Development and preliminary validation of the Ego Identity Process Questionnaire
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A new self-report identity inventory was developed that avoids some of the shortcomings of previous measures and offers the advantages of short completion time, objective scoring, and separate, continuous exploration and commitment scores. The Ego Identity Process Questionnaire consists of 32 items which assess the dimensions of exploration and commitment in eight areas: occupation, religion, politics, values, family, friendships, dating, and sex roles. Three samples of college students were utilized. Evidence was presented of moderately high reliability and of construct and concurrent validation via confirmatory factor analysis, association with Marcia's interview, and relationships with personality characteristics.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most researched areas in adolescent development has been Erikson's (1963) concept of ego identity. Most methods for assessing identity have rested on Marcia's (1964) operationalization of the construct in terms of two conceptual dimensions: crisis (or exploration) and commitment. Utilizing these dimensions, individuals are classified into one of four identity statuses: identity achievement, moratorium, foreclosure and diffusion (Marcia et al., 1993).

Marcia's (1964) original semi-structured interview determines the presence or absence of crises and commitments in three domains (occupation, religion, and politics). Over time, the domains of the interview have been expanded to include standards of sexual behavior (Marcia and Friedman, 1970) and the interpersonal domains of friendship, dating, and sex roles (Grotevant and Cooper, 1981; Grotevant et al., 1982). Grotevant
and his colleagues also introduced separate ratings of exploration and commitment. This adaptation has permitted measurement of the two dimensions on separate, continuous scales as well as classification of individuals into identity statuses.

A major advantage of continuous scores is the increased sensitivity of measurement over that of the implicitly dichotomous scales used by the identity status paradigm (Bosma, 1992; Grotevant, 1986). Continuous scores offer the potential for testing relations with other variables using a variety of statistical techniques. Furthermore, using separate exploration and commitment scores provides a direct assessment of the individual contribution of each dimension instead of confounding the two in the categorical nature of identity statuses. Bosma (1985) also observed the importance of assessing continuous exploration and commitment scores in his measure, which employs both an interview and a questionnaire.

A major problem with the use of interviews is that they are time consuming and costly in terms of administration and scoring. Because interviews are individually administered, it is difficult to obtain large sample sizes.

To overcome such difficulties, Adams et al. (1979) developed a paper-and-pencil measure, the Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (OM-EIS), which assesses identity status in the areas of occupation, religion, and politics. The OM-EIS yields continuous scores for each of the four identity statuses (e.g. moratorium score), and based on these scores, individuals are classified into one of the statuses.

To combine the advantages of Adams et al.'s (1979) OM-EIS and Grotevant and Cooper's (1981) extended interview into one measure, Grotevant and Adams (1984) developed the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOM-EIS). This self-report questionnaire includes the ideological domains of occupation, religion, politics, and philosophical life-styles, and the interpersonal domains of friendship, dating, sex roles, and recreation. The scoring procedure is similar to that of the OM-EIS. Total scores based on all domains, as well as separate scores for the ideological and interpersonal realms, have been used. A revision of the EOM-EIS (EOMEIS-2; Bennion and Adams, 1986) was undertaken to improve selected items.

One limitation of the OM-EIS and the EOMEIS-2 deals with the actual content of items. For example, most of the sex role questions refer to the issue of marriage rather than to a general view of sex roles. Another problem is that diffusion scores were positively correlated with moratorium scores for both the OM-EIS (Adams and Jones, 1983; Campbell et al., 1984) and the EOMEIS-2 (Bennion and Adams, 1986). This relationship may be due to the wording of the items. Since the questions were constructed to measure the identity statuses directly — each of which are
defined by two dimensions — many of the questions merge the content of two separate ideas.

Moreover, the OM-EIS and the EOMEIS-2 are not able to distinguish between the dimensions of exploration and commitment. Continuous exploration and commitment scores would be more meaningful and useful than identity status scale scores because the relationship and possible overlap between commitment and exploration could be assessed directly. In addition, statistical analyses performed on the four status scores are not statistically independent because each status shares its level on each dimension with another status.

The purpose of the present series of studies was to develop a measure of ego identity that overcomes the limitations of both the aforementioned paper-and-pencil measures and the interviews by focusing on the processes of commitment and exploration. Ideally, this new measure should take a short time to administer, avoid the problems of biased content, provide separate commitment and exploration scores, and be objectively scored.

PILOT STUDY

A pilot study was conducted to generate items for a new measure of identity and to examine certain psychometric properties of the new measure, namely test–retest reliability, internal consistency reliability, and association with social desirability.

Respondents

The sample consisted of 73 college students (35 males and 38 females) from a moderately sized private university in an urban setting. These participants were recruited by 12 students enrolled in a psychology course. They ranged in age from 18- to 24-years-old, with a mean of 20.0. There were 5 freshmen, 31 sophomores, 21 juniors, and 16 seniors.

Measures

Ego identity

The test plan for the new measure started with the eight domains covered by the EOMEIS-2. Because recreation may be either inter- or intra-personal, and because Erikson considers family to be important in the process of attaining ego identity, the recreation domain used by Grotevant and Adams was replaced with a family domain. The philosophical lifestyles domain was renamed the values domain, since the term philosophical life-styles may appear ambiguous to respondents. Thus, the final test plan called for four domains (occupation, religion, politics, and values)
within the ideological realm and four domains (family, friendships, dating, and sex roles) within the interpersonal realm. Each domain was to include two exploration and two commitment items, and the final scores were to be separate sums of the exploration and commitment items.

In creating the original item pool, ideas underlying some items on Marcia’s (1964) original interview, Grotevant and Cooper’s (1981) interview, and Grotevant and Adams’ (1984) EOM-EIS were modified into new items. Questions from the interviews were changed from an open-ended response format to a closed-ended format. Items from the EOM-EIS were revised to assess exploration and commitment, as opposed to a particular identity status, as well as to overcome the content problems. For example, the sex role questions were expanded to include the roles of men and women in institutions other than marriage. Finally, several items were written with more of a behavioral orientation (e.g. talking to people about religion) because such items generally involve less inferring than cognitive or affective items.

These modifications and item writing efforts resulted in a pool of 67 items. To avoid the possible effect of an acquiescence response set, approximately half of the items were stated in the positive direction and half in the negative direction. The items were designed in a Likert-type format with six possible responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Social desirability
The Marlowe–Crowne Social Desirability Scale (M-C SDS; Crowne and Marlowe, 1960), which consists of 33 true–false items, was employed to measure respondents’ tendency to present themselves in a socially desirable manner.

Procedure
The 73 participants were administered the 67-item version of the new measure and the M-C SDS in a counterbalanced order. Following a 10- to 12-day interval, a revision of the new measure was administered to 57 participants.

Results
Three forms of item analyses were used to evaluate each item: internal consistency, association with social desirability, and diversity of response.\(^1\) Items were eliminated based on low corrected item-scale correlations within each domain and dimension, high correlations with social desirability scores, and low standard deviations or less than the full range of

\(^1\)A more detailed description of the selection of items for the questionnaire is available from the authors upon request.
responses. A total of 53 items remained as a result of these analyses. For the second wave of data collection, 29 new items were added to create a larger item pool. The 82 items were administered to 57 of the original respondents.

To determine which items to select for the final version of the new identity measure, the first criterion was expert agreement on the dimensions of exploration and commitment. A set of definitions for each dimension was created and five advanced graduate students in psychology rated which dimension each item appeared to measure. Items with less than 80% agreement were discarded. The same criteria for item analysis (e.g., internal consistency) were then employed to select the best 32 items, with two items measuring exploration and two items measuring commitment in each domain.

For this 32-item version, the internal consistency estimates (coefficient alpha) for the commitment and exploration scores were 0.80 and 0.86, respectively. The kappa coefficient (Fleiss, 1971) for the five expert raters over all 32 items was 0.76 ($p < 0.01$), indicating statistically significant agreement among the experts regarding the assigned dimension of the items. Correlations with social desirability scores were $r(55) = 0.23$, $p < 0.05$ for commitment and $r(55) = -0.32$, $p < 0.01$ for exploration. These 32 items were given to an additional sample of 46 undergraduates to assess one-week test–retest reliability. The reliability coefficients were $r(40) = 0.90$, $p < 0.01$ for commitment and $r(40) = 0.76$, $p < 0.01$ for exploration. The correlation between exploration and commitment scores at the first time of testing was $r(44) = -0.35$, $p < 0.05$.

**STUDY 2**

The purpose of the second study was to obtain evidence pertaining to the construct and predictive validation of the new measure via several different approaches including a confirmatory factor analysis, congruence with Marcia’s measure, and correlations with other psychological variables. Thus, the degree to which the obtained relationships are consistent with expectations derived from psychological theory and research was evaluated.

These expectations were derived from the literature reviews (Bourne, 1978b; Marcia, 1980; Waterman, 1982; Muuss, 1988) on the identity statuses and psychological functioning. On the basis of research with other measures of identity status, the following associations were expected between the identity statuses and personality characteristics: (1) those in the achieved status would be highest in internal locus of control, in masculinity, and in self-esteem; (2) those in the foreclosure status would
be highest in authoritarianism, and lowest in anxiety; (3) those in the moratorium status would be lowest in authoritarianism and highest in anxiety; and (4) those in the diffusion status would be lowest in internal locus of control and in self-esteem.

Respondents

The sample consisted of 260 college students, equally divided between the sexes. The participants ranged in age from 17- to 24-years-old, with a mean of 19.1. There were 84 freshmen, 95 sophomores, 45 juniors, and 36 seniors. Volunteers for participation were recruited from required courses.

Measures

Ego identity
The 32 items in the final version of the scale from the pilot study were randomly ordered across the two dimensions and eight domains to create the Ego Identity Process Questionnaire (EIPQ; see Appendix A). The EIPQ contains 20 positively-worded and 12 negatively-worded items. Respondents indicate their degree of agreement to each statement on a 6-point Likert-type scale. In scoring positively stated items, “strongly agree” receives 6 points, “agree” 5 points, “slightly agree”, 4 points, and so on. Scoring is reversed for negatively-stated items. Item scores are summed to obtain total scores for exploration and commitment separately, each of which can range from 16 to 96. Alpha coefficients were 0.75 for commitment and 0.76 for exploration in this sample. To permit comparison to measures of status, median scores of 66.5 for exploration and 62 for commitment were used to determine the identity statuses for each participant. Respondents above the median on both dimensions were classified as identity achieved, whereas those below the median were classified as diffused. Respondents above the median on exploration, but below the median on commitment were classified as moratorium, and those with the reverse pattern were classified as foreclosed.

Marcia’s (1964) original Identity Status Interview was used as an alternate measure of ego identity. Identity status is determined on the basis of the presence or absence of crisis and commitment in the domains of occupation, religion, and politics.

Personality variables
Self-esteem was measured by Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965), a 10-item instrument, with four response choices for each. Locus of control was assessed with Rotter’s (1966) Internal-External (I-E) scale, consisting of 29 forced-choice type items, with high
scores representing external locus of control. The authoritarian submission and conventionality subscales of the California Fascism (F) scale (Adorno et al., 1950) were employed to assess endorsement of authoritarian values. Form Y of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI; Spielberger, 1983) was employed to assess anxiety level. Consistent with previous research, the 20-item trait anxiety scale was used. The Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974) was used to measure masculine sex role orientation. Although the BSRI provides scores for both masculinity and femininity, only masculinity scores were used, since previous research has only found masculinity to be related to identity status (e.g. Prager, 1983; Schiedel and Marcia, 1985).

Procedure

Two hundred and eleven of the 260 participants were administered the EIPQ and the complete set of personality measures, ordered via a Latin-square design. Thirty participants were administered Marcia's interview and the EIPQ in a counterbalanced order. The coders of the interview data were trained by the procedures outlined by Marcia. The percentage of agreement among status assignment between the two coders was 0.83, and disagreements were resolved by majority rule with a third coder. Nineteen participants were given only the EIPQ.

Results

A confirmatory factor analysis was performed using the unweighted least squares estimation method via LISREL VI (Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1986) on the two items of each domain and dimension (e.g. the commitment items from the family domain). This level of item groupings was chosen for the analysis because the factor structure of exploration and commitment was hypothesized to be a second-order structure; the scale was constructed with the 16 two-item groups as the first-order structure. The goodness-of-fit index was 0.94, the adjusted goodness-of-fit index was 0.72, and the root mean square residual was 0.079. An inspection of the modification indices revealed that the sex role/exploration component should be set free to vary on either dimension. To improve the fit, the analysis was repeated with this change, and the goodness-of-fit was 0.94, adjusted to 0.76, and the root mean square residual was 0.075. These results provide preliminary evidence for the validity of the two-factor model.

Next, Marcia's interview was compared to the EIPQ. Eighteen of the 30 identity status assignments based on the EIPQ and Marcia's interview were in agreement. The congruence between the two measures was evaluated with the Kappa index, which shows the proportion of agreement in
joint judgments after chance agreement is excluded (Cohen, 1960). The value was 0.47, \( p < 0.01 \).

Consistent with most recent identity research there were no sex differences in identity status classification, \( \chi^2 (3, N = 260) = 1.14 \), n.s. However, the body of identity literature suggested that sex and status might interact in relationship to personality variables. Thus, a 2 (Sex) \( \times \) 4 (Identity Status) multi-variate analysis of variance was conducted with the personality variables as dependent measures. There was not a significant interaction of sex and status.\(^2\)

A significant main effect of identity status was found, Wilks' \( \Lambda = 0.81 \), \( F(15, 536) = 2.83, \ p < 0.001 \). Uni-variate ANOVAs showed identity status main effects for self-esteem, \( F(3, 203) = 4.89, \ p < 0.01 \), masculinity, \( F(3, 202) = 7.02, \ p < 0.001 \), and locus of control, \( F(3, 203) = 2.65, \ p < 0.05 \) (see Table 1). The Student–Newman Keuls test revealed that those in the identity achievement and foreclosure statuses had higher self-esteem scores than those in the moratorium status. Those in the achieved status obtained higher masculinity scores than those in both the diffusion and moratorium status. Those in the foreclosure status also scored higher on masculinity than those in the diffusion status. Those in the achieved status showed more internal locus of control than those in both the moratorium and diffusion status. The main effect of identity status approached significance for authoritarianism, \( F(3, 203) = 2.29, \ p < 0.08 \), and anxiety, \( F(3, 199) = 2.52, \ p < 0.06 \). For authoritarianism, the mean trends were in the directions predicted (with those in the foreclosure status scoring the highest and those in moratorium the lowest). Those in the foreclosure status seemed to display the least anxiety.

These analyses of the effect of identity status allow for a comparison of results with the EIPQ with results from other measures which yield information about status. However, the EIPQ was designed to provide more detailed information about the processes of exploration and commitment. To separate the dimensions, each of the personality variables was correlated with exploration and commitment scores for each sex separately. Most of the significant relationships were found with commitment (See Table 2). For both sexes, commitment correlated positively with self-esteem and masculinity and negatively with anxiety. For males, authoritarianism and commitment correlated positively. For females, external locus of control correlated negatively with commitment. Regarding associations with exploration scores, authoritarianism correlated negatively for males only.

\(^2\)The main effect of sex was significant for the variables of authoritarianism and masculinity, \( F(1, 203) = 9.77, \ p < 0.01 \) and \( F(1, 202) = 13.99, \ p < 0.001 \), respectively, with males scoring higher on both variables.
Table 1. Means and standard deviations of personality characteristics by identity status using the EIPQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Foreclosed</th>
<th>Moratorium</th>
<th>Diffused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>32.63</td>
<td>32.70</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>30.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>42.36</td>
<td>38.40</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>40.23</td>
<td>39.11</td>
<td>43.11</td>
<td>43.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>100.60</td>
<td>95.81</td>
<td>90.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N = 211.$

Table 2. Correlations of exploration and commitment scores with other personality variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Exploration</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For females, $N = 104$; and for females, $N = 107$.

$^* p < 0.05$; $^{**} p < 0.01$.

**DISCUSSION**

The present study provided positive validation evidence for the EIPQ. There was significant agreement among the expert raters concerning the dimensions assessed by the items. The test–retest reliability estimates and the internal consistency estimates for each dimension were moderately
high. The internal consistency estimates were lowered somewhat by the diversity of items built into the test plan. The factor analysis yielded a relatively high goodness-of-fit for the two-factor model. The EIPQ tended to classify individuals into the same statuses as Marcia’s interview, providing evidence of concurrent validation. Finally, the analyses of variance and correlations with personality variables supported most of the expectations for construct validity. A significant main effect of identity status was found for masculinity, self-esteem, and locus of control. Commitment scores were correlated with self-esteem, anxiety, and masculinity for both sexes, and were correlated with authoritarianism for males and locus of control for females, all in the directions predicted. A few expectations for validation were not met: exploration correlated negatively with authoritarianism only for males, and the main effects of identity status for authoritarianism and anxiety yielded only trends.

One possible reason for the conflicting results is that the EIPQ differs from past measures in terms of its psychometric and conceptual properties. The process of item development for the EIPQ attempted to avoid problems of past measures. Furthermore, the EIPQ uses different domains from other measures to determine identity status. If there is a lack of consistency across domains, the particular domains included in a measure of identity can influence scores on the dimensions as well as the resulting status categorization. For example, since Marcia’s interview and the EIPQ differ in the number of domains measured, the interview weighs the importance of politics and religion as being higher than the EIPQ does. For this reason Grotevant et al. (1982), Bosma (1992), and Archer (1992) advocated the use of separate domain scores. The utility of such scores on the EIPQ should be explored in further research. Such work, however, would require increasing the length of the EIPQ, consequently reducing its usability as a short and quick measure.

In addition, much of the early research on identity statuses was flawed by several confounds (Raphael, 1977; Bourne, 1978a; Orlofsky, 1978). Since many of the investigations included only one sex, males and females were often administered different dependent measures as well as identity measures with different domains. Thus, the sex differences which were suggested by a comparison of these studies actually may have been the result of differences in method. The present study avoided these methodological problems, and the findings are consistent with other research (Archer, 1989) that questions the sex differences assumed to be present in ego identity attainment.

When comparing the identity statuses, the statuses that made commitments (identity achievement and foreclosure) demonstrated more desirable characteristics than those with no commitments (moratorium and diffusion). Also, when the exploration and commitment dimensions were
related to the variables individually (via correlations), commitment was related to more variables.

One possible explanation for the importance of commitment in this research is that the commitment dimension is more readily identifiable than the exploration dimension. This interpretation is supported by the association between the diffusion and moratorium status scores on the OM-EIS and the EOMEIS-2 (Adams and Jones, 1983; Bennion and Adams, 1986). The presence or absence of exploration should differentiate the diffusion and moratorium statuses, but this differentiation is incomplete. Future research should attempt further specification of the exploration dimension. Such work could explore whether paper-and-pencil measures can adequately tap exploration or whether the probes of interviews are necessary to differentiate between behaviors that superficially address exploration and those associated with an in-depth process of exploration (e.g. exploring different avenues to the same goals versus exploring different goals). Comparison of the EIPQ scores with the Grotevant and Cooper (1981) interview (which yields separate exploration and commitment scores) and with the Identity Style Inventory of Berzonsky (1989), another process-oriented, paper-and-pencil test, would be logical steps in this process.

Lastly, it should be noted that the present study employed the sample-based median split technique for the assignment of respondents to status categories. An inherent problem with this technique is that persons are placed into categories regardless of the actual extent of commitment and/or exploration. Thus, by definition, the relative distribution of the statuses across age remains constant. In reality, however, there is a greater percentage of identity achievers among older adolescents than among younger adolescents. It is therefore suggested that future studies focus on determining other procedures to derive identity statuses.

In conclusion, the new measure of ego identity avoids some of the shortcomings of previous measures and offers the advantages of short completion time, objective scoring, and separate exploration and commitment scores. Sufficient construct and concurrent validation evidence is presented here to suggest future research with the EIPQ. Additional validation evidence with different samples and different dependent measures is necessary to confirm the utility of the EIPQ.
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Appendix A. Items for Ego Identity Process Questionnaire.3

+C (1) I have definitely decided on the occupation I want to pursue.
+C (2) I don’t expect to change my political principles and ideals.
+E (3) I have considered adopting different kinds of religious beliefs.
−E (4) There has never been a need to question my values.
+C (5) I am very confident about what kinds of friends are best for me.
−E (6) My ideas about men’s and women’s roles have never changed as I became older.
+C (7) I will always vote for the same political party.
+C (8) I have firmly held views concerning my role in my family.
+E (9) I have engaged in several discussions concerning behaviors involved in dating relationships.
+E (10) I have considered different political views thoughtfully.
−E (11) I have never questioned my views concerning what kind of friend is best for me.
−C (12) My values are likely to change in the future.
+C (13) When I talk to people about religion, I make sure to voice my opinion.
−C (14) I am not sure about what type of dating relationship is best for me.
−E (15) I have not felt the need to reflect upon the importance I place on my family.
−C (16) Regarding religion, my beliefs are likely to change in the near future.
+C (17) I have definite views regarding the ways in which men and women should behave.
+E (18) I have tried to learn about different occupational fields to find the best one for me.
+E (19) I have undergone several experiences that made me change my views on men’s and women’s roles.
+E (20) I have consistently re-examined many different values in order to find the ones which are best for me.
−C (21) I think what I look for in a friend could change in the future.
+E (22) I have questioned what kind of date is right for me.
+C (23) I am unlikely to alter my vocational goals.
+E (24) I have evaluated many ways in which I fit into my family structure.
+C (25) My ideas about men’s and women’s roles will never change.
−E (26) I have never questioned my political beliefs.
+E (27) I have had many experiences that led me to review the qualities that I would like my friends to have.
+E (28) I have discussed religious matters with a number of people who believe differently than I do.
−C (29) I am not sure that the values I hold are right for me.
−E (30) I have never questioned my occupational aspirations.
−C (31) The extent to which I value my family is likely to change in the future.
+C (32) My beliefs about dating are firmly held.

C indicates commitment; E indicates exploration; + indicates a positively-worded item; − indicates a negatively-worded item.

3A copy of the EIPQ with instructions to the respondent may be obtained from the author.