Development and Early Validation Friendship Identity Process Questionnaire (FIPQ)

Ruly Ningsih[(✉)], Sigit Sanyata, and Suwarjo Suwarjo

Guidance and Counseling Department, Universitas Mercu Buana Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

ruly.ningsih@mercubuana-yogya.ac.id, {sanyatasigit, suwarjo}@uny.ac.id

Abstracts. An assessment in identity development focused on friendship process was developed that used to assess deeper of interpersonal identity process. This study aimed to developing and validating identity of friendship questionnaire. Participants of the study were late adolescence age 17 until 21 years (N_350) in various ethnic. Data were collected on 38 items, consisting of 16 items that reflected friendship exploration and 22 items reflected of friendship commitments. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) used to find friendship exploration and commitment components. Exploration dimension formed 5 components and commitment components formed 7 components.

Keywords: friendship identity process · EFA exploration · EFA commitments

1 Introduction

Education is one of most powerful social constructs to lead a change. The triangle of word to express about education are educate, educator, and student. In Indonesia context, guidance and counseling service is one of integral part in education. Their focus in on build personal-social skills, career planning, and academic achievement.

Before doing an action, counselor/teacher in guidance and counseling should develop their understanding to student. There are many perspectives to gain awareness about who is student, such as psychological perspective. Student in university is at the late adolescence development stages. Late adolescence as important school transitions to college student [1]. Galaway and hudson proposed that transition to university as a major step before being adult [2]. University also being chance for student to develop their skills in academic, social skills, and etc. most of students experienced their time studying as a positive period and explained that their thinking skills had developed during their time at university [3].

Improvement student skills not only helped by campus but also social relation, such as friends. Friends gives a trust, loyalty, and emotional support each other's [4]. How can they make a friend? Berndt& Festinger [5] has been argued that a desire for comparison and self-affirmation leads people to prefer friends who are similar to themselves. Study also found that adolescents select others as friends who have a similar level of

delinquency compared with their own level [6]. Make a friend or found a close friend are not easy for student. They should do deep exploration about friends. Deep exploration makes better understanding for student so they can make a commitment. Exploration and commitment in Marcia terminology is used to knowing level of identity.

2 Identity of Friendship Construct

A study in identity formation are very popular issues among scholars. Crocetti, Sica, Schwartz, Serafini &Meuss study identity in educational and interpersonal domain. Other study, Crocetti, Schwartz, Fermani, Klimstra, & Meeus found that Italian participants more represented in the moratorium statuses [2]. Identity related to juvenile delinquency among adolescence. Both clinicians gave more intention on identity formation among juvenile delinquents [3].

Identity proposed by Erickson. Erickson said that identity refers to bipolar dimention range from achieve until diffusion [4]. Operationalized Erickson, Marcia recently proposed definition of identity. Identity refers to a sense of oneself as having continuity with the past, active direction in the present, and a future trajectory [5]. Marcia [5] suggested exploration and commitment as a dimension of identity and separated four identity statuses based that dimensions. Marcia also found four identity statuses based on exploration and commitment. Exploration is an important process before a commitment what is also represents the degree to wich late adolescents deal with their existing commitments in an active manner [6]. Commitment refers to strong choices that adolescents have made with regard to various developmental domains, along with the self-confidence that they derive from these choices [7].

Relation among adolescence is the important phase before adult. One of the most important things in adolescence is relation with peers. Study also associated identity and friendship. Study in friendship proposed identity status, conflict and friendship supporting contributed to predictive variability to achieve identity (3.2%), moratorium (2.4%), and diffuse (2.5%) [8].

Hence, there are many various models for assessing identity development. Balisteri, et. al. [9] developed EIP questionnaire which separated exploration and commitment score. EIPQ have 32 questions in 8 domains. The other hand, Adam also proposed EOMEIS-2 which have 6 rsponse scale in many domains [9].

3 Developing Questionnaire

In developing questionnaire, we used Heppner, Wampold, Kivlighan, Jr. [10], such as conceptualization and operational construct, study literatures, build items and response format, content analysis, conducted empirical study, and psychometric analysis. Content validity is used to assess validity of instrument. Psychometric analysis using exploratory factor analysis. Scoring criteria using Likert type scale with modification to be 4 continuums. Favorable item scoring start from 4 to one, and unfavorable item scoring start from 1 to 4. Data categories using median exploration and median commitment. Identity achievements are above median both exploration and commitment score, and diffuse are below median on both. Moratoriums are above median for exploration and below median

for commitment, and last is foreclose. Foreclosure are below median for exploration and above median for commitment [11].

4   Early Validation

Participants were college student (n_350). Ages ranged from 16 to 22 years (*M*_19) years. Participants were identified to the researchers only by gender, and field of education. Sample consisted of scientific education (n_90) and social science (n_260). They were 105 male and 245 female. Females have more attention to interpersonal domain than male [12].

Final version of FIPQ were 38 items (33 positive items and 5 negative items). Questionnaire response using Likert-type scale. In positive items, we used 4 point for "very much like me" and 1 point for "not at all like me", and the omit procedure for negative items. Median for exploration 43 and 69 for commitment. Exploration scale range from 16 until 64, and commitment scale scoring range from 22 until 88. Achieve is participant score which exploration and commitment score above median. Respondent below median for both dimension classified as diffuse. Respondent have exploration score below median and commitment above median, they identified as foreclosed. Thus, respondent who have exploration above median and commitment below median classified as moratorium [13].

Factor analysis was performed using the development sample (*n* _ 350) and 38 "core" items in 2 dimensions. Dimension exploration has 4 aspects (knowledgeably, activity to gather information, considering alternative potential identity elements, and desire to make an early decision [12]. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy for exploration scale was 0.815. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant (*p* _ .000). The factors were subjected to varimax rotation. The initial factor analysis and scree test using the 16 core items of exploration scale showed that a five-factor model was most appropriate. All items have communalities above .30. And anti-image correlation above .50. Rotation matrix was .25. Total variance explained 60.407. The Cronbach's alpha value for the overall scale was (0.790) if item 1 was deleted. This table showed that dimension of exploration formed 5 factors.

Second dimension, commitment have 5 aspects (knowledgeability, activity toward implementing the chosen identity elements, emotional tone, identification with significant others, projection of one's personal future, and resistance to being swayed [12]. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy for commitment questionnaire was 0.777. Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant (*p* _ .000). The factors were subjected to varimax rotation. The initial factor analysis and scree test using the 22 core items of exploration scale showed that a seven-factors model was most appropriate. All items has communalities above .30. And anti-image correlation above .50. Total variance explained was 60.483. The Cronbach's alpha value for the overall scale was (.738).

Here is a mapping of friendship identity using descriptive statistics. This table shows that 8.29% of participants from sciences have achieved scores, 3.43% moratorium, 3.71%, foreclosed and 10.29% diffuse. Participants come from social achieve 32.00%, 11,71% moratorium, 8.57% foreclosed, and 22.00% are in diffuse category. This shows that there is a difference in identity status between students who come from sciences with students who come from social.

Table 1. EXPLORATION DIMENSION

No.	Item	Coeficient	Component
3	I think about the importance of closeness with friends	.786	1
1	I know about the importance of having a best friend.	.783	1
2	I think of some activities that need to do with my best friend.	.735	1
4	I think about the quality of friendship	.597	1
7	I am looking for information about how to build warmness friendship	.819	2
6	I've found information about the need for activities with friends.	.700	2
5	I find out about the benefits of friendship	.621	2
17	I took the time to share my feelings with my best friend	.809	3
16	I decided being more openness about my feelings to friends	.797	3
12	I'am increasing the frequency of meetings with new friends	.440	3
11	When I am not comfortable with my friends, I try to find positive aspect of my best friend that makes me feel good again.	.419	3
10	I need to know better about others before making friends.	.763	4
9	I consider some people that I think suitable to be my close friends.	.759	4
13	I can get new friends easily.	.539	4
15	I get a close friend through the same hobby.	.768	5
14	I am searching earnestly to find a true friend.	.482	5

There are differences in interpersonal matters. Woman could be intimate with openness, and man being intimate by doing activity togethers [14]. Costa & Campos found that student from law and arts have higher identity than engineering and medicine [12], law and arts are closed with social science, the other hand engineering and medicine are closed with scientific sciences.

This study focused on developing a questionnaire of friendship identity process. This research to examine this domain in more depth so that is clearly process of friendship identity process. Some researchers have found the importance of the study of friendship. Friendship becomes the place to sharing values, ideas, life goals, and talking about things that could reinforce the choices and the establishment [4, 15]. Azmitia, Ittel, & Radmacher found that late-adolescent need friendship at home and at university as a supportive context in their explorations [15]. Other researchers, viewing that the identity of adolescents by the identity of friends [16]. The development of FIPQ intended as a

Table 2. COMMITMENT DIMENSION

No.	Items	Coeffiecient	Component.
28	I feel rejected by my best friend.	.808	1
29	I do not feel too close to my best friend.	.803	1
30	I feel discomfort with my best friend.	.794	1
31	I do not have a firmly held determination on friendship.	.602	1
27	I feel worried about the negative impact if I get too close to my best friend.	.442	1
23	I realized that my best friend helped me to learn anything in secondary school.	.716	2
38	I find out the wisdom of conflict in friendship.	.678	2
20	I took the time to meet my best friend.	.605	2
26	I have a positive belief in friendship.	.598	2
24	I upold my principles in making friendships.	.498	2
35	I try to set the goal of friendship together with my best friend	.733	3
37	I have a goal in the relationship with friends.	.696	3
36	I meet my friends regularly in accordance with the schedule that has been agreed upon.	.681	3
39	I have shared values when there is a conflict with a friend	.610	3
33	I sort out activities with friends according to what my idol does.	.912	4
34	I chose the person who can be close friends like my significant others doing.	.901	4
32	I look from others about what kind of people he/she chooses to be close friend	.463	4

(*continued*)

Table 2. (*continued*)

No.	Items	Coeffiecient	Component.
21	I often share about everything with my friends.	.801	5
18	I have the best friend to share.	.687	5
22	I consider the advantages and disadvantages clossness with friends	.768	6
25	I identify things that can be revealed with friends and those that are not.	.628	6
40	I try to interpret the small frequensi of meeting with friends in a positive way.	.818	7

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 7 iterations.

Table 3. FRIENDSHIP IDENTITY STATUSES

No.	Cluster	Identity Friendship Statuses	M/F	Count	%	
1	Science	Achieve	Male	12	3,43%	
			Female	17	4,86%	8,29%
		Moratorium	Male	6	1,71%	
			Female	6	1,71%	3,43%
		Foreclosed	Male	6	1,71%	
			Female	7	2,00%	3,71%
		Diffuse	Male	25	7,14%	
			Female	11	3,14%	10,29%
						25,71%
2	Social	Achieve	Male	24	6,86%	
			Female	88	25,14%	32,00%
		Moratorium	Male	10	2,86%	
			Female	31	8,86%	11,71%
		Foreclosed	Male	4	1,14%	
			Female	26	7,43%	8,57%
		Diffuse	Male	18	5,14%	
			Female	59	16,86%	22,00%
						74,29%
Total				**350**	**100%**	

screening tool to see the development of interpersonal domain identity. The implications of the development of a questionnaire of a friendship identity that importance for discussions related to identity development interventions at the individual and socio-cultural level [17].

5   Conclusions

This questionnaire is assessing deeper in friendship as one of domains of identity. Based on the result, we can conclude that all constructs could be explained by all items.

References

1. M. Azmitia, M. Syed, and K. Radmacher, "Finding Your Niche: Identity and Emotional Support in Emerging Adults' Adjustment to the Transition to College," *J. Res. Adolesc.*, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 744–761, 2013, doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12037.
2. G. R. Adams, M. D. Berzonsky, and L. Keating, "Psychosocial resources in first-year university students: The role of identity processes and social relationships," *J. Youth Adolesc.*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 81–91, 2006, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-005-9019-0.
3. M. Lairio, S. Puukari, and A. Kouvo, "Studying at University as Part of Student Life and Identity Construction," *Scand. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 115–131, 2013, doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2011.621973.
4. M. Azmitia, A. Ittel, and K. Radmacher, "Narratives of friendship and self in adolescence," *New Dir. Child Adolesc. Dev.*, vol. 2005, no. 107, pp. 23–39, 2005, doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.119.
5. L. Eklund and S. Roman, "Do adolescent gamers make friends offline? Identity and friendship formation in school," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 73, pp. 284–289, 2017, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.03.035.
6. A. Knecht, T. A. B. Snijders, C. Baerveldt, C. E. G. Steglich, and W. Raub, "Friendship and delinquency: Selection and influence processes in early adolescence," *Soc. Dev.*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 494–514, 2010, doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2009.00564.x.
7. W. Meeus, R. van de Schoot, L. Keijsers, and S. Branje, "Identity Statuses as Developmental Trajectories: A Five-Wave Longitudinal Study in Early-to-Middle and Middle-to-Late Adolescents," *J. Youth Adolesc.*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 1008–1021, Aug. 2012, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/S10964-011-9730-Y.
8. R. M. Jones, J. M. Vaterlaus, M. A. Jackson, and T. B. Morrill, "Friendship characteristics, psychosocial development, and adolescent identity formation," *Pers. Relatsh.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 51–67, 2014, doi: https://doi.org/10.1111/PERE.12017.
9. K. Bartoszuk and J. F. Pittman, "Profiles of identity exploration and commitment across domains," *J. Child Fam. Stud.*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 444–450, 2010, doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-009-9315-5.

10. P. Heppner, B. Wampold, J. Owen, and K. Wang, "Research design in counseling," 2015, Accessed: Dec. 21, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=PcPRBQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=%5B20%5D%09Heppner,+P.+P,+Wampold,+B.+E.,+Kivlighan,+Jr.+D.+M.+(2008).+Research+Design+in+Counseling.+Thompson,+Brookcole.&ots=ZMPK6erI3n&sig=YJUvs_oYzhfdJ7DGauNUt5KxNEo.

11. E. Balistreri, N. a Busch-Rossnagel, and K. F. Geisinger, "Development and preliminary validation of the Ego Identity Process Questionnaire," *Journal of Adolescence*, vol. 18, no. 2. pp. 179–192, 1995, doi: https://doi.org/10.1006/jado.1995.1012.

12. J. Marcia, A. Waterman, D. Matteson, and S. Archer, "Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research," 2012, Accessed: Dec. 21, 2022. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books?hl=id&lr=&id=jU-5BgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT13&dq=%5B11%5D%09Marcia,+J.+E.,+Waterman,+A.S.,+Matteson,+et.+all.+(1993).++Ego+Identity,A+Handbook+For+Psychosocial+Research.+New+York:+Springer-Verlag.&ots=3dAhdx1i_e&sig=bZeMkjGkkMK9A0rrnQlnJoVvq6M.

13. S. L. Archer, *Interventions for adolescent identity development*. Sage, 1994.

14. R. Sharabany, R. Gershoni, and J. E. Hofman, "Girlfriend, boyfriend: Age and sex differences in intimate friendship.," *Dev. Psychol.*, vol. 17, no. 6, pp. 800–808, 1981, doi: https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.17.6.800.

15. E. M. Morgan and N. Korobov, "Interpersonal identity formation in conversations with close friends about dating relationships," *J. Adolesc.*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 1471–1483, 2012, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2011.09.005.

16. L. K. Kerpelman, Jenifer L, Pittman Joe F. & Lamke, "from the SAGE Social Science Collections . All Rights Reserved .," *J. Adolesc. Res.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 325–346, 1997.

17. J. E. Marcia, "Identity and intervention," *J. Adolesc.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 401–410, 1989, doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/0140-1971(89)90063-8.