

EGO IDENTITY STATUS AND SELF-MONITORING BEHAVIOR IN ADOLESCENTS

Asiye Kumru

Ross A. Thompson

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

This research examined the association between identity status and self-monitoring behavior including age and gender differences in these variables in 476 adolescents (15 to 22 years old) in Turkey—a non-Western society characterized by traditional and modernist culture elements. Identity was assessed with the Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status, and self-monitoring was measured by the Self-Monitoring Scale. Identity and self-monitoring were significantly associated for ideological identity with identity-achieved students lowest and diffusion students highest in self-monitoring. There were no associations for interpersonal or general identity status. Consistent with research in North America, there were significant increases in identity achievement and moratorium with age and no gender differences in identity status. Males were significantly higher than females in self-monitoring, but there were no age differences. These findings are discussed in relation to the influences on identity formation in Turkey.

Keywords: *ego identity; self-monitoring; adolescence; gender differences*

A productive body of research on adolescent identity development has emerged during the past several decades stimulated by Marcia's (1966) operationalization of Erikson's (1968) portrayal of identity formation. Whereas Erikson described two outcomes of identity formation (identity achieved vs. diffused), Marcia delineated four identity statuses that are defined by the self-reported experiences of crisis and commitment. *Identity-achieved* adolescents have made a personal commitment to an identity following a period of crisis or exploration. The *moratorium* status is character-

Address correspondance to Asiye Kumru, Department of Psychology, Abant Izzet Baysal University, Golkoy/Bolu 14280, Turkey; e-mail: akumru@ibu.edu.tr.

Journal of Adolescent Research, Vol. 1x No. x, Month 2003 1-16

DOI: 10.1177/0743558403255066

© 2003 Sage Publications

ized by the current exploration of alternatives but no commitment. *Foreclosed* adolescents have experienced no crisis but have determined identity commitments (e.g., commitments have been adopted from others). *Identity diffusion* occurs when adolescents are confused or disorganized in their identity, and they experience no exploration that is likely to change this status. Erikson described how identity commitments can emerge in areas such as the choice of occupation, sex-role orientation, family roles, and in religious and political worldviews. Although there have been thoughtful critiques of Marcia's four-fold identity statuses (see Cote & Levine, 1988), research using his measures have contributed to a better understanding of identity development and its consequences.

Considerable research has been devoted to understanding the influences on and the consequences of the development of identity and the correlates of each identity status (for reviews, see Adams, Gullotta, & Montemayor, 1992; Kroger, 1993; Marcia, Waterman, Matteson, Archer, & Orlofsky, 1993; Waterman, 1984). The research described here contributes to this understanding by examining (a) the association between identity status and self-monitoring behavior and (b) age and gender differences in identity (and self-monitoring) in a sample of Turkish adolescents.

Identity Status and Self-Monitoring

According to Erikson (1968), identity achievement has many implications for social functioning and self-presentation. In contrast with the undue self-consciousness that is associated with identity confusion, Erikson argued that identity achievement confers self-assurance and confidence owing to the integration of a sense of self with purpose to a committed future course. This enables social leadership (rather than conformity alone), flexibility (rather than role fixation), and the intimacy that derives from a secure self-definition that permits personal disclosure. In social situations, identity-achieved adolescents are more likely to be genuine and consistent in their self-presentation to others—that is, to be low in self-monitoring.

Self-monitoring describes the individual management of self-presentation, expressive behaviors, and nonverbal displays of affect (Snyder, 1974, 1987). Individuals high in self-monitoring regulate their expressive self-presentation to maintain desirable public appearances, and, thus, they focus on the interpersonal appropriateness of social behavior and use the expressions of others in social situations as signals for regulating the self. Individuals low in self-monitoring more typically express what they really think, feel, and

believe and have little interest in regulating their expressive self-presentation according to the social climate.

Self-monitoring tends to increase through adolescence as individuals develop more sensitive perspective-taking skills, increased social acuity, and a greater capacity to adapt to different communicative contexts (Pledger, 1992). Most researchers have found that males are significantly higher than females in self-monitoring (Nesler, Tedeschi, & Storr, 1995; Snyder, 1987; Snyder, Simpson, & Gangestad, 1986), although some have reported no gender differences (e.g., Pledger, 1992). Most of the research on self-monitoring has, however, focused on the correlates of self-monitoring by documenting attitudinal and behavioral differences between high and low self-monitors that include differences in their social behaviors, perceptions, and beliefs about other people (see Snyder, 1987).

As proposed by Snyder, self-monitoring is related to self-awareness and identity. Individuals high in self-monitoring have a pragmatic conception of self that defines identity in terms of specific social situations and corresponding roles—a flexible “me for this situation” (Snyder, 1987, p. 48). By contrast, low self-monitors seem to have a more principled conception of self that defines identity in terms of inner characteristics and personal attributes. Their sense of self derives from an enduring, continuing “me for all times and places” that does not vary significantly according to situation or role (Snyder, 1987, p. 49).

The reliance of low self-monitors on an internalized, enduring sense of identity suggests that individuals who are identity-achieved would also be likely to be low self-monitors by comparison with adolescents in other identity statuses. Identity-achieved adolescents would be likely to regard themselves with self-understanding and assurance that would enable them to be more genuinely revealing to others in contrast with the greater uncertainty and self-consciousness of adolescents who had not completed the identity formation process. This is consistent with Snyder’s argument that high self-monitoring adolescents would try to refine the skills of changing self-presentation in the company of different reference groups to resolve conflicting role demands, whereas low self-monitoring adolescents would resolve the same conflict by articulating their values and defining behavioral patterns that enable them to think and act consistently in different social situations. This view is also consistent with Erikson’s (1968) view of the association between identity achievement, self-understanding, and self-presentation, and it suggests that adolescents who are identity-diffused would likely be highest in self-monitoring with people in the foreclosure and moratorium statuses

between these two groups. Although foreclosure individuals may appear also to have acquired the strong self-assurance needed for low self-monitoring, the appropriation of their identity from others leads to the expectation that they would also be high, rather than low, in self-monitoring by comparison with identity-achieved individuals.

Several studies support these expectations. Adams, Abraham, and Markstrom (1987) reported that, for ideological identity status, adolescents who were identity-achieved were more willing to reveal themselves to others, even in potentially embarrassing circumstances. Another study by this research team showed that identity-achieved adolescents were also the least self-focused on laboratory and questionnaire measures, whereas diffused youth were most self-focused on these measures. Miller and Thayer (1988) reported that high and low self-monitors were different primarily in the importance of external rather than internal sources of identity to them. In an unpublished dissertation, Taylor (1987) reported that lower self-monitoring was associated with identity achievement and higher self-monitoring was associated with moratorium and foreclosure statuses, although these findings varied according to identity domain and were mediated by social desirability. Finally, Berzonsky (1995) reported that nonachieved adolescents were likely to internalize a public self-presentation in their subsequent self-ratings, whereas no internalization effect was found for identity-achieved adolescents (see also Berzonsky, 1992). These findings are consistent with a broader body of research showing that identity-achieved individuals are more self-accepting and have a more stable self-definition in contrast with identity-diffused individuals who are more role-confused (see Marcia, 1980; Waterman, 1984).

Our study was conducted with adolescents living in Turkey, but the consistency of these findings in the context of identity theory leads us to expect that identity achievement will be associated with low self-monitoring and that identity diffusion will be associated with high self-monitoring in this Turkish sample. The findings of Adams, Abraham et al. (1987) lead to the expectation that these associations may vary according to identity domain with ideological identity most likely to reveal an association between identity status and self-monitoring. Thus, the association between identity and self-monitoring was examined independently for ideological and interpersonal domains. Finally, we anticipated replicating the age and gender differences in self-monitoring previously reported because of the reliance of developmental changes in self-monitoring on the growth of broad, cognitive competencies and gender differences in public presentation that are likely to occur among Turkish adolescents as well as those in the United States.

Age and Gender Differences in Identity Status in a Turkish Sample

A second goal of this investigation was to further understanding of developmental and gender-related influences on identity formation by exploring age and gender differences in a non-Western context.

A number of studies suggest that identity status changes considerably through adolescence and young adulthood. Identity achievement is found more commonly in older individuals, and younger adolescents are characterized by less mature identity statuses like diffusion and foreclosure with moratorium status also increasingly apparent at older ages. Longitudinal studies of identity formation confirm this developmental pattern (see reviews by Kroger, 1993; Marcia, 1993b; Waterman, 1993). The most extensive advances in identity formation tend to occur during the collegiate years rather than during high school partly owing to the opportunities afforded by collegiate education as well as the catalysts of the institutional transition from high school to college for identity formation (Kalakoski & Nurmi, 1998).

Gender differences in identity status have been comparably well studied. These have yielded the general conclusion that, contrary to Erikson's original formulations, there are few, if any, systematic differences between men and women in identity status, developmental processes of identity formation, or identity content (for reviews, see Kroger, 1997; Marcia, 1993b; Waterman, 1993). Identity in the relationship-oriented domains of sexual values and family/career priorities may be more salient for women than for men, but these are few differences in relation to the varieties of comparisons that have been conducted.

In her review of the ego identity literature, Kroger (1993) urged greater attention to the association between identity and environmental context. Consistent with this view was her call for greater inquiry into the nature of identity formation and the meanings of identity statuses for individuals in settings outside North America. An extensive research literature reports on studies in Western and non-Western societies, and they find, in general, that identity statuses remain valid in terms of the processes underlying identity formation in each cultural context (see Marcia, 1993b, for a review). In these studies, *validity* is assessed in terms of the opportunities and constraints on the dual influences of crisis and commitment for individuals within a particular society. In a traditional collective society, for instance, an institutionalized moratorium for identity exploration may be nonexistent and foreclosure may be the most common and adaptive identity status (Marcia, 1993a).

Our goal was to examine whether the well replicated developmental and gender associations with identity status in United States samples would also

be observed in a large sample of Turkish adolescents. There are no prior English-language reports of identity formation in Turkish adolescents, and there were several reasons for expecting that different patterns of results might emerge in Turkey. First, Turkey is a nation that is characterized by a combination of traditional collectivist cultural beliefs with the influence of individualist Western values associated with modernization and globalization. These potentially competing influences are especially influential for adolescents, particularly those attending college. Thus, it is possible that the familiar developmental trends of increasing identity achievement and moratorium status with age would be apparent in this Turkish sample as in the United States (see Varan, 1990) or, alternatively, a more unique pattern (such as a large proportion of adolescents in the moratorium status or in foreclosure) might be evident as a consequence of these alternative traditional and modern influences. Second, the same dual influences of traditionalism and modernism can also potentially influence gender-related processes of identity formation. It was, thus, of interest to examine whether gender differences in identity status would be more apparent in this Turkish sample, possibly as a consequence of traditional values concerning gender roles (see Eryuksel, 1987; Yildirim, 1997) or whether the absence of gender differences from prior studies would be confirmed in this sample, also (see Varan, 1990). Moreover, because the age range of this sample spanned high school and collegiate students, we were especially interested in whether an Age \times Gender interaction would possibly reveal variable gender differences based on the institutional context. Because of the limited prior literature in this area, however, we did not pose specific hypotheses concerning age and gender differences or an Age \times Gender interaction.

To summarize, this study examines the association between identity status and self-monitoring along with age and gender differences in identity and self-monitoring in a sample of Turkish adolescents where the confluence of traditional, collectivist cultural beliefs and individualist Western values may yield different and interesting patterns of results compared to those of prior studies conducted in the United States.

METHOD

Participants

The 476 participants—240 females and 236 males—were students from three high schools and a university who volunteered to participate in the present study. Students were recruited through classes at their schools, which

were selected to yield a broadly representative sample of middle-class youth living in a large urban area (Ankara, Turkey). The sample consisted of four age groups: 15 years old ($M = 15.16$, $SD = 1.13$, range = 14.83-15.25, $n = 119$), 17 years old ($M = 17.25$, $SD = 1.28$, range = 16.92-17.33, $n = 120$), 19 years old ($M = 19.16$, $SD = 1.42$, range = 18.75-19.26, $n = 119$), and 22 years old ($M = 22.18$, $SD = 1.38$, range = 21.75-22.33, $n = 118$).

Measures

Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOM-EIS-2). Student responses to the EOM-EIS-2—developed by Grotevant and Adams (1984), revised by Benion and Adams (1986), and translated into Turkish by Varan (1990)—were used to classify students into one of the four identity statuses. The questionnaire consisted of 64 items measuring the presence or absence of crisis and commitment in both the Ideological Domain (occupation, politics, and religious and philosophical worldviews) and the Interpersonal Domain (friendship, dating, recreation, and sex roles) via a six-point, Likert-type response format. Sample items included: “I haven’t chosen the occupation I really want to get into, and I’m just looking at whatever is available until something better comes along,” and “I’ve thought my political beliefs through and realize I can agree with some and not other aspects of what my parents believe.” Two items were used to measure each status for the Interpersonal and Ideological subscales, each of which consisted of four subdomains, so that each of the four identity statuses was indexed by 16 items (8 for Ideological and 8 for Interpersonal Domains).

The Turkish translation of the EOM-EIS-2 was used previously with Turkish high school and college students with reliability estimates between .64 and .89 for the high school sample (Varan, 1990) and above .84 for undergraduate students (Eryuksel, 1987). Content validity of the EOM-EIS-2 was also investigated by Eryuksel (1987). Four judges, each psychologists, evaluated all items for whether they were appropriate for what they were intended to measure in this population. On a scale of 1 to 3 (with 3 indicating that the item was most appropriate), the 64-item scores ranged from 2.34 to 2.80 with agreement between the judges above 90%.

Self-Monitoring Scale (SMS). The SMS, developed by Snyder and Gangestad (1986) and translated into Turkish by Coskun (1990), was used to assess self-monitoring. The 18-item version of the SMS was presented in a true-false format (sample items included: “I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain others,” and “I have trouble changing my behavior to suit different people and different situations.”).

Procedure

Participants were ensured of confidentiality. Questionnaires were presented by a single researcher in counterbalanced order to classes of high school students and undergraduates. Administration lasted about 60 minutes for the high school students and 40 minutes for the undergraduate students.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses categorized the students into four identity statuses for General Identity and for Ideological and Interpersonal Domains using the guidelines of Adams, Bennion and Huh (1987). This required several steps. First, raw scale scores for Diffusion, Foreclosure, Moratorium, and Identity Achievement were derived by summing responses to the appropriate items. Group means and standard deviations were calculated for the four identity statuses, and then the mean and standard deviation were summed to define the normative mean for each status. To define each student's status membership, his or her scale score for each identity status was compared with the normative mean with the scale score exceeding the normative mean defining that person's identity status. For example, students who were above the normative mean on the Foreclosed scale but below the normative mean for the other three status groups were classified in the foreclosed group.

Second, when student scores were above the normative means for more than one identity status, they were initially classified into a transition stage. Using the guidelines of Adams, Bennion et al. (1987), transitional individuals were subsequently classified into one of the four identity statuses by assigning them to the lower of the two (or more) identity statuses for which their scale scores were higher than the respective normative means. This procedure was based on a rank ordering of the identity statuses from most to least sophisticated (i.e., achievement, moratorium, foreclosure, and diffusion). For example, when transitions involving diffusion were indicated, such as Foreclosure-Diffusion, the student was assigned to the diffusion group.

Finally, students whose scale scores were consistently below the normative means for all identity statuses were initially classified as *low-profile moratoriums*. Again, using the Adams, Bennion et al. (1987) guidelines, these students were subsequently combined with the conventionally defined moratorium students for analysis. These procedures for the secondary classification of transitional and low-profile moratorium students were based on the

TABLE 1: Descriptive Data for Identity Status

<i>Identity Status</i>	<i>Domain</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Normative Mean</i>
Achieved	General	68.89	11.18	80.07
	Ideology	35.82	6.88	42.21
	Interpersonal	33.06	6.34	39.50
Moratorium	General	54.02	13.29	67.30
	Ideology	26.47	7.19	33.67
	Interpersonal	27.41	7.74	35.15
Foreclosed	General	38.94	14.39	53.33
	Ideology	20.75	8.13	28.88
	Interpersonal	18.29	7.56	25.85
Diffused	General	46.51	10.97	57.48
	Ideology	21.91	6.42	28.32
	Interpersonal	24.47	6.89	31.36

conclusions of Adams, Bennion et al. (1987, p. 25) in which moratorium and low-profile moratorium students are very similar in attitudes, values, and developmental trajectories and in which the collapsing procedure for transitional students is likewise empirically supported. In addition, in light of criticisms that fewer than half the participants in most samples can be classified using stricter criteria (i.e., including only those whose scale scores are higher than one and only one normative mean) (see Jones, Akers, & White, 1994), these procedures enabled us to retain the entire sample in our analyses. This was important, especially for a study examining identity statuses in a new cultural context for which a broad, representative sample is most desirable.

Table 1 presents the means, standard deviations, and normative means for each of the four identity statuses for General, Ideological, and Interpersonal Identity. The number of students in each identity status for General Identity and for each identity domain by age are in Table 2.

Age, Gender, and Identity Status

A multinomial logit analysis was used to assess age and gender differences and their interaction in the distribution of General Identity status and of identity in Ideological and Interpersonal Domains.

There were significant age effects for General Identity (z values for significant parameters $> 2.37, p < .05$), Ideological Domain (z values for significant

TABLE 2: Students in Each Identity Status by Age

Age Group (in years)	Domain	Identity Status			
		Achieved	Moratorium	Foreclosed	Diffused
15	General	7	61	22	29
	Ideology	10	56	26	27
	Interpersonal	7	59	21	32
17	General	10	62	18	30
	Ideology	12	53	29	26
	Interpersonal	4	69	14	33
19	General	10	96	4	9
	Ideology	15	86	6	12
	Interpersonal	8	95	6	10
22	General	26	78	6	8
	Ideology	21	79	8	10
	Interpersonal	29	74	7	8

parameters > 2.65 , $p < .01$), and Interpersonal Domain (z values for significant parameters > 2.09 , $p < .05$). Inspection of significant parameters indicated that for each form of identity, significant age effects were accounted for by an increase with age in Achieved and Moratorium identity statuses (see Table 2). Despite this, however, there was a rather high proportion of students in the Moratorium status at each age. There were also large decreases with age in Foreclosure and Diffusion, but these did not yield significant parameters (perhaps because of low frequencies at older ages).

There were no significant effects of gender for any of the analyses. Although there were small but significant Age \times Gender interactions for General Identity and Interpersonal Identity (z values for significant parameters > 2.15 , $p < .05$), the very few significant parameters made these interaction effects difficult to interpret, and they will not be discussed further.

Age, Gender, and Self-Monitoring

A factorial ANOVA was used to assess age and gender differences and their interaction on Self-Monitoring scores. There was a significant gender effect, $F(1, 468) = 4.28$, $p < .04$, with males ($M = 7.30$, $SD = .19$) obtaining higher Self-Monitoring scores than females ($M = 6.75$, $SD = .19$). There were no significant age differences and no Age \times Gender interaction.

Self-Monitoring and Identity Status

A one-way ANOVA was used to assess the association between Self-Monitoring scores and identity for General Identity status and for identity in Ideological and Interpersonal Domains. There were no significant associations between Self-Monitoring and General or Interpersonal Identity status. There was a significant association between Self-Monitoring and Ideological Identity, $F(3, 472) = 2.81, p < .04$. Post-hoc Fisher LSD tests revealed that students with Achieved status ($M = 6.57, SD = 3.08$) were significantly lower in Self-Monitoring compared with those in Diffusion ($M = 7.88, SD = 2.96$). Moratorium students ($M = 6.90, SD = 2.87$) were also significantly higher than Diffusion students. Students in Foreclosure status ($M = 6.98, SD = 2.87$) did not differ significantly from students in the other two groups.

DISCUSSION

This study was designed to extend understanding of (a) the association between identity status and self-monitoring behavior and (b) age and gender differences in identity (and self-monitoring) in a sample of Turkish adolescents. The association between identity status and self-monitoring is especially important because it contributes to an appreciation of how individual self-understanding and the expectations of the social context are interrelated with respect to these two central features of adolescent development. The research was conducted with a sample of adolescents in Turkey where the interaction of a traditional culture with the Western values of modernization would provide the opportunity to explore the generalization of identity development theory and the correlates of identity formation in a non-Western context.

Identity Status and Self-Monitoring

The central finding of this research is that identity status and self-monitoring are associated for the ideological domain. In this domain, Identity-Achieved students had the lowest Self-Monitoring scores and were significantly different from those of Diffused status who were highest in Self-Monitoring. Moratorium students were also significantly lower than Diffused students. These results are consistent with theoretical expectations and also partially replicate the report of Taylor (1987) who also found an association between identity achievement and low self-monitoring scores. Moreover, like Adams, Abraham et al. (1987), the association between Identity and

Self-Monitoring was in the Ideological—not Interpersonal—Domain. In our study, these associations were not replicated in the Interpersonal Domain or for General Identity.

Taken together, these findings contribute to the view that during adolescence, the development of a commitment to a chosen identity contributes to a stable conception of self that does not necessarily have to be adapted to different situations and partners. Identity-achieved adolescents can present themselves consistently in different contexts because they are more sure of who they are independently of the social climate surrounding them. By contrast, adolescents who are still at earlier stages of identity development may feel a greater need to take their cues from others concerning how to monitor, regulate, and control their public behavior. Consistent with this view, the students of Moratorium status were also significantly lower in Self-Monitoring than Diffusion students, as moratorium is generally considered a more mature level of identity development than diffusion and, like identity achievement, tends to increase with age. These associations were true of Ideological but not Interpersonal Identity, which may occur because Ideological Domain issues of religion, occupation, politics, and philosophical worldview are more clear and self-defining for adolescents than are the interpersonal concerns with friendship, dating, and recreation, and resolution of these issues perhaps inspires greater social self-confidence.

The connection between mature levels of identity and lower self-monitoring in a Turkish sample is important because it suggests considerable generality to this association in adolescent self-understanding. In both United States samples and now in at least one non-Western culture, identity achievement seems to contribute to maturity in self-understanding that results also in more genuine and reliable self-presentation in social contexts. Confirmation of this conclusion, however, awaits further studies in Western and non-Western contexts that examine other features of self-understanding that may mediate and/or elucidate this association.

Age and Gender Differences

Consistent with theoretical expectations and prior research, there were age differences in identity status that indicated that older adolescents in Turkey assumed more mature statuses (i.e., Identity Achievement and Moratorium) than did younger adolescents. These were observed for General Identity status as well as for identity in Ideological and Interpersonal Domains. Although there were also lower proportions of students in Diffused and Foreclosed identity statuses at higher ages, these differences were not statistically significant.

These findings suggest that processes of identity development may be generally comparable in a non-Western society like Turkey to the well-studied processes observed in the United States. It is noteworthy that, in this study, the most significant transition with age (see Table 2) was between the 15- and 17-year-olds (the high school samples) and the 19- and 22-year-olds (the collegiate samples), which suggests that in Turkey, as elsewhere, institutional transitions may be important catalysts to identity development (Kalakoski & Nurmi, 1998). The high proportion of students at each age in the Moratorium status raises the question of what proportion of these students were deemed moratorium by conventional criteria and what proportion were low-profile moratoriums. In this sample, the proportion of low-profile moratorium students was high: More than 85% of the Moratorium status students for each form of identity were low-profile moratoriums. (There were no significant differences between conventionally classified moratoriums and low-profile moratoriums on Self-Monitoring, and the association between Ideological Identity status and Self-Monitoring remained marginally significant [$p < .077$] with low-profile moratorium students excluded despite the reduced sample size.) Importantly, in an unpublished dissertation in Turkey, Varan (1990) also found that 88% of the Moratorium status students were low-profile moratoriums, indicating that this may be a general feature of identity among Turkish adolescents. The high incidence of low-profile moratorium students in two samples of Turkish adolescents may be related to the unique experiences of youth growing up in a society with the competing views of a traditional collectivist culture and emergent individualist, modernist Western values, especially because the developmental influences on identity and the aspirations underlying identity formation may be very different within each worldview. This conjecture requires confirmation, however, in further study of the development of identity in Turkey.

The findings of this study also replicated prior findings from United States samples revealing that males and females did not differ significantly in identity status. With respect to self-monitoring, on the other hand, males were found in Turkey to obtain higher Self-Monitoring scores than females, and this also replicates the results of research in the United States (Nesler, Tedeschi, & Storr, 1995; Snyder, 1987; Snyder et al., 1986). Indeed, the only failure of this study to replicate prior research from Western contexts was that there were no associations between Self-Monitoring and age contrary to the expectation that self-monitoring would increase throughout adolescence (Pledger, 1992). It is difficult to interpret this failure to replicate, of course, without further study of the antecedents of individual differences in self-monitoring in Turkey.

In general, the findings of this study suggest that two crucial facets of developing self-understanding in adolescence—identity formation and self-monitoring—are related in Turkish adolescents as they are for youth in the United States and that the developmental trends associated with identity are also quite comparable. The process of identity development—in Turkey, as elsewhere—is associated with self-presentation skills that cause the adolescent not only to look at the self differently but also to present the self differently to the social world.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G. R., Abraham, K. G., & Markstrom, C. A. (1987). The relations among identity development, self-consciousness, and self-focusing during middle and late adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 23*(2), 292-297.
- Adams, G. R., Bennion, L., & Huh, K. (1987). *Objective measure of ego identity status: A reference manual*. Unpublished manuscript, Utah State University, Logan.
- Adams, G. R., Gullotta, T. P., & Montemayor, R. (Eds.). (1992). *Adolescent identity formation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bennion, L. D., & Adams, G. R. (1986). A revision of the Extended Version of the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status: An identity instrument for use with late adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 1*, 183-198.
- Berzonsky, M. D. (1992). A process perspective on identity and stress management. In G. R. Adams, T. P. Gullotta, & R. Montemayor (Eds.), *Adolescent identity formation* (pp. 193-215). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Berzonsky, M. D. (1995). Public self-presentations and self-conceptions: The moderating role of identity status. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(6), 737-745.
- Coskun, H. (1990). *The effects of self-monitoring on the reasoning of failure and success*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Cote, J. E., & Levine, C. (1988). A critical examination of the ego identity status paradigm. *Developmental Review, 8*(2), 147-184.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Eryuksel, G. N. (1987). *Identity statuses in adolescence: A cross-sectional study*. Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Grotevant, H. D., & Adams, G. R. (1984). Development of an objective measure to assess ego identity in adolescence: Validation and replication. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 13*, 419-438.
- Jones, R. M., Akers, J. F., & White, J. M. (1994). Revised classification criteria for the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOMEIS). *Journal of Adolescence, 17*, 533-549.
- Kalakoski, V., & Nurmi, J. E. (1998). Identity and educational transitions: Age differences in adolescent exploration and commitment related to education, occupation, and family. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 8*(1), 29-47.
- Kroger, J. (1993). Ego identity: An overview. In J. Kroger (Ed.), *Discussions on ego identity* (pp. 1-20). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kroger, J. (1997). Gender and identity: The intersection of structure, content, and context. *Sex Roles, 36*(11/12), 747-770.

- Marcia, J. E. (1966). Development and validation of ego-identity status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3(5), 551-558.
- Marcia, J. E. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 159-187). New York: Wiley.
- Marcia, J. E. (1993a). Epilogue. In J. E. Marcia, A. S. Waterman, D. R. Matteson, S. L. Archer, & J. Orlofsky (Eds.), *Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research* (pp. 273-281). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Marcia, J. E. (1993b). The status of the statuses: Research review. In J. E. Marcia, A. S. Waterman, D. R. Matteson, S. L. Archer, & J. Orlofsky (Eds.), *Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research* (pp. 22-41). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Marcia, J. E., Waterman, A. S., Matteson, D. R., Archer, S. L., & Orlofsky, J. L. (1993). *Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Miller, L. M., & Thayer, F. J. (1988). On the nature of self-monitoring: Relationships with adjustment and identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 544-553.
- Nesler, M. S., Tedeschi, J. T., & Storr, D. M. (1995). Context effects, self-presentation, and the Self-Monitoring Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 29, 273-284.
- Pledger, M. L. (1992). Development of self-monitoring behavior from early to late adolescence. *Adolescence*, 27, 329-338.
- Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 30(4), 526-537.
- Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances/private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. New York: Freeman.
- Snyder, M., & Gangestad, S. (1986). On the nature of self-monitoring: Matters of assessment, matters of validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 125-139.
- Snyder, M., Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. (1986). Personality and sexual relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 181-190.
- Taylor, R. D. (1987). *The association between self-monitoring, self-acceptance, family relations, and identity formation in late adolescence*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Varan, A. (1990). *Identity statuses as related to age, gender, and social context during high school years*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.
- Waterman, A. S. (1984). *The psychology of individualism*. New York: Praeger.
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Developmental perspectives on identity formation: From adolescence to adulthood. In J. E. Marcia, A. S. Waterman, D. R. Matteson, S. L. Archer, & J. Orlofsky (Eds.), *Ego identity: A handbook for psychosocial research* (pp. 42-68). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Yildirim, A. (1997). Gender role influences on Turkish adolescents' self-identity. *Adolescence*, 32, 217-231.

Asiye Kumru is a doctoral student in the developmental psychology program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (UNL). Her research interests focus on identity development, prosocial and moral development in children and adolescents, and parental beliefs and values concerning the emotional needs of their young children outside the family. She received her M.A. degree in 1998 in developmental psychology from UNL and her B.A. in 1991 from Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Ross A. Thompson is the Carl A. Haggold Distinguished Professor of Psychology at the University of Nebraska. His research focuses on early social, emotional, and personality development and the intersection of developmental science and public policy. He is the author of Preventing Child Maltreatment Through Social Support: A Critical Analysis, coeditor of The Postdivorce Family: Children, Parenting, and Society, and is currently completing a book entitled Early Brain Development, the Media, and Public Policy.