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ABSTRACT

PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS, ADJUSTMENT TO COLLEGE, AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS AS THEY RELATE TO RESIDENTIAL MOBILITY

Black, Laura Patricia
University of Dayton, 1991
Advisor: Dr. Judith P. Allik

This study investigated the effects of residential mobility by looking at selected variables of personality characteristics, adjustment to college, and interpersonal relationships. It was hypothesized that individuals who have high rates of residential mobility would score higher on the personality dimensions that reflect greater social skills, social participation, and greater tolerance of new ideas and people, would adjust more easily to the novel situation of beginning college, and would show more independence in their interpersonal relationships. On the basis of a preliminary questionnaire which reviewed mobility history, 120 first-year students from the University of Dayton were chosen to participate. Four groups were formed of 30 subjects each. Each group consisted of equal numbers of males and females who had either no moves since the age of 5, only one move, two moves, or three or more moves.
Three measures were given: The Jackson Personality Inventory, The Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire, and The Interpersonal Support Evaluation List. To determine if there were any significant differences between students with varying rates of residential mobility, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed, with number of moves and gender as the independent variables. All results proved statistically non-significant. It was speculated that the effects of moving may have been attenuated by the specificity of the population studied. The narrowing of the socioeconomic range may have diluted effects that in past research were found to be significant because of the greater socioeconomic diversity of the samples.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Contemporary American society is characterized by rapid change induced by technological advances and scientific progress. Advancement and progress are also synonymous with a high rate of residential mobility. The U.S. Bureau of the Census reported that 43.7 million persons changed residences between March 1986 and March 1987 (U.S. Census, 1987). Adjunct to this lifestyle are concerns about the impact of transience on the individual as well as on society as a whole. For example, high mobility has frequently been linked to rootlessness and depersonalization. Toffler's popular novel, *Future Shock* (1970), has reinforced this notion and has been a catalyst for concern about the impact of high mobility. Speculation as to the possible risks involved with high rates of mobility has led to the exploration of this topic in the social sciences.

The main thematic question reflected in most research on residential mobility is whether to view the experience as facilitating, debilitating, or both. Many assume that frequent relocation is a negative experience. Although this conclusion is supported by some of the research which has
investigated the psychological impact of moving, it is contradicted by other research which has indicated that moving can have a positive effect. It seems reasonable to hypothesize that the effects of mobility on any given variable may vary on a continuum from positive to negative. The variables of investigation most focused on in past and current research include the areas of demographics, academic achievement, mental health, and personality characteristics.

**Demographic Correlates of Residential Mobility**

Early research dealt with demographic characteristics of frequent movers. Wilber (1963) calculated the mobility expectancies for U.S. citizens after the age of 4 and found males to have a mobility expectancy of 12.92 and females to have a mobility expectancy of 13.08. He also found that the rate of mobility decreases with increasing age. Long (1973) studied mobility rates between 1966 and 1971 and found mobility rates to be highest for young children, decreasing until age 16, and then reaching a peak at age 22. Although demographic studies help to lend insight into possible confounding factors in research of this type, they do not address the question of the psychological effects of mobility on the individual. The aspects of the individual's functioning that may be affected by high rates of mobility must be studied.
Residential Mobility and Academic Achievement

Most of the past research in the area of residential mobility as it affects individual development has focused on its relation to scholastic achievement. Early studies indicated debilitating effects of high mobility on school achievement. Perrodin and Snipes (1966) studied the effects of residential mobility in relation to achievement in reading, arithmetic, and language. They found that students who were retained in a grade had experienced more moves. Moore (1966) suspected the confounds of socioeconomic status to be partly responsible for these effects. He conducted a study which controlled for the effects of socioeconomic status and found no significant differences in academic performance, but did find a tendency for less school involvement with the more highly mobile group. Schaller (1976), in a review of 14 studies of the effects of residential mobility on academic performance, criticized earlier studies for failing to report pre-academic status of individuals. A recent study has determined that differences in academic performance of children who change schools generally existed prior to the move (Blane, Pilling & Fogelman, 1985). In summary, the results of this research have been generally inconclusive; some findings indicate no effect on academic performance while others suggest a decrement in performance with increased moves.
Residential Mobility and Mental Health

Earlier studies have also attempted to link mental illness to residential mobility. The experience of frequent uprootings has been felt by some to lead to mental disturbance. Most investigations of this type have involved adults who have had histories of frequent relocation in childhood. The results of these investigations have also been conflicting. Swanson (1968) found that Louisiana state hospital patients were no more or less residentially stable than a random sample of non-patient controls. Furthermore, all who had experienced some residential mobility showed symptoms of mental illness before the change of residence. In a longitudinal study, children referred to child guidance clinics were found as adults to be highly mobile and more likely to have serious social problems (Robins & O'Neal, 1958). On the more positive side, Christun, Bergeron, and Addison (1970) found geographic mobility to be inversely related to mental illness. They questioned whether the person who stays in one place for a long time may be losing touch with the world.

Gabower (1959) conducted a comprehensive investigation into the relation between residential mobility and emotional disturbance in childhood. Mothers of children who had been involved in the psychiatric unit of the U.S. Navy hospital in Bethesda, Maryland, were matched with mothers and healthy children. Both groups had experienced extensive mobility.
Gabower found that only one-third of the psychiatric parents had made efforts to prepare their children for moving, while all control mothers did. Furthermore, three times as many parents of the control children as experimentals found moving to be advantageous. The manner and attitude of the mothers themselves in making the move was implicated as a cause of emotional disturbance in the children.

Lee (1963) produced evidence to show migration to be a predictor of admission to hospitals for mental illness. With control for factors of such as race, education, occupation, and marital status, admission rates were still found to be the highest for migrants from other states.

While there is some indication that mobility may be detrimental to general mental health, there also is evidence that mobility may prove to enhance levels of adaptation. According to Levine, Murry, and Weslowski (1966), it is usually easier for people to accept change and new experiences if such changes are frequent in their lives. Marchant and Medway (1987) found some evidence that the frequent mover is likely to take part in more activities and organizations than the less frequent mover. They interviewed 40 Army families regarding their history of geographic mobility, identification with Army life, their personal well-being, and their children's school achievement and social competence. Frequent relocation was not found to be detrimental to the service member spouse, and was
positively associated with higher child school achievement and social competence. Also the degree of spouse military identification was found to be positively related to children's adjustment. Investigation of mobility in military families by McAllister, Butler, & Kaiser (1973) has supported the suggestion that those who move a great deal may assume changing residence as a characteristic way of life and thus may actually be better able to adjust than other movers due to their history of mobility.

A well documented study by Mann (1972) investigated the effect of residential mobility on the adaptation of college students. College represents a prototypical experience with a novel and complex environment for students, most of whom are drawn from the middle and upper social class, negating the confounding of low socioeconomic status found in many mobility studies. High residential mobility was hypothesized to contribute to the development of cognitive complexity, flexibility, and autonomy by providing diversity of experience. High mobility students were expected to adapt better to the stress, novelty, and complexity of the college environment. Measures of situational and chronic anxiety along with personality characteristics were assessed. The highly mobile students reported less anxiety than the low mobility students in both acute and chronic measures. Results on the personality measures were consistent with expectations for males, but not for females.
The highly residentially mobile male differed from the low mobility male in being more intellectually oriented, placing more value on autonomy and independence, and in being more adaptive.

Self-concept and interpersonal functioning have been studied in an attempt to determine if the highly mobile individual has a different self perception or a different quality of relating to others. According to Mead (1934), self-concept is an attempt to define the self through the perceptions of others; therefore self-concept could be considered a subset of interpersonal functioning. Stability during early years would increase the likelihood of consistent feedback about one's self. The instability of the highly mobile individual could likewise cause inconsistent feedback about one's self and affect the quality of his or her interpersonal relationships.

Research investigating the relation between mobility and interpersonal functioning has also proven to be conflicting. A study by Brett (1982), contrasting a mobile sample drawn from a population of employees domestically transferred by a U.S. corporation and three comparison samples drawn from the 1977 Quality of Employment Survey, found very few differences between the two groups across all aspects of well-being. Aspects of well-being included self, standard of living, family life, marriage, work, and social relationships.
However, studies indicating detrimental effects of mobility on interpersonal functioning appear to be more numerous. Past researchers such as Folsom (1949) and Khleif (1970) have argued that children of highly mobile families may find it difficult to maintain deep, life-long friendships with people outside the family. In order to avoid the pain of separation, they may train themselves to distance themselves from others. Wooster and Harris (1972) found highly mobile boys to be handicapped in the development of concepts necessary to the assessment both of self and others. In a study of friendship formation, King (cited in Khleif, 1970) found that friendships were viewed by mobile subjects as tenuous relations which were constantly subject to change, while non-mobile children viewed them as more permanent and important parts of their lives. There may be general differences in the quality of the friendships of a highly mobile individual.

Several studies lend weight to the possibility of a curvilinear relationship between mobility and social functioning. Downie (1953) measured social acceptance in 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th grade children. Those with one or two moves were chosen more frequently, as measured by a sociometric device, than those who had been in the system all their lives, those who had moved frequently, or those who had been in the system less than a year. A study by McAllister et al. (1973) also found evidence for a
curvilinear relation between social contact and mobility. They found a high level of search for social contacts following moving, a decrease, finally followed by a gradual increased social life.

Mobility and Personality Characteristics

The effect of mobility on personality characteristics or the development of personality poses a challenging question to which very little research has been addressed. Research dealing with personality must first address the fundamental question of the nature of personality. One could view personality as an innate set of stable characteristics of thinking, feeling, and behaving. The opposite view may see personality as a state-dependent set of characteristics which is acquired through learning.

A study by Sticht and Fox (1966) found a positive relation between geographic mobility and anxiety and dogmatism. The high-mobility group scored higher on dogmatism and anxiety and they tended to move at an earlier age than the low-mobility group. The correspondence between age at the time of the first residence change and anxiety was better than that between age at first move and dogmatism. It was suggested that anxiety may be more closely related to the time of the move, whereas dogmatism may be more closely related to the frequency of the moves.
In an attempt to study mobility among the middle-class, Landis and Stoetzer (1966) did an exploratory study of recent migrants to a California metropolitan area of one-half million. Families included were moving to seek better economic opportunities. Landis and Stoetzer found the sample to be higher than anticipated in independence, self-reliance, and ability to adapt. They argued that the traditional view of mobility as an upsetting and uprooting occurrence may not be true for the middle-class migrant. They saw frequent moves producing certain adjustment skills that enable this population to get settled quickly and acclimated to a new environment.

The general characteristics of adolescents during a time of residential change was investigated in an attempt to look at aspects of ego functioning in a high functioning sample (Silbur, 1961). A group of competent high school seniors who were anticipating the transition to college participated. The general characteristics of this sample were observed to be a tendency to reach out for new experiences, to be active in dealing with challenge, and enjoyment of the sense of mastery.

A study by Rowe (1973) found no significant relation between high mobility and feelings of self-to-other distance. Rowe did find, however, that mobility was inversely related to a feeling of powerlessness; i.e., individuals who were less mobile tended to feel less
powerful.

The Present Study

Crisis theory proposes that a state of crisis may exist when an individual faces a life stress related to the loss of basic supplies or to a novel situation which challenges them beyond current capabilities (Fagan, Janda, Baker, Fischer, & Cove, 1967, cited in Goebal, 1974). Frequent movers face novel situations and have increased life stress compared to non-movers. With each move, one may either experience crisis, or cope and learn, thereby gaining better coping skills and resources to face the next stressful situation. Discovering identifiable benefits of mobility may enable future movers to recognize and utilize these benefits.

If the premise of theorists such as Piaget and Maslow (Goebel, 1974) are accepted, development is seen as positive in thrust. One could conclude then that adaptive behavior is not just to maintain homeostasis, but to achieve growth. A changing environment may increase one's ability to adapt because one has had more experiences in which to learn to cope. There is even some support to this notion on a physiological level; research has found increased environmental complexity to relate positively to increased brain weight in laboratory animals (Rosenzweig, 1968). It is reasonable to hypothesize that highly mobile individuals may
have some positive skills or characteristics that have resulted from the stimulation that comes from experiencing novel situations and that enable them to adapt more readily to new circumstances.

The primary focus of this study was to investigate the effect of the number of moves an individual experienced before the age of 18 on selected personality characteristics, adjustment to college, and interpersonal relationships. Most research has investigated the number of moves in a dichotomous manner, either high or low mobility rates. An investigation of characteristics of individuals who are categorized by varying degrees of residential mobility is supported by research that suggests a curvilinear relation may exist between number of moves and interpersonal functioning (Downie, 1953). Consequently, the present study attempted to be exploratory, investigating personality characteristics that have not been addressed extensively in past research. These personality characteristics are conformity, social adroitness, social participation, tolerance, and value orthodoxy. The sample available for the study promoted an investigation of a group that has not been extensively studied in the past--college students. Criticisms of past research have been directed at controlling for socioeconomic status and/or the nature of the move. Because college provides an excellent opportunity to study the adaptibility of the middle-class, who, as a
sample, most often move because of better economic opportunities, this study attempts to control for socioeconomic status and the nature of the move by utilizing a sample of first year college students in a private Midwestern University.

In summary, the purpose of the present study was to assess whether there is a relation between rates of mobility and general personality characteristics, the ability to adapt to novel situations, and one's perception of support from others. To accomplish this, college students were given the Jackson Personality Inventory, the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire, and the Interpersonal Support Evaluation List.

The following hypotheses were advanced:

1. Individuals who have high rates of mobility will score significantly higher on the personality dimensions reflecting greater social participation and tolerance of new ideas and people, while significantly lower on dimensions reflecting one's conformity and willingness to follow the norm.

2. Individuals who have high rates of residential mobility will adjust better to the novel situation of beginning college.

3. Individuals who have high rates of residential mobility will view interpersonal relationships differently and show more characteristics of independence. Therefore
their perceived availability of support will be higher than those who are used to having stable environments in which support is constant.
Chapter II

METHOD

Subjects

One-hundred and twenty first-year undergraduate students from the University of Dayton, a private Catholic university, participated. All who participated were 18 or 19 years of age and were living in university housing. An equal number of males and females were selected from a preliminary questionnaire given to all introductory psychology students about the frequency of their residential mobility (see Appendix A). A "move" was defined as a primary change of residence and of school after the age of 5, not including the move to college. Students who moved due to the military were eliminated. Four groups were formed of 30 subjects each for the independent variable of number of moves. Groups were determined from the questionnaire and divided according to individuals having experienced no moves since the age of 5, only one move, two moves, and three or more moves. Groupings according to number of moves were determined by a previous pilot study showing the distribution of students falling into these
groups to be approximately equal.

**Measures**

*Jackson Personality Inventory (1976).* The Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI) is used to assess a variety of personality characteristics in normally functioning individuals of average to above average intelligence and education. The test has a practical orientation of predicting behavior in a variety of contexts without emphasizing psychological disturbance. The 16 personality dimensions have clear popular appeal with labels that are relevant to everyday perceptions about people. Individual sub-scales are: anxiety, breadth of interest, complexity, conformity, energy level, innovation, interpersonal affect, organization, responsibility, risk taking, self esteem, social adroitness, social participation, tolerance, value orthodoxy, and infrequency.

The JPI consists of 320 true-false questions with timing of 30-40 minutes. Norms are based on the responses of 2000 males and 2000 females drawn from a total of 43 colleges and universities in North America. Reliability studies showed internal consistency coefficients with a median value of .93 for a California sample and .90 for a Pennsylvania sample. Items are relevant to assigned scales and the scales are distinctive as shown by low correlations with one another.
This study utilizes scores on the following subscales of the Jackson Personality Inventory: Conformity, Social Adroitness, Social Participation, Tolerance, and Value Orthodoxy. The Conformity scale is designed to measure social conformity; persons receiving high scores on this scale are likely to be susceptible to social influence and group pressure and to change their behavior to be consistent with others, while persons receiving low scores may be notable for their independence and a tendency to act in opposition to social influence. An example of a question on the JPI Conformity scale is "I try to act in such a way that others will accept me."

The Social Adroitness scale reflects a person’s skill in social situations. Persons high on this scale are "skillful at persuading others to achieve a particular goal, often by indirect means." Low scorers are defined as "tactless when dealing with others, socially naive and insensitive to the effects of their behavior on others." A question is "I hold my personal feelings in check if they might interfere with my getting what I want from someone." The Social Participation scale measures the tendency for a person to prefer the company of others. An example from this scale is "At a social event I try to get around and talk to all of the guests." High scorers will eagerly join social groups and seek both formal and informal association with others, while low scorers are likely to keep to
themselves, have a smaller group of friends, and avoid social activities.

The JPI Tolerance scale reflects the "capability of a person to experience views unlike their own without a negative affect; those who are capable of liking, admiring, and respecting persons with different backgrounds, and behavior." High scorers are accepting of people or ideas that are different, while low scorers would be quick to make a judgement, feel threatened by persons who hold different beliefs, and reject others of different backgrounds. An example of this scale is "I find it refreshing to discuss my views with someone who strongly disagrees with me." The final scale of the JPI used for this study was the Value Orthodoxy scale. An example question is "Our censorship laws have proven to be for our own good." This scale is designed to reflect the degree to which an individual has incorporated values of cultural change or of tradition. High scorers would "not try marajuana if legalized, tend not to report present use of marajuana or tobacco, and are opposed to legalizing marajuana." Low scorers would demonstrate traditional or conservative attitudes in the areas of religion, sex, and economics (Jackson, 1977, cited in McReynolds, 1977).

These scales were chosen for several reasons. Although social variables have been investigated in relation to mobility, most studies have looked at school-age children.
This study attempted to investigate these characteristics in young adults who find social relations a high priority. Tolerance, Conformity, and Value Orthodoxy were included as variables because they have been absent in past research and were all seen as potentially related to characteristics of flexability.

**The Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL).** The ISEL (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983) is a measure of perceived availability of social support (see Appendix B). It was designed to study the hypothesis that social support is a moderator between undesirable life events and physical and depressive symptomatology. The 48-item questionnaire measures perceived availability of four separate functions of support and also provides an overall support score. Respondents indicate whether each of the 48 statements apply to themselves.

The ISEL has four subscales: (1) Tangible Support--perceived availability of material aid; (2) Appraisal--the perceived availability of someone to talk to about one's problems; (3) Self-esteem--the perceived availability of a positive comparison when comparing one's self to others; (4) Belonging--the perceived availability of people one can do things with. Sample items include: "I hang out in a friend's room or apartment quite a lot" (Belonging Scale), "There are very few people I trust to help solve my
problems" (Appraisal Scale).

The items of the ISEL are counterbalanced for desirability; half the items are positive statements about social relationships while half are keyed in the negative direction. Items were developed on theoretical grounds to cover the domain of socially supportive elements of relationships which college students might be expected to experience. Subscale independence was maximized by selecting items which were highly correlated with items in their own subscale and at the same time minimally correlated with other subscales.

The internal reliabilities for the subscales range from .68 to .92; for the total scale the ranges are .77 to .90. Test-retest data indicate that the scales are reliable over time and are also sensitive to changes in support.

Validity testing has indicated a moderate (+.46) correlation with a previously validated measure of support and an inverse relation to a measure of social anxiety (Cohen & Hoberman, 1983; Wood, 1984).

The overall support score was used because it provides the best measure of perceived support and it is the scale most often used in research with this measure.

Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ). The SACQ was developed by Baker and Siryk (1989) to assess how well a student is adapting to the demands of the college
experience. The two primary applications of the SACQ are in the areas of counseling and research.

The SACQ is a 67-item, self-report questionnaire. The development of the SACQ was undertaken with the assumption that adjustment is multifaceted. Therefore, it is divided into four principle subscales that focus on certain aspects of adjustment to college. The first, Academic Adjustment, assesses various educational demands. A Social Adjustment Scale is relevant to societal demands involved in adjustment to college. Personal-Emotional Adjustment reflects how the student is feeling psychologically and physically. Goal Commitment/Institutional Attatchment is designed to explore student’s feelings about being in college, in general, and the college they attend.

Each item is a statement that the student responds to on a 9-point scale ranging from "applies very closely to me" to "doesn’t apply to me at all." Values from 1 to 9 are assigned to successive positions in a continuum from less adaptive to more adaptive adjustment. Administration takes approximately 20 minutes. Items are hand-scored or computer scored. An overall index of adjustment is obtained by summing the scores across all scales to achieve a Full Scale Score (the higher the score, the better the adjustment).

The SACQ’s norms were derived from a pooling of raw scores for first and second-semester freshman from Clark
University and Holy Cross College over the academic years beginning in 1980-1984. Later samplings from many colleges throughout North America proved to be similar to the original sample (Baker & Siryk, 1989).

Estimates of internal consistency were performed. Coefficient alpha values for the final version of the SACQ were obtained from studies involving one or both SACQ authors. Values for the Academic Adjustment subscale range from .81 to .90, for the Social Adjustment subscale from .83 to .91, for the Personal-Emotional Adjustment subscale from .77 to .86, Attachment subscale from .85 to .91, and the Full Scale from .92 to .95 (Baker & Siryk, 1989).

A number of studies undertaken at various universities have provided evidence for criterion-related validity. The Full Scale correlated positively with factors like GPA and academic honors (Baker & Siryk, 1984) and negatively with association with a psychological service (Freeman, 1987, cited in Baker & Siryk, 1989). Correlates between the SACQ and certain personality characteristics—academic motivation, social propensity, and alienation—were in the expected directions (Baker & Siryk, 1980, 1983, 1984).

Studies by other researchers also support the validity of the measure. Pearlin & Schooler (1978) found substantial and significant correlations between a measure of psychological coping resources and all SACQ subscales. Flescher (1986), cited in Baker and Siryk (1989),
investigated adjustment to college and mental health characteristics and found significant correlations between the SACQ and Full Scale scores on the Mental Health Inventory (Veit & Ware, 1983). Garner (1986), cited in Baker and Siryk (1989), and Stoltenberg, Garner, and Kell (1986), cited in Baker and Siryk (1989), found that the more stable a student's family, as measured by FACES II Scale, the better the adjustment to college as measured by the SACQ. Lastly, Caro (1985), cited in Baker and Siryk (1989) and Hogan (1986), cited in Baker & Siryk (1989), both found statistically significant correlations in the expected directions between a measure of perceived support from friends and all SACQ subscales.

The present study used the Full Scale measure which gives an overall index of adjustment and is the scale most frequently used in research. Breaking down the scores into the subscales would have provided redundant information from the other measures (JPI and ISEL).

Procedure

Testing was done in groups of 30 or fewer subjects. The experimenter read instructions and answered any questions (see Appendix C). All students completed the Jackson Personality Inventory, Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire, and the Interpersonal Support Evaluation List. Order was counterbalanced using the six permutations
of the three inventories.

The testing session took approximately 1 hour and 45 minutes. After completing the inventories subjects were given a debriefing statement (see Appendix D).
Chapter III
RESULTS

This study investigated the relation between residential mobility and selected personality characteristics, adjustment to college, and interpersonal relationships. Personality characteristics, including several factors which relate to interpersonal relationships, were measured by the Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI). These factors include conformity, social adroitness, social participation, tolerance, and value orthodoxy. Adjustment to college was measured by the Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire (SACQ), and interpersonal support was measured by the Interpersonal Support Evaluation List (ISEL). The total raw score was used for the ISEL, while t-scores were used for the SACQ and the JPI. The means, standard deviations, and ranges for each measure are presented in Table 1.

As can be seen from Table 1, which shows t-scores for the JPI and SACQ, the subjects in this study were within one standard deviation of the college student normative scores on all subtests of the JPI. They did tend, however, to
Table 1
Means and Standard Deviations for Total Sample on the JPI, SACQ, and ISEL (n = 120)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPI (t-score)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNY</td>
<td>50.36</td>
<td>10.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>11.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>55.43</td>
<td>8.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLO</td>
<td>54.88</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACQ (t-score)</td>
<td>49.52</td>
<td>9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEL (raw score)</td>
<td>190.98</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory; Subscales-CNY = Conformity, SCA = Social Adroitness, SPT = Social Participation, TOL = Tolerance, VLO = Value Orthodoxy; SACQ = Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire, ISEL = Interpersonal Support Evaluation List.
report somewhat higher levels of social participation and value orthodoxy, and somewhat less tolerance than the students in the normative sample. The subjects in this study also reported average levels of adaptation to college as indicated by the SACQ t-score of 49.5. Norms for the ISEL were not available.

To determine the relation between the measures, Pearson correlations were computed. Table 2 presents the correlations among the seven measures used in this study. As can be seen from this table, many of the correlations were significant. The relation between the students' reports of their perceived social support and their adjustment to college was highly significant, suggesting that students who perceive themselves as receiving support are better adjusted to college.

In order to determine whether there were significant differences among students with varying rates of mobility, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed, with number of moves and gender as the independent variables and the scores on the seven measures as the dependent variables. The results of this MANOVA are presented in Tables 3, 4, and 5. Because the multivariate F was not significant, univariate F tables are presented. Table 3 presents the group by gender effects, Table 4 presents the group effects alone, and Table 5 presents the gender effects alone. The subjects did not significantly differ in their
Table 2

Inter-measure Correlations of the JPI, SACQ, and ISEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>CNY</th>
<th>SCA</th>
<th>SPT</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VLO</th>
<th>SACQ</th>
<th>ISEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNY</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLO</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACQ</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory; Subscales- CNY = Conformity, SCA = Social Adroitness, SPT = Social Participation, TOL = Tolerance, VLO = Value Orthodoxy; SACQ = Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire, ISEL = Interpersonal Support Evaluation List.

* p<.05

** p<.01

*** p<.001
Table 3

Univariate F-Tests and Probability Levels for Effect of Rates of Mobility by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>$F$ (3,12)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNY</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLO</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACQ</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEL</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory; Subscales- CNY = Conformity, SCA = Social Adroitness, SPT = Social Participation, TOL = Tolerance, VLO = Value Orthodoxy; SACQ = Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire, ISEL = Interpersonal Support Evaluation List.
### Table 4

**Mean Scores, Standard Deviations, and Probability Levels of Students with Varying Rates of Mobility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Number of Moves</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3+</th>
<th>F(3,12)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNY</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>48.93</td>
<td>50.67</td>
<td>50.83</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.03</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>52.40</td>
<td>49.70</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>12.77</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>53.30</td>
<td>55.20</td>
<td>55.23</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>48.37</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLO</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>54.77</td>
<td>55.53</td>
<td>55.63</td>
<td>53.57</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>10.04</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACQ</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>50.63</td>
<td>49.20</td>
<td>46.73</td>
<td>51.50</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEL</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>190.43</td>
<td>196.07</td>
<td>186.17</td>
<td>191.23</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>23.79</td>
<td>17.69</td>
<td>17.91</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory; Subscales- CNY = Conformity, SCA = Social Adroitness, SPT = Social Participation, TOL = Tolerance, VLO = Value Orthodoxy; SACQ = Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire; ISEL = Interpersonal Support Evaluation List.
### Table 5

**Mean Scores and Probability Levels for Males and Females**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNY</td>
<td>51.77</td>
<td>48.95</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>51.20</td>
<td>48.98</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPT</td>
<td>55.05</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>44.02</td>
<td>47.22</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLO</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>54.35</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISEL</td>
<td>189.27</td>
<td>192.68</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACQ</td>
<td>49.22</td>
<td>49.82</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** JPI = Jackson Personality Inventory; Subscales- CNY = Conformity, SCA = Social Adroitness, SPT = Social Participation, TOL = Tolerance, VLO = Value Orthodoxy; SACQ = Student Adaptation to College Questionnaire; ISEL = Interpersonal Support Evaluation List.
level of conformity, social adroitness, social participation, tolerance, value orthodoxy, adjustment to college, or perceived availability of social support as a function of residential mobility. Furthermore, male and female subjects were not differently affected on these variables as a function of mobility. While non-significant, the mean scores on the JPI subscales of Social Participation and Tolerance increase as the number of moves increases (see Table 4). Further, as can be seen in Table 5, females in this sample tended to be relatively more tolerant than males.
Chapter IV
DISCUSSION

Changes in society and technology that have led to increasing residential mobility for U.S. families have also led to increasing questions about the effects of such transience. Past research has provided conflicting information about the effects of mobility. Reasons for conflicting results are said by some to be due to the heterogeneity of samples investigated; one characteristic in particular that may prove to confound results is the reason behind the move. A move due to financial difficulty would be vastly different than one due to financial opportunity or gain. This study examined the relation between residential mobility and characteristics of a more homogeneous population—first year students from a private university. The study focused on three areas of functioning: personality characteristics, adjustment to college, and interpersonal relationships. It was hypothesized that students who had moved frequently would be less conforming, more skillful in social situations, more often engaged in social activities, better adjusted to college, and would perceive their interpersonal environment as more supportive, and show more
self-reliance and independence. Analysis of the data collected did not support any of these hypotheses.

The hypotheses advanced about specific personality characteristics were based both on past research and on general psychological theory. Specific hypotheses related to personality characteristics were that the high mobility group would produce scores that reflected greater social skills and participation and tolerance of new ideas and people, as well as lesser conformity and degree of conservatism in values. Landis and Stoetzer’s (1966) study that found middle-class families to show higher levels of independence, self-reliance, and ability to adapt, along with Marchant and Medway’s (1987) study that found evidence that the frequent mover is likely to take part in more activities and organizations, both prompted the previous hypotheses. The present results did not find differences between the frequent mover and the non-frequent mover in conformity, social adroitness, or social participation. It was also found that low mobility students and high mobility students did not differ in their tolerance of new ideas or people or in the degree to which they have incorporated the values of cultural change. These results are positive in that mobility may not relate to an individual’s level of conformity, social skills, social participation, tolerance, or liberalism.

The lack of a difference between frequent and
infrequent movers in their ability to adapt to the college environment is not consistent with the findings of Landis and Stoetzer (1966) or Mann (1972). Both studies suggested that frequent moves would produce better adjustment skills, but Mann found a gender difference with males showing significantly better in adjustment. The incongruity may be due to the fact that Landis and Stoetzer's study interviewed middle-class families who had recently relocated, while the present study utilized individuals who were adjusting to college. The latter is an experience that does not involve the immediate tangible support of the family, while the former is an experience in adjustment in which the whole family is involved and could provide support.

Non-significant results between students with different rates of mobility on the measure of perceived support from others is consistent with Brett's (1982) study of domestically transferred employees from a U.S. corporation. Brett found very few differences between a domestically transferred sample and three comparison samples in their social relationships. However, studies indicating detrimental effects on interpersonal functioning are more numerous (Folsom, 1949; King, cited in Khleif, 1970; Wooster & Harris, 1972). The present results indicate that rates of mobility do not relate to the support that is perceived to be available from others.

Gender was included as an independent variable in this
study even though it was not expected to be significant. Surprisingly, the one variable that came closest to approaching significance was the Tolerance subscale on the Jackson Personality Inventory for the main effect of gender. Males were found to be somewhat less tolerant than females in this sample. This finding could be due to a wide variety of factors, and would be difficult to explain. Theories from socialization practices to the specific characteristics of the population studied could be hypothesized.

Another possible reason for the present discrepancy between past studies and the present investigation is that past studies tended to use heterogeneous populations, some comparing psychiatric and non-psychiatric populations. A closer look at older studies reveals that few researchers controlled for socioeconomic status, and it was suggested as a variable for future control (Landis & Stoetzer, 1966). It is possible that this study, using a more homogeneous population, has reduced the effects of socioeconomic status as it interacts with residential mobility. Therefore, non-significant results may be because the nature of the upper-socioeconomic move is qualitatively different from a lower-socioeconomic move.

The type of university where the study was conducted may also have contributed to the lack of differences among students with varying rates of mobility. The college, being a private Catholic university, may place more emphasis on
creating camaraderie and sense of "family." New students are given support in a number of ways by the university; this may level the effect of perceiving adequate support from others.

The high correlations between some of the measures were expected from data of past studies. Several studies found that the more cohesive and stable the student's family the better the adjustment to college as measured by the SACQ (Garner, 1986, cited in Baker & Siryk, 1989; Stoltenberg et al., 1986, cited in Baker & Siryk, 1989). The highly significant correlation between the measure of interpersonal relationships and adaptation to college suggests that students who adapt more quickly to college also have a greater degree of perceived support from others. This notion is supported by research which found statistically significant correlations in the expected directions between perceived support from friends and all SACQ subscales (Caro, 1985, cited in Baker & Siryk, 1989; Hogan, 1986, cited in Baker & Siryk, 1989).

The opportunity for future research in this area is vast, considering the conflicting findings of past studies and the exploratory nature of the present study. Future studies could differentiate according to both socioeconomic status and the nature of the move to better understand the discrepancies in existing research. Other factors that could affect the perceived availability of support, such as
number of siblings in the family, could be included as research variables.

An alternative design to investigate the effects of mobility would be to measure pre-existing personality characteristics, form groups according to different personality types and varying rates of mobility, and then measure adaptation and perceived support of new college students. In this way, it could be determined if certain prior personality characteristics interact with mobility to produce differences in adaptability or perceived support.

The changes in technology along with changes in society are making research in the area of moving a priority. Findings would influence all aspects of our society, from social issues to corporate relocation strategies, therefore providing knowledge about an ever-increasing social experience.
APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION COVER SHEET
We need information about your residential history. Think carefully and be as accurate as possible. A move is defined as a primary change of residence. Fill out initial information and then put a check in the appropriate columns:

Name: __________________________ Year: Fr. So. Jr. Sr.
Gender: M / F (circle one) (circle one)

Local phone number: ____________ Age: ______

Good time to reach? ________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age at time of move</th>
<th>Moved?</th>
<th>Involved a change of:</th>
<th>Move due to Military?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Don’t include college as a move.</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>______ ______ ______</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If your primary residence did not change the first 19 years of your life, please put a check here ______.
THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.
APPENDIX B

INTERPERSONAL SUPPORT EVALUATION LIST
ISEL Scale

For clarity, each subscale is listed separately. The scale presented to subjects consists of all 48 items in random order. For each scale, the first 6 items are written so that a "true" response indicates support, while for the second 6 items a "false" response indicates support.

Instructions

This scale is made up of a list of statements each of which may or may not be true about you. For each statement we would like you to circle "true" or "probably true" if the statement is true about you or "probably false" or "false" if the statement is not true about you.

Please read each item quickly but carefully before responding. Remember that this is not a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

Tangible Scale
1. I know someone who would loan me $50 so I could go away for the weekend.
2. I know someone who would give me some old dishes if I moved into my own apartment.
3. I know someone who would loan me a $100 to help pay my tuition.
4. If I needed it, my family would provide me with an allowance and spending money.
5. If I wanted a date for a party next weekend, I know someone at school or in town who would fix me up.
6. I know someone at school or in town who would bring my meals to my room or apartment if I were sick.
7. I don't know anyone who would loan me several hundred dollars to pay a doctor bill or dental bill.
8. I don't know anyone who would give me some old furniture if I moved into my own apartment.
9. Even if I needed it, my family would (or could) not give me money for tuition and books.
10. I don't know anyone at school or in town who would help me study for an exam by spending several hours reading the questions.
11. I don't know anyone at school or in town who would loan me their car for a couple of hours.
12. I don't know anyone at school or in town who would get assignments for me from my teachers if I was sick.

Belonging Scale
1. There are people at school or in town who I regularly run with, exercise with, or play sports with.
2. I hang out in a friends room or apartment quite a lot.
3. I can get a date who I enjoy spending time with whenever I want.
4. If I decided at dinner time to take a study break this evening and go to a movie, I could easily find someone to go with me.
5. People hang out in my room or apartment during the day or in the evening.
6. I belong to a group at school or in town that meets regularly or does things together regularly.
7. I am not a member of any social groups (such as church groups, clubs, teams, etc.).
8. Lately, I often feel lonely, like I don’t have anyone to reach out to.
9. I don’t have friends at school or in town who would comfort me by showing some physical affection.
10. I don’t often get invited to do things with other people.
11. I don’t talk to a member of my family at least once a week.
12. I don’t usually spend two evenings on the weekend doing something with others.

Appraisal Scale

1. I know someone who I see or talk to often with whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about problems I might have budgeting my time between school and my social life.
2. I know someone who I see or talk to often with whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about any problem I might have adjusting to college life.
3. I know someone who I see or talk with whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about sexually transmitted diseases.
4. I know someone who I see or talk to often with whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about any problems I might have meeting people.
5. I know someone who I see or talk to often with whom I feel perfectly comfortable discussing any sexual problems I might have.
6. I know someone who I see or talk to often with whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about any problems I might have with drugs.
7. There isn’t anyone at school or in town with whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about any problems I might have making friends.
8. There isn’t anyone at school or in town with whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about any problem I might have getting along with my parents.
9. There isn’t anyone at school or in town whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about difficulties with my social life.
10. There isn’t anyone at school or in town with whom I would feel perfectly comfortable talking about my feelings of loneliness and depression.

11. I don’t know anyone at school or in town who makes my problems clearer and easier to understand.

12. Lately, when I’ve been troubled, I keep things to myself.

**Self-Esteem Scale**

1. Most people who know me well think highly of me.
2. Most of my friends think I’m smart.
3. Most of my friends don’t do as well as I do in school.
4. I will have a better future than most other people will.
5. Most of my friends have not adjusted to college as easily as I have.
6. Most people think I have a good sense of humor.
7. I don’t feel friendly with any teaching assistants, professors, campus or student officials.
8. Most of my friends are more satisfied or happier with themselves than I am.
9. Most of my friends are more popular than I am.
10. Most of my friends are more interesting than I am.
11. Most of my friends have more control over what happens to them than I.
12. Most people are more attractive than I am.
APPENDIX C

EXPERIMENTER INSTRUCTIONS
Instructions

You will be completing three measures: one concerning personality characteristics, one concerning adaptation to college, and one concerning interpersonal relationships. Your identity in connection with your scores will be confidential; I will be the only one who has access to both. It is very important that you take your time and answer each question as honestly as possible. You will notice that you may have a different ordering of tests than the person next to you- this is a technique to balance out any effect that test order may have on performance. Each test has instructions at the top- please read them before you begin each measure. If you have any questions, raise your hand, and I will come and answer them. After you have completed all the measures, bring all materials up to me. I will give you a debriefing sheet which explains this study in more depth. Thank you for your participation.

All who complete these forms will receive two credits, which will be entered within a week.
APPENDIX D

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
The Van Study
Debriefing Information

Some children and adolescents move frequently as they are growing up; others remain in the same place for 18 years. The purpose of the present study is: (1) to assess whether the number of moves affects the current level of adaptation to college, (2) to assess whether there is an effect of rates of mobility on general personality characteristics, and (3) to determine if there is an effect of the number of moves on the perceived availability of support from others. In order to study this, we have separated subjects according to the number of moves they have experienced and have now given certain measures which will address the above questions.

The independent variable (IV), or the variable which the experimenter manipulates, is the number of moves that a person has experienced. There are five levels or categories of the IV; (1) subjects who have never moved, (2) subjects who have only moved once, (3) subjects who have moved twice, (4) subjects who have moved three or four times, and (5) subjects who have moved five or more times. The dependent variables, or what is being measured, are the scores on the three written measures you have completed.

After the data are collected, statistical tests will be done to determine if any of the levels of the IV are significantly different from each other for each given measurement. Results of the study will give insight into possible characteristics of frequent movers.

The predictions for the results are called the hypotheses. These are based on past research done in the area of residential mobility and theory from developmental and personality psychology. The hypotheses for this study are that students with higher rates of mobility will be better adjusted to college, will have greater social participation, and will show more characteristics of independence. If you are interested in obtaining the results you may contact me for information. Thank you for your participation.

Laura Black
832-0803
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