relationship between the year of study and the levels of career indecision based upon that factor averaging at  $p=35.05$ .

		What year of university are you in?							
		First				Second			
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty		5.60 <sub>a</sub>	1.52	5		6.83 <sub>a</sub>	1.47	6	
CDS_Indecision		35.40 <sub>a</sub>	12.7	5		30.50 <sub>a</sub>	9.59	6	
achievement		3.46 <sub>a</sub>	0.33	5		3.63 <sub>a</sub>	0.37	6	
Moratorium		2.80 <sub>a</sub>	0.38	5		2.91 <sub>a</sub>	0.82	6	
foreclosure		2.12 <sub>a</sub>	0.21	5		2.14 <sub>a</sub>	0.61	6	
diffusion		2.92 <sub>a</sub>	0.6	5		2.44 <sub>a</sub>	0.73	6	
Identity_Status	Achievement			4 <sub>a</sub>	80.00%			5 <sub>a</sub>	83.30%
	Moratorium			2	0.00%			1 <sub>a</sub>	16.70%
	Foreclosure			2	0.00%			2	0.00%
	Diffussion			1 <sub>a</sub>	20.00%			2	0.00%
	Tied statuses			2	0.00%			2	0.00%
	Total			5	100.00%			6	100.00%
		What year of university are you in?							
		Third				Fourth			
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty		5.67 <sub>a</sub>	1.37	6		6.22 <sub>a</sub>	1.1	33	
CDS_Indecision		39.00 <sub>a</sub>	11.05	6		36.25 <sub>a</sub>	9.32	33	
achievement		3.31 <sub>a</sub>	0.68	6		3.35 <sub>a</sub>	0.5	33	
Moratorium		3.02 <sub>a</sub>	0.49	6		2.87 <sub>a</sub>	0.5	33	
foreclosure		2.28 <sub>a</sub>	0.7	6		2.14 <sub>a</sub>	0.47	33	
diffusion		2.97 <sub>a</sub>	0.35	6		2.68 <sub>a</sub>	0.58	33	
Identity_Status	Achievement			3 <sub>a</sub>	50.00%			22 <sub>a</sub>	66.70%
	Moratorium			2 <sub>a</sub>	33.30%			7 <sub>a</sub>	21.20%
	Foreclosure			2	0.00%			2	0.00%
	Diffussion			1 <sub>a</sub>	16.70%			4 <sub>a</sub>	12.10%
	Tied statuses			2	0.00%			2	0.00%
	Total			6	100.00%			33	100.00%
		What year of university are you in?							
		Other				Total			
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty		6.35 <sub>a</sub>	1.69	17		6.21	1.35	67	
CDS_Indecision		32.88 <sub>a</sub>	9.21	17		35.05	9.69	67	
achievement		3.51 <sub>a</sub>	0.58	17		3.42	0.51	67	
Moratorium		2.81 <sub>a</sub>	0.39	17		2.87	0.49	67	
foreclosure		1.89 <sub>a</sub>	0.64	17		2.09	0.54	67	
diffusion		2.64 <sub>a</sub>	0.42	17		2.69	0.54	67	
Identity_Status	Achievement			13 <sub>a</sub>	76.50%			47	70.10%
	Moratorium			3 <sub>a</sub>	17.60%			13	19.40%
	Foreclosure			2	0.00%			0	0.00%
	Diffussion			1 <sub>a</sub>	5.90%			7	10.40%
	Tied statuses			2	0.00%			0	0.00%
	Total			17	100.00%			67	100.00%

### **Indecision and Status by Degree Level**

Based upon the data that were collected in our survey, there is a correlation between the level of degree a person attains and their level of career indecision but not necessarily their identity status. Those that were in bachelor's level programs had the highest career indecision while those in masters and doctorate programs both had lower levels than a bachelors' degree and doctorates had the least career indecision but should not be considered due to the low level of participation from that group. The values of each program and their respective career indecision and identity status numbers are presented as follows:

Mean values	Bachelors'	Masters	Doctorate	Other
Career Indecision	36.44	30.60	29.00	29.57
Career Decision	6.13	6.40	7.00	6.43
Achievement	3.39	3.41	3.53	3.64
Moratorium	2.91	2.50	2.66	2.85
Foreclosure	2.16	1.58	1.31	2.15
Diffusion	2.74	2.66	2.81	2.29

Based upon these results, conclusions can be drawn that a student that is taking a higher level of degree will have less career indecision but their identity statuses will deviate from the progression of the degree. For instance, the doctorate level of degree has a higher level of identity diffusion than those in the masters and bachelor's programs but due to lack of participation from that group, is not truly representative of those students.



This implication suggests that despite having a higher level of career decision, the doctorate candidates may be struggling to form an identity. These results again are based on a limited sample size and could be significantly different based on an increased number of participants, so statistically speaking they are not valid in wide measurement of university students. So in essence, the level of degree will have a direct effect on the career indecision of students. However, despite a reduced career indecision based on the level of degree, identity statuses appear to stay relatively the same meaning that they have issues with their identities.

### **Indecision and Status by BA Degree**

Based upon the data collected in our survey, there appears to be some variances in the level of identity status and indecision based upon the bachelors' degree that an undergrad is pursuing. There is significant difference in relation to the indecision in one degree compared to another. In comparing these figures however, there were numerous exclusions due to no participants in some bachelors' degrees and the variables in relation to their mean value are heavily skewed based upon some survey participants as some bachelors' programs may have many and others may have fewer participants which "have a drastic effect on the measurement of the reliability of the data. Based upon the count of participants, this measure is unreliable in creating a scale in which to measure the career indecision and identity status of students in their respective degrees.

Mean values	(B.A.Sc)	(B.A)	(B.A.S)	(B.B.R.M)	(B.Comm)	(B.Sc)	(B.Sc.) (Agr)	(B.Sc.) (Env)	Other Bachelors'
Career Decision	6.0	6.08	5.00	5.00	6.42	6.33	8.00	4.00	6.0
Career Indecision	45.00	32.69	41.00	43.00	37.58	34.67	33.00	45.00	44.00
Achievement	3.69	3.34	2.56	2.25	3.33	3.50	3.31	3.81	3.56
Moratorium	3.50	2.88	3.13	3.13	2.71	2.91	3.44	2.94	3.10
Foreclosure	3.38	2.16	1.88	2.00	2.18	2.22	1.19	2.25	2.02
Diffusion	2.80	2.52	2.47	2.69	2.70	3.08	2.94	3.25	2.99

The counts for each degree from left to right on the chart were: 1, 13, 1, 1, 13, 9, 1, 1, and 3. Thus, conclusive evidence based on the indecision and status based on the bachelors' degree is not accurately measurable. So, the implication is that based on the data set, career indecision and identity status, there is no clear relationship between them and the bachelors' degree a student is taking.

### **Indecision and Status by Cumulative GPA**

The data collected for this analysis appeared to show constancy in relation to the GPA and indecision and identity status of participants. With all things considered equal in relation to academic achievement, the levels of career indecision and identity status appeared to be relatively similar in their results and led to believe that academic achievement played a smaller role in identity status and career indecision than was previously thought. The data is presented as follows:

		What is your cumulative average?							
		90%-100%				80%-89%			
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty		5.67 <sub>a</sub>	1.53	3		6.36 <sub>a</sub>	1.44	26	
CDS_Indecision		36.33 <sub>a</sub>	7.77	3		35.16 <sub>a</sub>	10.88	26	
achievement		2.97 <sub>a</sub>	0.24	3		3.48 <sub>a</sub>	0.57	26	
Moratorium		2.65 <sub>a</sub>	0.23	3		2.83 <sub>a</sub>	0.6	26	
foreclosure		1.94 <sub>a</sub>	0.38	3		1.97 <sub>a</sub>	0.58	26	
diffusion		2.77 <sub>a</sub>	0.38	3		2.55 <sub>a</sub>	0.58	26	
Identity_Status	Achievement			2 <sub>a</sub>	66.70%			19 <sub>a</sub>	73.10%
	Moratorium			4	0.00%			5 <sub>a</sub>	19.20%
	Foreclosure			4	0.00%			4	0.00%
	Diffusion			1 <sub>a</sub>	33.30%			2 <sub>a</sub>	7.70%
	Tied statuses			4	0.00%			4	0.00%
	Total			3	100.00%			26	100.00%
		What is your cumulative average?							
		70%--79%				60%-69%			
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty		6.10 <sub>a</sub>	1.4	29		6.33 <sub>a</sub>	1	9	
CDS_Indecision		34.93 <sub>a</sub>	9.43	29		34.67 <sub>a</sub>	9	9	
achievement		3.42 <sub>a</sub>	0.49	29		3.40 <sub>a</sub>	0.45	9	
Moratorium		2.98 <sub>a</sub>	0.41	29		2.69 <sub>a</sub>	0.41	9	
foreclosure		2.18 <sub>a</sub>	0.55	29		2.21 <sub>a</sub>	0.4	9	
diffusion		2.72 <sub>a</sub>	0.52	29		2.98 <sub>a</sub>	0.49	9	
Identity_Status	Achievement			20 <sub>a</sub>	69.00%			6 <sub>a</sub>	66.70%
	Moratorium			7 <sub>a</sub>	24.10%			1 <sub>a</sub>	11.10%
	Foreclosure			4	0.00%			4	0.00%
	Diffusion			2 <sub>a</sub>	6.90%			2 <sub>a</sub>	22.20%

	Tied statuses			4	0.00%			4	0.00%
	Total			29	100.00%			9	100.00%
What is your cumulative average?									
50%-59%									
49% and under									
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %	
CDS_Certainty	0.1		0		0.1		0		
CDS_Indecision	0.1		0		0.1		0		
achievement	0.1		0		0.1		0		
Moratorium	0.1		0		0.1		0		
foreclosure	0.1		0		0.1		0		
diffusion	0.1		0		0.1		0		
Identity_Status	Achievement			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%
	Moratorium			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%
	Foreclosure			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%
	Diffusion			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%
	Tied statuses			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%			0 <sup>3,4</sup>	0.00%
	Total			0	0.00%			0	0.00%

Based upon this, conclusions can be drawn that any effect that GPA has on identity status and career indecision are minimal. The small increase in some quadrants can be assumed to be deviations from the count in each category but are still in the same realm as the others with no extreme deviations. Thus, GPA appears to have a limited effect if any on the identity status and career indecision of students. An example would be someone with a high GPA but does not know what he or she wants to do for a career. They can be smart but may have trouble in coming to a choice about career or their identity status. The implication of this is that the GPA of a student will not have a great

effect on the identity status and career indecision of students. Correlations based on this analysis indicate that career indecision is still very high based upon the average of each group of students being directly related with subscript a and high career indecision with an average p value in the area .35 which shows a strong correlation.

### **Indecision and Status by Living Arrangement**

Based upon the data collected in the survey for this measurement, there appears to be a significant difference between those that choose to live alone compared against those that live with room mates or family. Career indecision and identity status were different for those who lived alone contrasted against those with roommates or those that with family members. This could be due to a variety of factors such as the influence that each group has over the individual and the idealism that is brought about by that influence. Family members could have heavy sway in a student's career indecision and identity status. For instance, parents of a student may want he or she to enter a certain profession while the student is unsure based upon their own personal preferences. Roommates can have the same effect as the person who is seen as the 'leader' may have influence over the decisions of the others. Those who were independent had much lower levels of career indecision and a moderate level of achievement compared against those that lived with family members. The data collected presented below:

	With whom do you live?			
	Alone			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty	7.00 <sub>a</sub>	1.15	7	
CDS_Indecision	28.86 <sub>a</sub>	7.13	7	
achievement	3.54 <sub>a</sub>	0.59	7	
Moratorium	2.63 <sub>a</sub>	0.3	7	
foreclosure	1.71 <sub>a</sub>	0.52	7	
diffusion	2.65 <sub>a</sub>	0.23	7	
	With whom do you live?			
	With roommates			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty	5.89 <sub>a</sub>	1.28	36	
CDS_Indecision	37.37 <sub>a</sub>	8.24	36	
achievement	3.38 <sub>a</sub>	0.49	36	
Moratorium	3.04 <sub>a</sub>	0.39	36	
foreclosure	2.17 <sub>a</sub>	0.54	36	
diffusion	2.70 <sub>a</sub>	0.51	36	
	With whom do you live?			
	With family			
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Count	Column N %
CDS_Certainty	6.50 <sub>a</sub>	1.29	18	
CDS_Indecision	32.00 <sub>a</sub>	10.24	18	
achievement	3.58 <sub>a</sub>	0.37	18	
Moratorium	2.76 <sub>a</sub>	0.48	18	
foreclosure	2.17 <sub>a</sub>	0.46	18	
diffusion	2.70 <sub>a</sub>	0.67	18	

Alone	
	Column N %
Achievement	85.70%
Moratorium	14.30%
Foreclosure	0.00%
Diffussion	0.00%
Tied statuses	0.00%
Total	100.00%

With roommates	
	Column N %
Achievement	61.10%
Moratorium	30.60%
Foreclosure	0.00%
Diffusion	8.30%
Tied statuses	0.00%
Total	100.00%
With family	
	Column N %
Achievement	83.30%
Moratorium	0.00%
Foreclosure	0.00%
Diffusion	16.70%
Tied statuses	0.00%
Total	100.00%

Based on the results, career indecision among those that lived with roommates appeared to be highest as well as having the lowest level of achievement identity of the three groups. The mean values of those that live alone suggest that independence can aid in the realization of a career decision. Thus concluding that there appears to be a relationship between the influence that others can have upon a student and their career decision and identity formation. The implication of this is that students who live alone or with family members will have lower career indecision than those who live with roommates. Implications about identity status suggest that those living alone or with family will have a higher achievement status than those who live with roommates.

## **Results/Conclusions**

Based upon the analysis, certain limitations were met in gaining conclusive data in some fields but there were some distinct data in others. One conclusion that had become apparent was that the achievement identity was the most prevalent identity status

compared against the other three. Further data sets also pointed to a non-significant difference in the gender of participants with similar subset data to indicate no direct distinction between either group.

An interesting relationship that was discovered was the effect of those who lived with particular people and its effect on the career indecision of participants. It appeared that those that lived by themselves or with family had a much higher rate of career decision contrasted against those that lived with roommates.

Further conclusions on the results were the lack of effect that a student's GPA had on their career indecision as well as their identity status. Results from analysis indicate that despite a person having a high average, they are unsure of their career aspirations as well as their own identity not being significantly different than those with lower GPAs.

Furthermore, the relationship between career indecision and identity status is established based on the correlations table as well as table 2, which were presented earlier. The degrees of which these two items are related are significant based upon the p values having succession over 0.05 with no measures having been disqualified due to error or subscript differences.

However, links between some measures could not be made based upon lack of participation or skewed participant data. For instance the level of degree contrasted against career indecision could not be accurately measured due to the skewed number of those in each sub-group. The importance of these results are indicators of how a university students approach making career decisions based on numerous factors such as age, living arrangement and other factors that provide important data to both professors and prospective employers. Professors can use this data to try and encourage students to



identify with a career and employers can use this data to also help sway the minds of students into making career decisions based upon their respective degrees.

### **Limitations/ Directions for future research**

Throughout this study many variables have been discussed: Generation Y, Marcia's Identity Status', and Career Indecision. If there was a higher participant response it is likely that the study would have found more results. Because of the small sample size it is possible to have more significant relations between variables, however they could not be shown with our data. For future research it would be interesting to see the relationships of different generations and age groups, in addition to Generation Y compared to indecision. This could assist many people in the future with regards to an individual's decision making.

## References

Adams, G. (1998). Objective Measure of Ego-Identity Status. Retrieved December 3, 2014, from [http://www.uoguelph.ca/~gadams/OMEIS\\_manual.pdf](http://www.uoguelph.ca/~gadams/OMEIS_manual.pdf) Armour, S. (2009, January 1).

Generation Y: They've arrived at work with a new attitude. Retrieved January 1, 2014, from [http://digitizingamerica.shanti.virginia.edu/sites/digitizingamerica.shanti.virginia.edu/files/USATODAY.com - Generation Y: They've arrived at work with a new attitude.pdf](http://digitizingamerica.shanti.virginia.edu/sites/digitizingamerica.shanti.virginia.edu/files/USATODAY.com%20-%20Generation%20Y:%20They've%20arrived%20at%20work%20with%20a%20new%20attitude.pdf)

Campbell, J. (2007). Adolescent identity development: the relationship with leisure lifestyle and motivation .Waterloo.McLeod, S. (2008). Erik Erikson. Developmental Psychology.

CDS (Career Decision Scale). (n.d.). Retrieved November 29, 2014, from <http://www4.parinc.com/products/Product.aspx?ProductID=CDS>

Cote, J.(2012) "Emerging Adulthood as an Institutionalized Moratorium: Risks and Benerfits to Identity Formation." American Psychological Assessment .

Druggedwithribena. (n.d.). Retrieved December 3, 2014, from <http://druggedwithribena.blogspot.ca/2012/04/identity-foreclosed.html>

Germeijs, Veerle, and Paul De Boeck. "A measurement scale for indecisiveness and its relationship to career indecision and other types of indecision." *European Journal of Psychological Assessment* 18.2 (2002): 113.

Hacker, Jason, et al. "Development of the Career Indecision Profile Factor Structure, Reliability, and Validity." *Journal of Career Assessment* 21.1 (2013): 32-41.

Konrath, S., Chopik, W., Hsing, C., & O'Brien, E. (2014). Changes in Adult Attachment Styles in American College Students Over Time: A Meta-Analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, Vol. 18(4), 326-348.

Osipow, Samuel. (1976). The Career Decision Scale [Measurement instrument]. *Psychological Assessment Resources*

Sappenan, S. (n.d.). The Millennial Generation Research Review. Retrieved November 30, 2014, from <http://www.uschamberfoundation.org/millennial-generation-research-review>

Skorikov, V., & Vondracek, F. (n.d.). Vocational Identity Development: Its Relationship to Other Identity Domains and to Overall Identity Development. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 13-35.

Generation Y: All grown up and emerging as leaders. (2012). *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 5(3). Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/subzero.lib.uoguelph.ca/doi/10.1002/jls.20237/pdf>

Vondracek, F., Schulenberg, J., Skorikov, V., Gillespie, L., & Wahlheim, C. (1995). The relationship of identity status to career indecision during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17-29.