

ATINER CONFERENCE PAPER SERIES No: PSY2013-0540

Athens Institute for Education and Research

ATINER



ATINER's Conference Paper Series

PSY2013-0540

**The Family Environment,
Satisfaction with Family Life and
Identity Crises of Female
University Students**

Aivis Dombrovskis

Doctoral Student in Psychology

Daugavpils University, Faculty of Social Sciences

Latvia

Athens Institute for Education and Research
8 Valaoritou Street, Kolonaki, 10671 Athens, Greece
Tel: + 30 210 3634210 Fax: + 30 210 3634209
Email: info@atiner.gr URL: www.atiner.gr
URL Conference Papers Series: www.atiner.gr/papers.htm

Printed in Athens, Greece by the Athens Institute for Education and Research.
All rights reserved. Reproduction is allowed for non-commercial purposes if the
source is fully acknowledged.

ISSN 2241-2891

18/09/2013

An Introduction to ATINER's Conference Paper Series

ATINER started to publish this conference papers series in 2012. It includes only the papers submitted for publication after they were presented at one of the conferences organized by our Institute every year. The papers published in the series have not been refereed and are published as they were submitted by the author. The series serves two purposes. First, we want to disseminate the information as fast as possible. Second, by doing so, the authors can receive comments useful to revise their papers before they are considered for publication in one of ATINER's books, following our standard procedures of a blind review.

Dr. Gregory T. Papanikos
President
Athens Institute for Education and Research

This paper should be cited as follows:

Dombrovskis, A. (2013) "The Family Environment, Satisfaction with Family Life and Identity Crises of Female University Students" Athens: ATINER'S Conference Paper Series, No: PSY2013-0540.

The Family Environment, Satisfaction with Family Life and Identity Crises of Female University Students

Aivis Dombrovskis
Doctoral Student in Psychology
Daugavpils University, Faculty of Social Sciences
Latvia

Abstract

In this paper, the author studies links between satisfaction in family life, family values and identity crises. Each family has specific values and relationship models among family members, and that proposed an examination of how these values and the micro cultural environment correlate with a set of identity elements for female students and their socio-demographic indicators, not least in terms of the area in which they hope to work in future. The author adapted instruments for the purposes of the study – the Identity Distress Survey (IDS) (Berman, Montgomery & Kurtines, 2004), a family environment study at the I (ideal) and R (real) form – the Family Environment Scale (FES) (Moss, R.H. and B.S. Moss, 2009). These forms were used to identify the major family values. The author also adapted the Satisfaction with Family Life Scale (SWFL) (Agate, Zabriskie, et.al., 2009). The respondents were 501 first-year students at various higher education institutions in Latvia, and all of them were women. The results show that there are important links among identity issues, family environments and the selected future profession of the respondents. There are also important correlations among identity issues, the family environment and satisfaction with family life. The results can be used in the practical work of psychologists, as well as raw data for further research into links among family life, identity crises, satisfaction with families, and other actors.

Keywords: Identity crisis, students, women, family, family values, Latvia

Corresponding Author:

Introduction

The family is the basic unit of society. Families are exactly what shapes societies. It may be, too, that the family is the oldest social institution of all (DeFrain & Asay, 2007). In emphasising the role of families in societies, Jonson argues that the stronger the families, the stronger the society (Jonson et.al., 2006). Families are made up of individuals, and the family environment shapes the individual. Erikson describes the development of an individual from a person with an unclear identity into a person with a distinct and clear identity (Erikson, 1968), thus indicating that the origin for identity is made up of the family environment and the child's parents, as Freud was first to note (Фрейд, 1925). Marcia has done work on the basis of Erikson's identity model and argues that individuals initially have a diffuse identity and that a segment of identity is then developed in a conscious way – one which individuals can integrate into themselves as an inviolable component (Marcia, 1980). The process of shaping identity involves a selection of various opportunities and choices up until there is a clear sense about work, career, ideology and beliefs and values (Erikson, 1968). Erikson defines identity crises which young people experience in their development to a great level of detail (Erikson, 1968), while Berman, Montgomery and Kurtines (2004) established the Identity Distress Survey (IDS) to come up with a precise understanding of the condition of an individual's identity while differentiating between identity crises and identity distress. The authors argue that identity problems cannot always be defined as an identity crisis (Berman, Montgomery & Kurtines, 2004).

When it comes to the importance of the family environment in the shaping of identity, researchers are increasingly examining family environments and the effect of such environments and of parents (Grotevant & Cooper, 1986) on the shaping of identity. Others have looked at the importance of child rearing (Hauser & Bowles, 1990), as well as at the way in which identities emerge in families (Marcia, 1993). Quintana and Lapsley argue that in rigid families in which parents control children to a high degree, young people have serious problems in terms of the development of their identity (Quintana & Lapsley, 1990). In families where parents allow children to be free and without strict controls while, at the same time, maintaining a presence in the kids' lives, the children can study their existence and get a better sense of their identity (Fullwider, Bush & Jacobvitz, 1993). R.H. Moos and B.S. Moos (2009) have studied family environments in depth and described it. They have established family profiles, classified types of families, identified family value systems, and looked at how these systems interact with and among family members. Satisfaction with family environments is closely linked to the amount of time spent in the family, i.e., the more satisfied individuals are, the more free time they spend with their families (Zabriskie & McCormic, 2003). The amount of time spent in the family is a direct indicator of the quality (goodness) of the family environment (Pavot & Diener, 1993).

Because the family environment is closely linked to the emergence of identity, this study analyses links between elements of identity crises,

satisfaction with family life, the family environment, and the socio-demographic indicators of respondents. The author has also looked at professional choices which ensure belonging to a certain group. Becoming a militarist, scientist, etc., can serve as a protective mechanism in terms of identifying with something that is larger and stronger (Freud, 1925). This allows individuals to preserve the wholeness of their identity during the process of identification.

There are three research questions in this study: 1) Are there links between satisfaction with family life, family values, identity crises and future professions?; 2) Are there links between satisfaction with family life, family values, identity crisis, and the status of being the only child in the family?; 3) Are their links between satisfaction with family life, family values and identity crises?

Methodology

Respondents

The research cohort was made up of 501 first-year female students from six higher education institutions in Latvia, representing all of Latvia's regions. The respondents were between 18 and 27 years old ($M=3.32$; $SD=1.93$). Approximately 60% of the respondents were 18 or 19. 38% of them lived at home, 28.9% had their own home, and 32.7% lived in dormitories. Before attending a higher education institution, 47.7% lived in a city, while 52% were from the countryside. 73.5% of respondents were unmarried, 6.8% were married, 18.6% were living with a boyfriend or girlfriend, and 1.2% were divorcees. 10.2% of the students had children and 89.8% did not. 73.9% of the students were born during the first marriage of their parents, while the rest came from different family models at the time of their birth. 14.6% of respondents were the only children in their family, while the rest had brothers or sisters. In terms of career choices, 12.8% wanted to be managers, 40.5% wished to become schoolteachers at the general education level, 14.4% wanted to have jobs in public relations and journalism, 20.4% were seeking to become preschool teachers, 9.2% wanted to work as psychologists, special pedagogues or speech therapists, social workers and 2.8% sought to become elementary schoolteachers. 84.6% of respondents were Latvians, 11.4% were Russians, and 4% were of another nationality.

Instruments

The Identity Distress Survey (IDS) (Berman, Montgomery & Kurtines, 2004) identifies levels of identity crises which have to do with unresolved or unfulfilled aspects of identity. The research is based on DSM-III-R (APA, 1987) identity crisis criteria, but it can also be used to evaluate DSM-IV (APA, 1994) identity problem criteria. Respondents were asked to answer 10 questions. The first nine were based on a Likert-style scale: (1) Not at all; (2) Somewhat; (3) At a medium level; (4) A lot; (5) Very much. The questions had

to do with how bitter, fearful or concerned they had been in recent times in regard to aspects of identity such as long-term goals, career choices, friendships, sexual orientation and behaviour, religion, values and views, as well as group loyalty. The last question had to do with how long the respondent had felt doubts about this issues and about the extent to which the symptoms hindered her everyday activities. At the conclusion of he survey, this was based on a special evaluation scale with a time interval of months (Hernandez, Montgomery & Kurtines, 2006).

The internal harmony of the survey (IDS) indicated Cronb. $\alpha=.84$, while the validity of the retest was at a level of Cronb. $\alpha=.82$. The survey indicated convergent validity with other identity development measurements (Berman, Montgomery & Kurtines, 2004). In the adapted version, the Cronbach alpha co-efficient on the scale related to the first seven questions is $\alpha=.74$, while for the entire scale (10 questions), the Cronbach alpha co-efficient is $\alpha=.76$. The reliability and validity of the adapted version were confirmed with factor analysis and convergent and divergent analysis. An identity crisis survey is useful in determining the way in which young men and women experience serious complications in the development of their identities, as well as in researching links between identity problems and other areas of psychological functions (Berman, Montgomery & Kurtines, 2004).

The Satisfaction with Family Life Scale (SWFL) (Agate & Zabriskie, et.al., 2009; Zabriskie, 2011) is a modified version (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003) of the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), with the word “life” being replaced with the words “family life” (Diener, Emmons, Larsen & Griffins, 1985). The survey has five paragraphs, and each is evaluated on the basis of a Likert-type scale from one to 7, where (1) represents a full denial of the claim, while (7) represents full agreement with the claim. The values that can be obtained on the scale are between 5 and 35 points. The original survey scale demonstrates acceptable psychometric indicators, as proven by the validity and internal harmony of the constructs (Cronbach alpha is 0.93), with test and retest plausibility ($r=.89$) (Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). In the adapted SWFL version, Stand. Cronbach $\alpha=.86$.

Zabriskie (2011) has proposed the hypothesis that if free time activities and the role of individuals that is integrated therein dictate the individual’s satisfaction with life and quality of life, then the relevant family’s free time will also be an indicator of satisfaction with family life and the quality thereof.

The Family Environment Scale (FES) survey was devised by Moos and Moos (2009). There are three different survey forms for adults (90 questions on each one), and one for children. The authors describe the “R” (realistic) and “I” (ideal) family environment in the various survey forms. There is also a third form, “Expectations,” which is not utilised in this study. Both the ideal and the expectation form coincide with the realistic family environment scale, because the content of the questions is the same as in the realistic form, only differentiating in terms of the time span – the past or the future (Moos & Moos, 2009). All of the forms have the same answer sheets in terms of form and content, with all questions leading to the answer True or False. All of the

answers are arranged in 10 subscales, and these make up 10 vertical columns (Moos & Moos, 2009). The survey involves the following dimensions and subscales:

I) Relationship Dimensions (Cohesion; Expressiveness; Conflict) and the following subscales:

1) Cohesion, which speaks to the degree of commitment, help and support family members provide for one another (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.78$; "R" adapted version $\alpha=.77$; $M=.72$, $SD=.26$; "I" $\alpha=.68$; $M=.92$, $SD=.13$).

2) Expressiveness, which speaks to the extent to which family members are encouraged to express their feelings directly (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.69$; "R" adapted version $\alpha=.52$; $M=.6$, $SD=.2$; "I" $\alpha=.43$; $M=.71$, $SD=.17$). Question 72 from the "R" form ($d_{72}=-.02$) and Questions 12 ($d_{12}=.09$) and 72 ($d_{72}=0.6$) from the "I" form have been excluded, because the discrimination indices are poor.

3) Conflict– the amount of openly expressed anger and conflict among families (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.75$; "R" adapted version $\alpha=.74$; $M=.32$, $SD=.25$; "I" $\alpha=.65$; $M=.08$, $SD=.14$). Question 13 ($d_{13}=.32$) has been excluded from the form, because the discrimination index is poor.

II) Personal Growth Dimensions (Independence; Achievement orientation; Intellectual-cultural orientation; Active-recreational orientation; Moral-religious emphasis) and the following subscales:

4) Independence, which speaks to the extent to which family members are assertive and self-sufficient and make their own decision (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.61$; "R" adapted version $\alpha=.57$; $M=.64$, $SD=.19$; "I" $\alpha=.33$; $M=.55$, $SD=.22$). Questions 24 ($d_{24}=.05$) and 54 ($d_{54}=.04$) have been excluded from the "R" form and Questions 44 ($d_{44}=.02$), 64 ($d_{64}=.09$), 74 ($d_{74}=.04$) and 84 ($d_{84}=0.2$) have been excluded from the "I" form because the discrimination indices are poor.

5) Achievement orientation, which speaks to the extent to which activities such as school and work are part of an achievement-oriented or competitive framework (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.64$; "R" adapted version $\alpha=.44$; $M=.5$, $SD=.17$; "I" $\alpha=.4$; $M=.52$, $SD=.17$). Questions 25, 55 and 85 ($d_{25}=.02$, $d_{55}=.09$, $d_{85}=.02$) have been excluded from the adapted "R" form and Questions 25, 55 and 85 ($d_{25}=-.01$, $d_{55}=.08$, $d_{85}=.03$) have been excluded from the adapted "I" form, because the discrimination indices are poor.

6) Intellectual-cultural orientation, which speaks to the level of interest in political, intellectual and cultural activities (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.78$; "R" adapted version $\alpha=.78$; $M=.55$, $SD=.25$; "I" $\alpha=.63$; $M=.8$, $SD=.2$).

7) Active-recreational orientation – the level of participation in social and recreational activities (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.67$; "R" adapted version $\alpha=.71$; $M=.5$, $SD=.27$; "I" $\alpha=.66$; $M=.83$, $SD=.19$).

8) Moral-religious emphasis – emphasis on ethical and religious issues and values (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.78$; "R" adapted version $\alpha=.62$; $M=.38$, $SD=.219$; "I" $\alpha=.68$; $M=.49$, $SD=.24$). Question 68 ($d_{68}=.09$) has been excluded from the "I" form, because the discrimination index is poor.

III) System Maintenance Dimensions (the Organization and Control subscales):

9) Organization– the level of importance in terms of clear organisation and structure in planning family activities and responsibilities (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.76$; “R” adapted version $\alpha=.59$; $M=.68$, $SD=.22$; “I” $\alpha=.56$; $M=.84$, $SD=.15$).

10) Control– the extent to which set rules and procedures are used to run family life (Orig. Cronbach $\alpha=.67$; “R” adapted version $\alpha=.54$; $M=.4$, $SD=.22$; “I” $\alpha=.38$; $M=.36$, $SD=.18$). Questions 10 and 90 ($d_{10}=.07$, $d_{90}=.09$) have been excluded from the “I” form, because the discrimination indices are poor.

The dimension of relationships and the dimension of preserving the system reflect the functionality of the internal family environment, while the personal growth dimension reflects the link between the family and the broader social environment (Moos & Moos, 2009). The “R” form of the survey helps to describe the way in which the respondents perceive their families. The “I” form helps to describe the type of family that respondents wish to have. This form was established so as to determine whether family members want the family to function. Other specialists (Moos & Moos, 2009) use the “I” form to determine the value orientation of family members. The use of the “I” and “R” forms can identify areas in which people want changes in their families.

Procedures

Respondents filled out the surveys during class sessions at universities, with frontal contacts with the researcher and his assistants. Explanations were given to all respondents as to the aim of the research and to the way in which the surveys were to be filled out. The instructions were written at the top of each survey, and the entire packet of surveys was filled out in a single session. The set of surveys was arranged so that the first test would be the FES “R” form, followed by the IDS, SWFL and then FES “I” form. Approximately 40 minutes were needed to complete the surveys. To ensure the confidentiality of respondents, respondents did not write down their real personal data, instead writing down freely selected pseudonyms and a four-digit number. The surveys were inspected in terms of their usefulness, and then they were encoded. The data were processed with the SPSS-19 version of computer software. Adaptation of the research instruments in Latvia’s cultural environment occurred in two rounds. In the first round of adaptation, the cohort was mixed up in terms of gender, with 500 respondents taking part ($M=1.66$, $SD=.47$, $N_{men}=170$, $N_{women}=330$). Only women ($N_{women}=501$) took part in the second round of adaptation. In both cases, respondents were selected on a random basis and in terms of their availability. The process was a voluntary one. Respondents were offered a reciprocal link by sending an E-mail to the author. This was indicated in the instructions of the surveys.

Results and Discussion

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used to determine the extent to which the empirically obtained data related to the research cohort was in line with

theoretical distribution. The finding was that in all of the tests, the bilateral significance level was $p < .05$, which shows that the cohort did not conform to the theoretical distribution and that non-parametric statistical methods would be used.

Factor analysis was conducted at first, identifying seven factors. Descriptive factor analysis was used to calculate links between the various factors and the future profession chosen by the respondents, evaluating the results in qualitative terms so as to determine the closeness of links among the variables (Raščevska & Kristapsone, 2000). If r is between .2 and .4, then the links are weak and insignificant; if it is between .4 and .7, it is at a medium level of closeness, it is at a medium level of closeness; if it is above .7, then the links are close. Links among identity crisis indicators, satisfaction with family life, the family environment, the socio-demographic indicators of respondents, and the choice of professions are illustrated in Tables 1, 2 and 3.

Analysis of links among satisfaction with family life, family values and indicators of identity crises (Table 1) shows that all respondents spoke of links to family values such as trust, help and support, but preschool pedagogues indicated very much negative links in this regard ($r = .81$). These women also indicated negative links ($r = .83$) in terms of support for open expression of emotions in their future families and their current family ($r = .6$). They were also the only ones to indicate positive links ($r = .84$) to freedom and independence in future or in their current family ($r = -.63$).

Table 1. *The ideal family values of female students (FES_I)*

Dimension	FES "I" Family Values (Factor)	Professional groups						
		Entire cohort	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Relationship Dimensions	Help; trust; support. (<i>Cohesion_I</i>)	.83	.70	.82	.88	.70	.80	-.81
	Support for open expression of emotions. (<i>Expressiveness_I</i>)	.44				.70		-.83
	Family conflicts. (<i>Conflict_I</i>)	-.80	-.73	-.80	-.70	-.78	-.86	
Personal Growth Dimensions	Freedom; independence. (<i>Independence_I</i>)							.84
	Achievements, Professional career, successes. (<i>Achievement Orientation_I</i>)	.62		.65			.68	
	Socio-political activities; intellectual activities; cultural activities and events. (<i>Intellectual- Cultural Orientation_I</i>)	.63		.70	.65		.83	.63
	Active leisure (<i>Active-Recreational Orientation_I</i>)	.70		.69			.88	.85
	Moral values; religion. (<i>Moral- Religious Emphasis_I</i>)	.84	.73		.72	.84		.75

System Maintenance Dimensions	Responsibility; clarity of goals; planning, clear duties. (<i>Organization_I</i>)	.68	.80		.73	.80		.86
	Clear limits on activities; family rules; specific internal procedures. (<i>Control_I</i>)	.54			.72			

Notes: 1.- managers; 2.- schoolteachers at the general education level; 3.- public relations and journalism; 4.- preschool teachers; 5.- psychologists, special pedagogues or speech therapists, social worker; 6.- elementary schoolteachers. (Extraction Method: Principal component Analysis; Number of factor: 7; Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization; Suppress abs.val. less than .4. I- dedicates factors FES, Ideal form, (Moos & Moos, 2009). Included in table professionals groups of factors which in its strength (+/-) from .44 to 1.

The entire cohort has a medium level of linkage to the factor Cohesion_R (r=.64). A similar level of linkage to the factor exists among respondents who have chosen to become Managers (r=.69). Moos & Moos argue that young people from families which provide them with assistance, in which people trust and support one another, and in which people appreciate an open expression of emotions to others have larger academic expectations and spend more time at their studies (Moos & Moos, 2009).

Future Managers show few links to factors in the relationship dimension (Table 2). This indicates that they have supportive families. They also have weak links to identity crisis factors (Table 3). Preschool pedagogues indicate many links to factors related to the family environment– assistance, trust and support (r=.90), weak links to Support for the open expression of emotions (r=-.60), as well as negative links to Family conflicts (r=-.79). This indicates a partly supportive family, and this professional group has the greatest number of indicated links to identity crisis factors. Moos & Moos argue that young people from more supportive families have better relations with their families, a stronger identity, and less in the way of being upset about things (Moos & Moos, 2009).

When it comes to the question “Are their links between satisfaction with family life, family values, identity crises and the selected future profession?”, the closest links between the choice of profession, satisfaction with family life, family values and identity crisis were indicated by those respondents who wish to become Preschool pedagogues (medium and close links in 27 factors), followed by General education pedagogues (medium and close links in 19 factors), Elementary school pedagogues (close links in 18 factors), future Managers (close links in 16 factors), future Public relations specialists and journalists (close links in 11 factors), and those who wish to become Psychologists, special education pedagogues or social workers (close links in 8 factors). It can be concluded here that there are links between family life, family values, identity crises, and the choice of profession.

Table 2. The family environment of the students' parents (FES_R)

Dimension	FES „R” Existing family values (Factor)	Professional groups						
		Entire cohort	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
Relationship Dimensions	Help; trust; support. (<i>Cohesion_R</i>)	.64	.69	.68	.76	.78		.90
	Support for open expression of emotions. (<i>Expressiveness_R</i>)		.66				.73	-.60
	Family conflicts. (<i>Conflict_R</i>)	-.52				-.70		-.79
Personal Growth Dimensions	Freedom; independence. (<i>Independence_R</i>)	-.47			-.69			-.63
	Support for open expression of emotions. (<i>Achievement Orientation_R</i>)	.57		.65			.76	
	Socio-political activities; intellectual activities; cultural activities and events. (<i>Intellectual- Cultural Orientation_R</i>)	.80		.78	.75			
	Active leisure. (<i>Active-Recreational Orientation_R</i>)	.74		.73	.66			
	Moral values; religion. (<i>Moral- Religious Emphasis_R</i>)	.83	.75		.68	.87		.89
System Maintenance Dimensions	Responsibility; clarity of goals; planning, clear duties. (<i>Organization_R</i>)	.55						.66
	Clear limits on activities; family rules; specific internal procedures. (<i>Control_R</i>)	.70		.67		.75	-.75	.74

Notes: 1.- managers; 2.- schoolteachers at the general education level; 3.- public relations and journalism; 4.- preschool teachers; 5.- psychologists, special pedagogues or speech therapists, social worker; 6.- elementary schoolteachers. (Extraction Method: Principal component Analysis; Number of factor: 7; Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization; Suppress abs.val. less than .4. R- dedicates factors FES, Real form, (Moos & Moos, 2009). Included in table professionals groups of factors which in its strength (+/-) from .47 to 1.

Table 3. *Indicators of the students' satisfaction with life and identity crises*

Factor	Professional groups						
	Entire cohort	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.
I feel satisfied in my family	.88	.83	.90	.87	.80	.77	.89
I feel ideal in my family	.84	.81	.84	.80	.78	.89	.90
I feel very well in my family	.83	.73	.84	.74	.74	.86	.85
I am satisfied with everything in my family	.81	.82	.77	.75	.71	.89	.65
I can satisfy my needs in my family	.75	.78	.80	.80	.69		.64
Career choice	.73	.66	.78	.73	.71		.63
Long-term goals	.69		.68	.75	.72		.82
Insecurity which limits happiness	.62	.73					.90
Friendship	.61		.64		.67		
Group loyalty (belonging)	.56			.64		.66	.65
Discomfort in discussing identity issues	.54		.65			.89	
Values and beliefs	.53				.64	.69	.88
Bitterness about identity issues	.50						-.78
Religion	.51					.63	.78
Sexual orientation and behaviours	-.55	-.76					.64

Notes: 1.- managers; 2.- schoolteachers at the general education level; 3.- public relations and journalism; 4.- preschool teachers; 5.- psychologists, special pedagogues or speech therapists, social worker; 6.- elementary schoolteachers. (Extraction Method: Principal component Analysis; Number of factor: 7; Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization; Suppress abs.val. less than .4. Included in table professionals groups of factors which in its strength (+/-) from .50 to 1.

In answering the second research question, Students who were the only children in their families showed close links to the factors: Cohesion_R ($r=.85$), I feel ideal in my family ($r=.82$), I am satisfied with my family ($r=.82$), I feel satisfied with everything in my family ($r=.72$), I can satisfy my needs in my family ($r=.7$), Active-Recreational Orientation_I ($r=.71$), Achievement Orientation_R ($r=.74$), Achievement Orientation_I ($r=.74$), Religion ($r=.71$), Moral-Religious Emphasis_R ($r=.77$), Moral-Religious Emphasis_I ($r=.87$), and negative links to Conflict_R ($r=-.72$), Conflict_I ($r=-.71$), and Independence_I ($r=-.67$).

Answers to the third research question, “Are there links between satisfaction with family life, family values and identity crises?” show that the very important statistical correlation ($p<0.01$) to the other factors (see Figure 1 in the appendix for more on this) was found in relation to Cohesion_R (13 correlations), Long-term goals (12), insecurity (12), limits on happiness (11), Expression_R (11), and Independence_R (12). The factor I can satisfy my needs in my family does not indicate a very important ($p<.01$) statistical

correlation to any other factor. It can be concluded here that there are very important statistical links between family life, family values and identity crises.

Figure 1. The correlation between satisfaction with family life, family values and identity crisis

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34			
1 Long-term goals	.49**																																				
2 Career choice	.53**	.40**																																			
3 Friendliness	.15**	.19**	.10**																																		
4 Sexual orientation and behaviors	.17**	.19**	.19**	.27**																																	
5 Religion	.25**	.25**	.29**	.15**	.20**																																
6 Values and beliefs	.20**	.39**	.32**	.24**	.16**	.30**																															
7 Compulsivity (behavior)	.26**	.39**	.31**	.29**	.18**	.22**	.19**																														
8 Decisive in discussing identity issues	.26**	.31**	.29**	.18**	.22**	.19**	.41**																														
9 Insecurity which limits happiness	.26**	.30**	.26**	.13**	.12**	.20**	.20**	.41**																													
10 Biases about identity issues	.24**	.27**	.17**	.16**	.15**	.20**	.44**	.23**																													
11 Confusion_R	-.13**																																				
12 Expressiveness_R	-.18**																																				
13 Conflict_R		.13**																																			
14 Independence_R			.11**																																		
15 Achievement Orientation_R				.11**																																	
16 Intellectual-Cultural Orientation_R					.11**																																
17 Active-Recreational Orientation_R						.11**																															
18 Moral-Religious Emphasis_R							.11**																														
19 Organization_R								.11**																													
20 Control_R									.11**																												
21 Confusion_J										.11**																											
22 Expressiveness_J											.11**																										
23 Conflict_J												.11**																									
24 Independence_J													.11**																								
25 Achievement Orientation_J														.11**																							
26 Intellectual-Cultural Orientation_J															.11**																						
27 Active-Recreational Orientation_J																.11**																					
28 Moral-Religious Emphasis_J																	.11**																				
29 Organization_J																		.11**																			
30 Control_J																			.11**																		
31 I feel liked in my family																																					
32 I feel very well in my family																																					
33 I feel satisfied in my family																																					
34 I can satisfy my needs in my family																																					

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

Limitations and recommendations for future research

This study focused only on first-year female university students aged 18-27, and in future it would be necessary to study these links in other age groups, also covering broader professional areas. It would certainly be necessary to study these links in terms of men, then examining links in cohorts which involve both genders. This paper does not offer a detailed look at all links, instead only focusing on major trends.

The practical use of the results

Psychologists have obtained for new research instruments that have been adapted in Latvia for the purposes of practical research. The results allow psychologists to propose a hypothesis about a client's family life in practical terms when being aware of the client's profession and number of children. The correlation between satisfaction with family life, family values and identity crisis shows which factors change when other factors are changed. This author believes that further research is needed in terms of these complex links so as to improve the psycho-social welfare of society.

References

- Agate, J.R., Zabriskie R.B, Agate S.T. & Poff R. (2009). Family Leisure Satisfaction and Satisfaction with Family Life. *Journal of Leisure Research*. Volume: 41.Issue:2. Copyright 2009 National Recreation and Park Association. Gale, Cengage Learning.
- American Psychiatric Association., (1987). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.,(3rd ed.rev.),Washington, DC:Author
- American Psychiatric Association., (1987). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders.,(4rd ed.rev.),Washington, DC:Author
- Berman S.L., Montgomery M.J. & Kurtines W.M., (2004). The Development and Validation of a Measure of Identity Distress. *Identity: An International Journal Of Theory and Research*, 4,1-8
- DeFrain, J.,&vAsay, S.M. (2007). Strong Families Around the World: An Introduction to the Family Strengths Perspective. *Marriage and Family Review*, 41 (1/2), 1-10
- Diener E., Emmons R.A., Larsen R.J. & Griffin S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71- 157.
- Fullwider-Bush, N., & Jacobvitz, D.B., (1993). The Transition to Young Adulthood: Generational Boundary Dissolution and Female identity Development. *Family Process*, 32, 87- 103.
- Grotevant, H. D., & Cooper, C. (1986). Individuation n Family Relationships: A Perspective on Individual Differences in the Development of Identity and Role-Taking Skill in Adolescence. *Human Development*, 29, 82-100.
- Hauser, S.T., & Bowles, M.K., (1990). Stress, Coping and Adaptation. In Feldman, S.S. & Elliot, G.R. (Eds.) *At the Threshold: The Developing adolescent* (pp.135-167). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hernandez L., Montgomery M.J. & Kurtines W.M., (2006). Identity Distress and Adjustment Problems in At-Risk Adolescents. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 6, 27-33.

- Jonson, H.A., Zabriskie, R.B., & Hill, B. (2006). The Contribution of Couple Leisure involvement, Leisure Time, and Leisure Satisfaction to Marital Satisfaction. *Marriage and Family Review*, 40(1), 69-91.
- Marcia, J.,E. (1980). Identity in Adolescence. In J.Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of Adolescent psychology* (pp.159- 188). New York: John Wiley.
- Marcia, J.,E. (1993). Epilogue. In Marcia, J.E., Waterman, A.S., Matteson, D.R., Acher, S.L., & Orlofsky, J.L. (Eds.), *Ego Identity: A Handbook for Psychosocial Research* (pp.22-41), New York, Springer- Verlag.
- Moss R.H., & Moos, B.S., (2009). *Family Environment Scale*. Manual and Sampler Set: Development, Applications and Research. Fourth Edition. Published by Mind Garden, Inc.
- Pavot, W., & Diener, E., (1993)., Review of the Satisfaction With Life Scale., *Psyhological Assessment*., 5(2), 164-172.
- Raščevska, M. & S. Kristapsone (2000)., *Statistika psiholoģijas pētījumos*., Izglītības soli. Rīga. [In Latvian]
- Quintana, S.M., & Lapsley, D.K., (1990). Rapprochement in late adolescent separation- individuation: A Structural equations approach. *Jurnal of Adolescence*, 13, 371-385.
- Zabriskie R.B., (2000). An examination of family and leisure behaviour among families with middle school age children. Unpublished dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
- Zabriskie R.B. & McCormick B.P. (2003). Parent and Child Perspectives of Family Leisure Involvement and Satisfaction with Family Life. *Journal of Leisure Research*. Volume: 35.Issue:2. Copyright 2003 National Recreation and Park Association. Gale Group.
- Фрейд З.,(1925) [Freid]. *Психология масс и анализ человеческого Я*. Москва. [In Russian].
- Бююль, А., & Цёфель (2005) [Bjul & Chefel] . *SPSS: искусство обработки информации*., DiaSoft, Москва. [In Russian].