2019

Failure to Launch, Wellness, and Mentorship

Adriano Roberto Marcoccia
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Adriano R. Marcoccia

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Monny Sklov, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Carolyn King, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Rolande Murray, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

The Office of the Provost

Walden University
2019

Abstract

Failure to Launch, Wellness, and Mentorship

by

Adriano R. Marcoccia

MA, Central Connecticut State University, 2015

BS, Southern Connecticut State University, 2011

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2019

Abstract

As of 2015, over 34% of emerging adults in the United States between 18 and 34-years-old were still living with their parents or guardians, and prior research has suggested this trend was steadily growing. The current study examined contextual factors, such as an individual's state of well-being during this transitional phase, to determine what, if any, variables may also be contributing to this issue. Both Adlerian theory and social exchange theory were used as the theoretical foundation to better understand how to mitigate this phenomenon. Amazon MTURK was used to recruit 336 participants who completed the survey. A series of MANOVAs and chi-square analyses were used to test for the relationship between the failure to launch phenomenon, wellness, and moderating effects of mentorship in this study. The results showed a significant, although weak, relationship between financial dependence and wellness factors of coping self ($p = 0.034$) and social self ($p = 0.026$). The presence of and frequency of contact with mentors significantly predicted successful launching ($p = 0.001$). Mentorship was not found to be related to wellness factors nor did it moderate the relationship between such factors and failure to launch. The findings implied mentorship was a potential mitigating factor to the failure to launch phenomenon. The positive implications include personal, familial, and societal growth for this population as they successfully transition to independent adulthood.

Failure to Launch, Wellness, and Mentorship

by

Adriano R. Marcoccia

MA, Central Connecticut State University, 2015

BS, Southern Connecticut State University, 2011

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2019

Dedications

To my family, friends, instructors, and coworkers who have not only supported but also inspired me to push the limits of my potential; always helping me to grow and better myself in the process. To my wife, Melissa, who has been by my side at my worst and my best and whose love, care, and patience seemingly know no bounds. To Arianna, who already drives me to want to be the best possible version of myself, and who gives me a greater purpose in life than I ever thought I would know. To my parents, Maria and Andy, without whom none of this would be possible, who have guided and unconditionally loved me through every obstacle (and there were quite a few I put them through). To my sister, Daniela, who is one of the strongest individuals I have ever known and a constant inspiration to me. To each and every other member of my family be it by blood, marriage, or even those unrelated who I still consider family (you know who you are) for everything we have ever shared and the love and support you have always shown me, of which I am lucky to say there is too much to list. Thank you, all of you, from the bottom of my heart.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to acknowledge and sincerely thank my chair, Dr. Monny Sklov. From being lucky enough to work with you through my advanced quantitative class to embarking on this journey together, there is not enough I can do to show my appreciation for your genuine kindness, patience, and knowledge. You pushed me in all the right ways and, as a result, made me better in ways that would not have been possible without your guidance and constant support. Thank you, also, to my committee member, Dr. Carolyn King who, likewise, showed genuine compassion, interest, and care in me as an individual and my topic from the moment of joining my team. To Dr. Rolande Murray, my URR reviewer, who made herself accessible beyond the scope of what was required of her and held me accountable to a work standard of which I can say I am proud. To each and every one of my instructors through this journey at Walden University, who allowed me to grow not only as a student, researcher, and professional but also as an individual. Thank you all for everything you have ever done for me.

Table of Contents

Lists of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Introduction

The goal of this research was to examine the relationship between wellness factors and mentorship that may contribute to or mitigate young adults from transitioning into independent adulthood (i.e., failing to launch; Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell, Burtless, Gornick, & Smeeding, 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie, Myers, & Sweeney, 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers, Luecht, & Sweeney, 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes, Spencer, Keller, Liang, & Noam, 2006; Roscoe, 2009). Though hoping to better understand the relationship between failure to launch and wellness factors, as well as the role mentorship may or may not play in said relationship, I sought to further recognize ways to help the identified population strive and successfully launch in this study. In this chapter, I provide the background, problem, and purpose of the study as well as present the research questions and hypotheses; discuss the theoretical foundation of the study; provide definitions for the variables being utilized; and examine the potential significance of the study in contributing to the discipline, advancing practices and policies, and influencing positive social change.

Background of the Study

The literature on the failure to launch phenomenon has shown statistical trends over time that have indicated an increasing difficulty for young adults to successfully transition into independent adulthood (Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012). Researchers have found decreased rates of independent living, increased rates of

dependent living (i.e., either with parents or relatives), decreased rates of financial independence, increased ages before reaching economic independence, increased premarital cohabitation with partners, a decline in young adults getting married, and an increase in school enrollment in this population (Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012). Kins and Beyers (2010) identified many of these items as *adult criteria* and found a relationship between meeting these criteria and subjective well-being. Lawson and Myers (2011) found similar results in their study of wellness factors that showed statistically significant relationships between wellness factors and an individual's personal and professional quality of life.

The wellness factors addressed by Lawson and Myers (2011) have also been studied extensively within the literature on wellness, including the wheel of wellness model and five-factor model of wellness (Hattie et al., 2004; Myers et al., 2004; Roscoe, 2009). Adlerian theory has provided a framework for much of the literature on wellness – specifically in addressing the five major life tasks of work, friendship, love, self, and spirit – from which the Five Factor Wellness Inventory (5F-WEL) had established five second-order factors of wellness that culminated in a primary total wellness factor: the creative self, which encompassed thinking, emotion, control, work, and positive humor; the coping self, which encompassed leisure, stress-management, self-worth, and realistic beliefs; the essential self, which encompassed spirituality, gender identity, cultural identity, and self-care; the social self, which encompassed friendship and love; and the physical self, which encompassed exercise and nutrition (Myers & Sweeney, 2005). Unsurprisingly, many of these items seemed, on the surface, to possibly have some

connection to the literature on failure to launch because the research was suggestive of difficulties within this population in achieving satisfaction in these factors, or areas, of wellness (Bell et al., 2007; Hattie et al., 2004; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Mykyta, 2012, Roscoe, 2009). However, no literature existed that empirically connected the two constructs. It was, instead, the literature on mentorship where a connection had been established as one potential method to increase these factors of wellness from both a personal and professional perspective (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al, 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009).

Much of the literature on mentorship – especially in studies grounded in social exchange theory – had found positive correlations between having a good relationship with mentors and items similar to, if not the same, as factors that have been studied in the wellness literature (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). Researchers have shown mentorship to be associated with positive mental health outcomes, including higher levels of well-being, higher levels of self-esteem, higher life satisfaction, higher levels of self-acceptance, and lower levels of depressive symptoms; again, factors that the failure to launch population has been shown to struggle with (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes

et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). Bedini and Anderson (2003) found similar trends between mentorship, well-being, and the failure to launch population literature as they examined the positive effects of mentorship for adult professionals on positive workplace effects, including lower intention to leave job, higher job satisfaction, higher organizational commitment, and higher organizational citizenship behaviors.

While the largest connection in the literature can be made between the variables of mentorship and wellness, there were also distinct similarities in the findings of the failure to launch population (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). Most significant was the lack of understanding as to what factors may potentially help this population in making the successful transition into adulthood. For starters, this population seemed to have difficulties in satisfying many of the factors of wellness; yet, little to no information was provided on how to specifically address this issue with this population. The literature on mentorship is limited in its scope having only addressed youth, adolescents, and those who already were working professionals (i.e., those who were either getting ready to launch or those who had already successfully launched; Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Fiske, 2014; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2002; Rhodes et al., 2006). I found little in the literature as to what specific factors influenced the gap between these populations or the variables that accounted for a successful transition. Additionally, those who did successfully transition

were still also shown to have received benefits of mentorship on areas of wellness that indicated successful launching was, perhaps, not an isolated variable in the relationship with wellness factors and that mentorship seemed to possibly have its own role among and between these variables (Daskivich et al., 2015; Sobowale et al., 2014). This substantiated the idea that additional variables needed to be addressed to grasp a more complete understanding of the connectivity between and among all these variables, specifically in addressing how to best help the failure to launch population and support successful transitions into adult independence. A more comprehensive review of the literature and the rationale for these assumptions can be found in Chapter 2 of this study.

Problem Statement

The failure to launch phenomenon has largely been defined by an inability for individuals to successfully transition to independent adulthood (Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). In fact, 34.1% of adults between the ages of 18 and 34 lived with their parents as of 2015, while just 10 years prior it was 26% (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). While changing workforce trends and the financial impact of increased costs of living outpacing relative earnings may explain some of this increase over the last 10 years, research on psychological correlates of the failure to launch phenomenon has been limited to studies of well-being and wellness. For example, Kins and Byers (2010) found a significant relationship between living arrangements and achievement of adult criteria and subjective well-being. While research has suggested relationships may exist between the failure to launch population

and factors of wellness, no researchers have found empirical evidence to support which factors, if any, had statistically significant correlations that might better inform practice.

It stands to reason that a broader measure of subjective well-being, such as the 5F-WEL, will provide a more comprehensive profile of factors related to the failure to launch phenomenon (Bell et al., 2007; Hattie et al., 2004; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Roscoe, 2009). Given that factors, such as creative self, coping self, essential self, social self, and physical self, may help differentiate between those who have failed to launch and those who have not, an important dimension regarding the extent to which a person launches may depend on the degree to which they feel mentored (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010 Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). The gap in the literature concerns identifying psychological wellness correlates of failing to launch, and especially, how these measures of wellness are moderated by the presence, or lack of, a mentor.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between wellness factors, such as the creative self, coping self, essential self, social self, and physical self, and mentorship that may contribute to or mitigate young adults from transitioning into independent adulthood (i.e., failing to launch; Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins

& Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). In this study, I assumed that understanding the relationship between failure to launch and wellness factors would be significant in gaining a better understanding of this phenomenon, whereas understanding the role mentorship may or may not play in this relationship would also further identify ways to help this identified population strive and potentially provide better ways to help them successfully launch. According to the literature on failure to launch, the two most consistent criteria for an individual successfully launching or failing to launch was determined by whether they were financially independent and whether they had independently and successfully moved out of their parents or relatives home as well; therefore, if both these criteria were not met the individual would be considered in the failure to launch category (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2015; Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012). Literature on mentorship had established a relationship with positive mental health outcomes, including higher levels of well-being, higher levels of self-esteem, higher life satisfaction, higher levels of self-acceptance, and lower levels of depressive symptoms, which are primarily accomplished through the quality of the mentor-mentee relationship (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Fiske, 2014; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2002; Rhodes et al., 2006). Therefore, in this study, I focused on exploring the connection between mentorship and wellness factors in the hope of better understanding factors that contributed to or

mitigated successful launching as well as to better inform services and practice that can help this population to be more successful.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

I developed the following research questions and hypotheses to guide this study:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between primary and second-order wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood?

$H_0$1: There are no significant differences in primary and second-order wellness factors between those who have failed to launch and those who have successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1a: The total wellness factor scores will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1b: The factor of creative self (i.e., thinking, emotion, control, work, and positive humor) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1c: The factor of coping self (i.e., leisure, stress-management, self-worth, and realistic beliefs) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1d: The factor of essential self (i.e., spirituality, gender identity, cultural identity, and self-care) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1e: The factor of social self (i.e., friendship and love) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1f: The factor of physical self (i.e., exercise and nutrition) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between mentorship and the successful transition into independent adulthood?

$H_0$2: There is no significant relationship between a person's exposure to mentorship and their successful transition into independent adulthood.

H_a2: There will be a significantly greater likelihood that a person who has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood has had more exposure to mentors than a person who has not successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

Research Question 3: What is the effect of mentorship on the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood?

$H_0$3: Mentorship will have no effect on the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood.

H_a3: Mentorship will moderate the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood.

Theoretical Foundation

The primary theoretical framework that aligned with the current study was social exchange theory (see Fiske, 2014). Social exchange theory asserted that interactions and exchanges (or negotiations) between individuals can serve to elicit some form of individual change and support stability within the context of a relationship (Fiske, 2014). The literature and research on mentorship have shown that the positive relationships between mentorship and positive outcomes found within said literature were primarily accomplished through the quality of relationship between mentor and mentee (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006). This finding aligned well with the assertions of social exchange theory in that the catalyst to eliciting these positive changes was formed due to the exchanges of mentor-mentee and, similarly, the relationship helped to promote and support stability within the positive outcomes for the individual (Dawley, Andrews, & Bucklew, 2010; Fiske, 2014; Gettings & Wilson, n.d.; Lapointe & Vandenberghe, 2017; Majiros, 2013; Rutti, Helms, & Rose, 2013; Thomas, 2006; van Emmerik, 2008). Mentorship, as studied in the literature, was rooted in social interactions and, therefore, social exchange theory was an appropriate lens to frame a better understanding of the relationship of this variable with the other chosen variables of failure to launch and wellness factors (see Edwards, Hershberger, Russell, & Markert, 2001; Wilmarth, Nielsen, & Futris, 2014; Woodyard & Grable, 2014).

Similarly, Adlerian theory was found to have a distinct connectedness within the literature on wellness as well as mentorship (Hattie et al., 2004; Karcher & Lindwall,

2003; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2005; Myers & Williard, 2003; Pomeroy & Clark, 2015; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991). Adlerian theory asserted five major life tasks of work, friendship, love, self, and spirit that all humans strive toward in hoping to achieve their own self-actualization (Hattie et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2004; Myers & Williard, 2003; Pomeroy & Clark, 2015; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991). Self-actualization, according to Maslow (1965), was identified as the highest order of a person having their needs met. Specifically, this referred to self-actualization being the independent process of an individual working throughout their lives to meet all the needs, such as those identified within Maslow's hierarchy, that would allow them to find their true self, purpose, and greatest well-being in life. The combination of this theory along with social exchange theory complemented each other well in understanding the connection between the chosen variables of failure to launch, wellness, and mentorship (see Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; Bitter, 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Ergüner-Tekinalp, Johnson-Migalski, & Belangee, 2018; Hattie et al., 2004; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Karcher & Lindwall, 2003; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Williard, 2003; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009; Shifron & Rasmussen, 2009; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991). In the literature, Adlerian theory had begun to help form an understanding of the connection between wellness factors and how the failure to launch population has seemed unable to meet their needs, whereas social exchange theory – specifically, as it related to mentorship – helped shape a lens from which I drew the

current hypotheses in hoping to find new ways to potentially mitigate these negative outcomes and promote positive ones within this population.

Nature of the Study

I used a quantitative, nonexperimental, cross-sectional survey design to answer the three research questions in this study. Failure to launch was the independent variable and was measured as a binary categorical level measurement (i.e., A_1 – has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood and A_2 – has not successfully transitioned into independent adulthood) with criteria including whether the individual was still either financially dependent on parents or relatives or dependent on parents or relatives for housing (see Bell et al., 2007.; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Wellness, the dependent variable, was a quantitative ratio level measurement obtained through scores on the 5F-WEL (see Hattie et al., 2004; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Myers & Williard, 2003; Roscoe, 2009). Finally, mentorship was utilized as a covariate and measured as a categorical ordinal level measurement (i.e., 0 = never had someone I considered a mentor, 1 = had someone I considered a mentor but am no longer in touch with, 2 = currently have someone I consider a mentor but have infrequent contact with, and 3 = currently have someone I consider a mentor and have frequent contact with). I chose these categories because much of the research on mentorship has indicated that the benefits to having such a resource were primarily influenced by the quality of mentor-mentee relationships (see Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Karcher, 2003; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006). By

conducting a categorical measurement that encompassed more than a simple binary measurement (i.e., did have a mentor or did not have a mentor), I hoped to provide more detailed information as to not only if mentorship moderated the relationship between failure to launch and wellness but also how the varied qualities of mentoring relationships may have impacted this potential effect.

Definitions

The following is a list of key terms and their definitions used in this quantitative study:

Emerging adulthood: The period of time between late-teens through the 20's in young adults who have not transitioned to full independence (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2015; Arnett & Fishell, 2014).

Failure to launch: A delayed ability, or inability, for young adults between 18–34 years old in age to successfully make the full transition to adult independence (Allen, 2017; Bell et al., 2007; Kaplan, n.d.; Kins & Beyers, 2010).

Mentee: The individual who receives support from a mentor (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Eller et al., 2014; Thomas, 2006).

Mentor: Someone who serves as a role model, counselor, adviser, guide, or life coach serving as a support system to a mentee; not limited to professionals or professional services rendered but also including natural relationships (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Eller, Lev, & Feurer, 2014; Thomas, 2006).

Mentorship: The act of engaging in a mentor-mentee relationship (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Eller et al., 2014; Thomas, 2006).

Wellness: A holistic approach to understanding the overall functioning and well-being of an individual including their mental and physical health (Hattie et al., 2004; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2008; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Williard, 2003; Roscoe, 2009; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991).

Assumptions

My first assumption in this study was that there were more factors contributing to the increasing difficulty young adults are having in successfully launching to independent adulthood than just economic factors (see Bell et al., 2007; Carnivale, Hanson, & Gulish, 2013). Specifically, those individuals who were stuck in this phase may have been struggling more holistically, and there may, in fact, have been a relationship between an individual's wellness and their ability to successfully navigate this transitional phase (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2007, 2015; Arnett & Fishel, 2014; Glenn & Van Wert, 2010; Kaplan, n.d.; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Wells, Fishman, Horton, & Raman, 2015; Xiao, Chatterjee, & Kim, 2014). Another assumption was that mentorship may have a significant positive impact on these wellness factors for individuals in the emerging adulthood phase. This led to the next assumption in that if mentorship can serve as a catalyst for greater levels of well-being and greater levels of well-being would increase an individual's chances of successfully transitioning into independent adulthood that there would be a relationship between mentorship and successful launching (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd

& Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). Lastly, as such, I also assumed that policy regarding serving the emerging adulthood population and failure to launch phenomenon may benefit from an increased knowledge base as to how these factors relate amongst each other to inform better practice in helping to serve this population and mitigate this growing phenomenon. It stands to serve that if this population can be better helped in this manner that it would not only contribute to positive social change on an individual level but also on a greater societal and economical level because the successful launching of this population will serve to grow the workforce and consumer populations.

Scope and Delimitations

The first delimitation in this study was the focus on the emerging adulthood (i.e., 18–34 years in age) population (see Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Research on the emerging adulthood population and failure to launch phenomenon have been limited in their scope to quantitatively and empirically identify relationships with variables outside of economic factors, and yet, the phenomenon has only been shown to be increasingly growing. As of 2015, the U.S. Census Bureau (2017) reported that 34.1% of this target population lived with their parents, up from 26% just 10 years prior in 2005. Similarly, the second delimitation was that research on mentorship has largely focused on the youth, adolescent, and adult populations, which encompassed all the phases before and after the emerging adulthood phase, but not the emerging adulthood phase itself (see Bedini & Anderson, 2003;

DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Fiske, 2014; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes, Bogat, Roffman, Edelman, & Galasso, 2002; Rhodes et al., 2006). The last delimitation was the geographical location, the United States, as research acknowledged this phenomenon as one that is driven by the changing cultural norms of western society (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2015; Kins & Beyers, 2010).

Limitations

The limitations to this study included the use of online sampling, surveying, and data collection. This made it impossible to verify the trustworthiness of participants, and the use of Mechanical Turk (MTURK) to gather the sampling pool may have potentially incited participants to be dishonest for small monetary gain upon their completion of the survey. While I used a proportionate-stratified random sampling technique, it was still difficult to ensure the generalizability of the study for a variety of reasons. First, data on only 50 participants were collected, and because MTURK operates as a first-come-first-serve basis, there was no way for me to ensure or prevent any disparity between any demographic variables outside of sex (which was proportionately stratified). The age range of 18–34 years old may vary in that the normal expectations of an 18-year-old are not the same as someone closer to the age of 34; yet, it was difficult to ensure that subgroups were not skewed toward one end of the age spectrum or the other (i.e., the failure to launch category being much farther skewed toward 18, whereas the successful launching category being skewed toward 34, which is a variable in itself worth consideration even though this population falls inside this entire age range). Finally, it

was equally difficult to ensure a balance of the mentorship categories among participants, which may ultimately have required more participants than this study intended to use to draw any meaningful conclusions regarding the moderating potential of mentorship on this population.

Significance of the Study

Through examining the relationship between successful transitions into adulthood; factors of the creative self, coping self, essential self, social self, and physical self; and the role mentorship may play in this process in this study, I sought to fill an empirical gap that identified the specific variables that either contributed to or mitigated successful launching to independent adulthood (see Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). This study was an original contribution to the literature as, at the time of writing, there were no known extant studies pertaining to the psychological struggles of the failure to launch population beyond financial means or changing economic trends. With this research, I hoped to provide a better foundational understanding of wellness factors and the role of mentorship in promoting successful launching of the young adult population, whom, researchers have found, have continued to show an increasing trend of difficulties in this endeavor over the past decade (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012;

Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Not only would this lead to positive social change at individual levels (i.e., helping the individuals within this population) but it also would serve to affect positive societal change on a larger scale because this population is comprised of those who would make up the young adult workforce. With this study, I looked to help to stabilize this population while also helping the economy through providing positive changes such as a larger workforce and housing economy growth through transitioning these individuals out of the homes of their parents or relatives and toward full independence.

Summary and Transition

In this chapter, I introduced the background, problem, and purpose of the study. Along with an introduction to the major themes and topics of study, the research questions and hypotheses were identified as well as the theoretical foundation of the study and definitions for the variables being utilized. The significance and rationale of the study were examined in exploring how the current research may contribute to the discipline, advance practices and policies, and influence positive social change. In Chapter 2, I will further identify and explore the knowledge and extant literature on the failure to launch phenomenon, wellness, and mentorship in the hopes of better understanding this problem and how the results of this study can potentially inform positive social change (see Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009).

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

As failure to launch is a newer phenomenon in research, it was the most difficult variable to find current, peer-reviewed works for and I had to expand my search to include non-peer-reviewed works as well (see Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2015; Arnett & Fishell, 2014; Furstenberg, Rumbaut, & Settersten, 2005; Fussell, Gauthier, & Evans, 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; Sachs, 2010; Settersten, Furstenberg, & Rumbaut, 2008; Settersten & Ray, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Likewise, research that connected failure to launch with either or both variables of wellness or mentorship served to be difficult to find as well (see Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). In fact, not much literature existed that empirically connected failure to launch with either. While this was not ideal for the purposes of the current literature search and review, this lack of prior literature further justified the need for the current study. In this chapter, I explore the literature search strategy, theoretical foundation, and a comprehensive review of the existing literature (see American Psychological Association, 2016; Google Scholar, n.d.; Walden University, n.d.a; Walden University Library, 2014c).

Literature Search Strategy

The library databases and search engines I used in this literature search included:

- PsycARTICLES,

- PsycINFO,
- Thoreau,
- Google Scholar,
- PsycBOOKS,
- PsycEXTRA,
- PsycCRITIQUES,
- Psychology Databases Combined Search,
- ProQuest, and
- ProQuest Ebook Central.

The key search terms, including being employed in Boolean phrases, were:

- *wellness,*
- *factors of wellness,*
- *Five-Factor Wellness Inventory,*
- *wheel of wellness,*
- *failure to launch,*
- *emerging adulthood AND failure to launch,*
- *emerging Adulthood AND financial independence,*
- *emerging adulthood OR failure to launch AND wellness,*
- *mentoring OR mentorship,*
- *mentorship OR mentoring and wellness,*
- *mentorship OR mentoring AND failure to launch OR emerging adulthood,*
- *social exchange theory,*

- *social exchange theory AND mentoring OR mentorship,*
- *social exchange theory AND wellness,*
- *Adlerian theory,*
- *Adlerian theory AND wellness,* and
- *Adlerian theory AND mentorship OR mentoring.*

The original scope of the literature review included only current, peer-reviewed work that was within the past 5 years. I then expanded the search to include relevant cited works from the current literature, both attempting to gain a greater understanding of the constructs of interest as well as their theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Searches for seminal works on all three of the variables including wellness (as well as the creation of the factor model of wellness and the creation of the 5F-WEL), a broad-scope search of mentoring and mentorship, and a broad-scope search of the failure to launch variable were conducted. The independent literature on wellness and mentoring served to expand my search to better understand theoretical and conceptual frameworks including Adlerian theory and social exchange theory, respectively. However, in the broad-scope searches of the variables, it was difficult to find enough work that was both peer reviewed and current within the past 5 years. Therefore, I expanded the search to include only peer-reviewed works, regardless of publication date.

Theoretical Foundation

The primary theoretical framework that aligned with this was social exchange theory (see Fiske, 2014). Social exchange theory asserted that interactions and exchanges (or negotiations) between individuals can serve to elicit some form of individual change

and support stability within the context of a relationship (Fiske, 2014). The literature and research on mentorship have shown that the positive relationships between mentorship and positive outcomes found within said literature were primarily accomplished through the quality of relationship between mentor and mentee (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006). This finding aligned well with the assertions of social exchange theory in that the catalyst to eliciting these positive changes was formed due to the exchanges of mentor-mentee and, similarly, the relationship helped to promote and support stability within the positive outcomes for the individual (Dawley et al., 2010; Fiske, 2014; Gettings & Wilson, n.d.; Lapointe & Vandenberghe, 2017; Majiros, 2013; Rutti et al., 2013; Thomas, 2006; van Emmerik, 2008). Mentorship, as studied in the literature, was rooted in social interactions, and therefore, social exchange theory was an appropriate lens to frame a better understanding of the relationship of this variable with the other chosen variables of failure to launch and wellness factors (see Edwards et al., 2001; Wilmarth et al., 2014; Woodyard & Grable, 2014).

Similarly, Adlerian theory was found to have a distinct connectedness within the literature on wellness as well as mentorship (Hattie et al., 2004; Karcher & Lindwall, 2003; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2005; Myers & Williard, 2003; Pomeroy & Clark, 2015; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991). Adlerian theory asserted five major life tasks of work, friendship, love, self, and spirit that all humans strive toward in hoping to achieve their own self-actualization (Hattie et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2005; Myers &

Williard, 2003; Pomeroy & Clark, 2015; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991). Self-actualization, according to Maslow (1965), was identified as the highest order of a person having their needs met. Specifically, this referred to self-actualization being the independent process of an individual working throughout their lives to meet all the needs, such as those identified within Maslow's hierarchy, that would allow them to find their true self, purpose, and greatest well-being in life. The combination of this theory along with social exchange theory complemented each other well in understanding the connection between the chosen variables of failure to launch, wellness, and mentorship (see Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; Bitter, 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Ergüner-Tekinalp et al., 2018; Hattie et al., 2004; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Karcher & Lindwall, 2003; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Williard, 2003; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009; Shifron & Rasmussen, 2009; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991). In the literature, Adlerian theory had begun to help form an understanding of the connection between wellness factors and how the failure to launch population has seemed unable to meet their needs, whereas social exchange theory – specifically, as it related to mentorship – had helped shape a lens from which I drew hypotheses in hoping to find new ways to potentially mitigate these negative outcomes and promote positive ones within this population.

Literature Review

Failure to Launch

Emerging adulthood, a term coined by Arnett (1998, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2015), was defined as the period of time between late-teens through the 20s in young adults who have not transitioned to full independence. Arnett coined the phrase emerging adulthood as a response to the more widely known phrase of failure to launch. While the two phrases largely define the same transitional period of time in a young adult's life, Arnett and others of a similar mind found that the negative connotation of failure to launch was psychologically detrimental to this population with the implications that these young adults had in some way failed, were incapable, or lesser than (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2015; Kins & Beyers, 2010). However phrased, the fact remained that independent adulthood was taking far longer for young adults to achieve than it had in previous generations (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2015; Arnett & Fishell, 2014; Furstenberg et al., 2005; Fussell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; Sachs, 2010; Settersten et al., 2008; Settersten & Ray, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). The U.S. Census Bureau (2017) reported that 34.1% of this target population lived with their parents as of 2015.

As societal shifts had occurred, especially in Western culture, so too did the definition of what it meant to be an independent adult. Unlike the norms of some Eastern cultures, where it was expected for young adults to live with and care for parents and relatives, Western culture had placed a large emphasis on self-sufficiency and leaving the parental home as a marker of adulthood (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2015; Kins & Beyers, 2010). There were two primary criteria agreed upon throughout much of the literature as to what defined independent adulthood and, therefore, what

encompassed the completion and transition out of this phase. Researchers agreed that independent adulthood was defined by an individual being financially independent from parents and relatives as well as independently providing for their housing situations without the support of parents or relatives (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2015; Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Dependence on financial or living situations from parents or relatives were the two primary factors that kept young adults in the emerging adulthood phase where they were considered to have not successfully launched (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2015; Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012). While most of the research into this population supported the operationalization of this phase of life as such, there was much dissent as to the relational nature of this transitional period being delayed longer than it had in the past and, in general, a very limited understanding of variables that may correlate to this phenomenon (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003, 2015; Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012).

One of the more pragmatic variables studied in the failure to launch phenomenon has been economic factors. This was not surprising as financial independence was identified as one of the primary markers of successful launching and the research did show that there was merit to this consideration. In 2010, the most common jobs for young men between 18 and 29 years old were largely concentrated in low-wage occupations, such as cooks (780,000 up from 310,000 in 1980); retail sales clerks (590,000 up from 10,000 in 1980); nonconstruction laborers (590,000 up slightly from 450,000 in 1980); and cashiers (500,000 up from 150,000 in 1980; Carnivale et al.,

2013). In 1980, the average age at which young adults reached the median wage was 26 years old, whereas in 2012, the average age shifted further back to 30 years old (Carnivale, et al., 2013).

Per these economical shifts in this population, there has also been a general disagreement among the costs and benefits of immigration. Carnivale et al. (2013) argued that relaxing immigration restrictions – specifically those trained in high-skill positions – would boon economic growth and support a larger workforce, helping to integrate and sustain this population through the creation of more work opportunities. Bell et al. (2007), on the other hand, argued that immigration – specifically those *not* trained in high-skill positions – was a major factor in the failure to launch phenomenon, positing that workforce trends had moved toward decreased wages for low-skill natives who had been forced to compete for work with low-skill immigrants.

While the research findings left no doubt that the economy is at least in part related to the failure to launch phenomenon, it was also clear in the literature that there were additional factors to account for as well that should not be neglected. For instance, while Xiao et al. (2014) found a significant positive relationship between an individual's income, assets, work status, and educational attainment and financial independence, they also found a significant negative correlation between parental income and a young adult's financial independence. In the same study, Xiao et al. noted a positive relationship between some psychological variables, including self-efficacy, problem-solving skills, and money management skills, and financial independence. These findings were suggestive that economic factors were not solely to account for in addressing the failure

to launch phenomenon but that, in fact, there may have been less-studied variables, specifically more psychological phenomena, which may have accounted for some of the variance (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2007, 2015; Arnett & Fishel, 2014; Glenn & Van Wert, 2010; Kaplan, n.d.; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Wells et al., 2015; Xiao et al., 2014).

One possible inference that could be made from the prior findings was that self-efficacy and perception may negatively impact motivation among this population to push themselves forward (Allen, 2017; Arnett & Fishel, 2014; Glenn & Van Wert, 2010; Kaplan, n.d.; Xiao et al., 2014). Burn and Szoeke (2016) agreed in asserting that even though living with parents during this transitional phase provided an economic safety net for these young adults, there were negative psychological consequences related to self-image specific to having their autonomy threatened and having ran the risk of stifling personal development in their striving for the status of becoming a fully independent adult.

Self-efficacy was found to be largely influenced by an individual's locus of control (Dörnyei, 2000; Geen, 1984; Stavredes, 2011; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000). That is, those with a strong internal locus of control have been found to generally believe they are in control of their own successes or failures and that they have the power within them to control their outcomes based on their own behaviors, actions, and efforts. Those who had been found to have a strong external locus of control generally believed the opposite in that their successes or failures were primarily due to outside forces such as luck (or lack thereof), their environment, other people, or other circumstances outside of their control. When put into context, even the language "failure to launch" implicitly implied that this

population has already failed in some capacity and, oftentimes, those thoughts can become reinforced to the point of becoming belief systems which may therefore affect an individual's self-efficacy and keep them inherently "stuck" in place. Similarly, when the assumption of the older generation (i.e., parents or older relatives) is that the young adult is incapable of certain tasks or accomplishments associated with successful launching to independence, the messaging will often be reflected in the young adult's motivation and subsequent behavior. For these reasons, Arnett (2015) argued for and coined the phrase emerging adulthood to describe this population.

One of the primary issues with this population potentially having low self-efficacy was the implications towards lack of motivation (Allen, 2017; Arnett & Fishel, 2014; Dörnyei, 2000; Geen, 1984; Glenn & Van Wert, 2010; Kaplan, n.d.; Wigfield & Eccles, 2000; Xiao et al., 2014). The expectancy-value theory of motivation, for example, posited that the two driving forces in motivation to action or change were the value an individual placed on said task and their belief in ability to complete it (i.e., self-efficacy). That is, regardless of how much value an individual placed on a goal, if they did not believe it to be attainable their motivation toward the task would significantly decrease. The self-determination theory of motivation, similarly, places a large emphasis on values in driving motivation; specifically focused on three life tasks which were believed to transcend cultural differences (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2002). These three core needs were the need for competence, autonomy, and relatedness. Deci and Ryan (2008) also found that meeting these three needs may predict psychological well-being in individuals and, vice versa, not meeting these needs may

predict nonideal well-being. It was importance to understand these motivational frameworks when addressing the emerging adulthood population and the failure to launch phenomenon as these needs and values which were shown to drive motivation were not seemingly being met in this population which was not only predicted to negatively impact motivation but also negatively impact well-being. That is to say, it was hard to determine whether the individuals in this phenomenon did not place enough value on launching or did not have enough belief in themselves to successfully launch – leaving somewhat of a "chicken or egg" scenario in being difficult to determine what the catalyst to eliciting motivational and actionable change may be. Regardless, it was clear that both needed to be addressed further in helping these individuals launch.

As Allen (2017) posited, though, there is a fine line to balance between enabling and appropriately supporting this population. In fact, Allen reported that, in his experiences, young adults have tended to simply take what was given. That is, if parents or guardians are willing to offer full financial or living arrangement support – especially with little in the way of obligations or expectancies to uphold on the part of the young adult – this population has generally been glad to accept the handout. Allen argued that this was more of an indictment on the parent or guardian (than the young adult) and that this behavior was more indicative of intelligence and shrewd negotiating skills on the part of the young adult than any type of negative pathology. Further, in reflection, Allen acknowledged that these skills could be strengths of the young adults and quite transferable to the real world when appropriately utilized.

It was unsurprising then that, like the assertions by Allen (2017), the research of Kins and Beyers (2010) found that young adults who lived with their parents or relatives during the emerging adulthood phase were delayed in their full transition to independent adulthood and self-sufficiency. Kins and Beyers took their research a step further, however, in beginning to merge some of the prior research regarding perception and the emerging adulthood phenomenon. More specifically, they began to examine the relationship between failing to launch and items of subjective well-being. Kins and Beyers did find a significant relationship between subjective well-being and successful launching, or transitions into independent adulthood. Similarly, Baggio, Studer, Iglesias, Daeppen, and Gmel (2017) explored the relationship between the psychological states associated with emerging adulthood and psychological well-being in Swiss men all approximately 20-years in age. The study was, however, limited in a variety of ways. Like the study by Kins and Beyers, the study by Baggio et al. only modestly measured factors of well-being quantitatively. Baggio et al. chose to measure psychological well-being through the lens of whether participants were experiencing symptoms of mental illness as well as a general life satisfaction inventory and did not measure the failure to launch variable but, instead, focused on markers such as identity exploration, experimentation, negativity, and the presence or absence of a stable relationship.

Likewise, other research has acknowledged but done little in the way of recognizing these psychological factors of wellness, including their relationship with perception and self-efficacy, as potential variables that may factor into the failure to launch phenomenon (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2007, 2015; Arnett & Fishel, 2014; Baggio et

al., 2017; Glenn & Van Wert, 2010; Henig, 2010; Kaplan, n.d.; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Sax, 2009; Wells et al., 2015; Xiao et al., 2014). While the studies agreed that wellness was a variable that may affect this phenomenon, prior research did little in the way of empirically examining a more quantified approach to assessing the specific relationship with wellness, or which specific factors may have been involved in this relationship (Hattie et al., 2004; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Roscoe, 2009). The following section addressed the need for continued research into the operationalization of wellness in this population as well as its potential connection to the failure to launch phenomenon.

Wellness

While the research on the failure to launch phenomenon did begin to acknowledge and modestly explore psychological variables, including wellness, there was little in the way of empirically addressing the full construct of wellness, and all prior findings only explored this variable as secondary in nature (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2015; Arnett & Fishell, 2014; Baggio et al., 2017; Glenn & Van Wert, 2010; Henig, 2010; Kaplan, n.d.; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Sax, 2009; Wells et al., 2015; Xiao et al., 2014). It was only in the literature specific to the construct of wellness that significant findings were made in connecting said factors of wellness with specific adult criteria; but, again, this research was also limited. Pomeroy and Clark (2015) offered a qualitative study that examined wellness and self-efficacy in a case study of two counseling clients, one male and one female both 24 years in age. Pomeroy and Clark argued that self-efficacy was not only predictive of future performance but also interconnected with wellness. Pomeroy and

Clark utilized the two case examples to illustrate their point. One of the clients had early recollections of high self-efficacy throughout life and a general positive outlook that seemed to carry through in her greater feeling of well-being and confidence while the other client expressed the polar opposite in their seemingly low levels of self-efficacy from an early age that may have contributed to a lifelong feeling of low self-worth, belief in self, and non-ideal well-being. While qualitative case study designs can be informative, they are limited in their scope and ability to provide sound empirical data.

One such article that did utilize quantitative methods was from Lawson and Myers (2011) who studied wellness factors as they related to personal and professional quality of life as well as career-sustaining behaviors in 506 mental health counselors. While the population used in their study may not readily be generalizable to the greater public, nor the failure to launch population, the study did shed light on a potentially impactful relationship between wellness factors and an individual's ability to persevere through obtaining and sustaining a career that required additional post-grad education and training. While limited in scope, the study by Lawson and Myers provided great implications as to the potential relationship between the emerging adult population and how wellness factors needed to be further explored empirically to better understand the potential variables involved in a population such as the failure to launch phenomenon. Moreover, Lawson and Myers shed light on the importance of a greater understanding of wellness as a construct that may be predictive of a variety of developmental needs being met; including those of adult criteria and, specifically, independence.

To better understand the potential reasoning for examining wellness factors as they may relate to the failure to launch phenomenon, the greater literature on wellness such as its roots in Adlerian theory and the development of the wheel of wellness and factor models of wellness were explored (Hattie et al., 2004; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2008; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Williard, 2003; Roscoe, 2009; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991). Adlerian theory asserted five major life tasks of work, friendship, love, self, and spirit that all humans strive toward in hoping to achieve their own self-actualization. Self-actualization, according to Maslow (1965), was identified as the highest order of one having their needs met; specifically, being the independent process of an individual working throughout their lives to meet all the needs, such as those identified within Maslow's Hierarchy, that would allow an individual to find their true self, purpose, and greatest well-being in life. With these roots, a factor structure of wellness was developed as researchers recognized the need to understand wellness as a construct outside of simply the lack of physical or mental illness and instead looked more toward a strength-based approach that sought to view the individual as comprised of multiple parts of the "whole" with a life-long task of seeking growth and self-actualization (Hattie et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2008; Myers et al., 2004; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Sweeney & Witmer, 1991).

Sweeny and Witmer (1991) constructed the original wheel of wellness based on the philosophy of Adlerian theory which addressed the major life tasks of work, friendship, love, spirituality, and coping or self-regulation. This work began to address each of these life tasks as phenomena that dynamically interacted amongst each other in

assessing the wholeness of the individual. Myers et al. (1998) took this model a step further in conducting factor analyses that not only determined how interrelated these domains of wellness were, but in also conducting the first comprehensive quantitative instrument to measure the construct of wellness as operationalized in the wheel of wellness model, the Wellness Evaluation of Lifestyle. In 2004 Myers and Sweeney continued their work, with the aid of Hattie, in further analyzing the construct of wellness as well as redefining and better analyzing the factors associated (Hattie et al., 2004). Through exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses Hattie et al. (2004) recognized five primary factors that were greater associated with a superordinate factor of wellness and their findings ultimately led to the creation of a more empirically sound instrument of measuring wellness, the 5F-WEL; Myers & Sweeney, 2005).

The 5F-WEL) utilized the prior research on wellness in formulating an empirically sound instrument to measure a greater overall superordinate factor of wellness, the five second-order factors as identified through the literature and continued exploratory as well as confirmatory factor analyses, and the subsequent discreet scales that were measured in each second-order factor (Abrahams & Balkin, 2006; Hattie et al., 2004; Myers et al. , 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2005, 2008; Myers, Sweeney, & Witmer, 1998; Rachele, Cuddihy, Washington, & McPhail, 2013; Roscoe, 2009). The second-order factors included the creative self which encompassed the discreet scales of thinking, emotion, control, work, and positive humor; the coping self which encompassed the discreet scales of leisure, stress-management, self-worth, and realistic beliefs; the essential self which encompassed the discreet scales of spirituality, gender identity,

cultural identity, and self-care; the social self which encompassed the discreet scales of friendship and love; and the physical self which encompassed the discreet scales of exercise and nutrition. In total, the 5F-WEL identified 17 discreet scales which comprised the five second-order factors that culminated in a comprehensive quantitative measurement of wellness.

The development and creation of the 5F-WEL was a critical step forward in the operationalization and understanding of wellness as a psychological construct (Myers & Sweeney, 2004). Having a better foundational understanding of wellness was paramount in looking through the literature on the failure to launch population as well as other populations such as adolescents and adults who, respectively, were the discreet populations leading right into and then following the emerging adulthood transitional phase (Daskivich et al., 2015; Edwards et al., 2001; Myers, Willse, & Villalba, 2011; Pomeroy & Clark, 2015; Sobowale, Zhou, Fan, Liu, & Sherer, 2014; Watson & Kissinger, 2007). One such study utilized the 5F-WEL to test for the relationship between wellness factors and self-esteem in adolescents (Myers et al., 2011). Myers et al. (2011) found that the second-order factors of coping self, social self, and creative self all significantly related to self-esteem in this population. While there was not enough statistical evidence to support the generalizability of these findings empirically, these findings were still notable as self-esteem was one of the psychological factors alluded to as a potential variable in the failure to launch phenomenon.

Watson and Kissenger (2007) explored wellness on college and university campuses; specifically testing for differences in wellness among student athlete and

student non-athlete populations, again having utilized the 5F-WEL to measure factors of wellness. They found significant differences among student athletes and student non-athletes on the second-order factors of social self and essential self as well as the discreet scale of love. Again, while the limited scope of this study was not readily generalizable, it was worth noting these significant differences among athletes and non-athletes who, by all accounts, fell into the emerging adult range with a mean of 22.35 years of age. The study showcased differences in wellness profiles among the emerging adulthood population but also acknowledged its own limitations in scope – only testing for differences in athletes versus non-athletes using a convenience sample from one university – and the need for continued research into wellness profiles of the greater emerging adulthood population.

Perhaps most interestingly, one theme that emerged in the continued review of wellness and failure to launch literature was the connection between Adlerian theory and Social Exchange theory; specifically, through the use of mentorship (Bitter, 2007; Edwards et al., 2001; Ergüner-Tekinalp et al., 2018; Fiske, 2014; Karcher & Lindwall, 2003; Shifron & Rasmussen, 2009; Wilmarth et al, 2014; Woodyard & Grable, 2014). Again, while limited research existed pertaining specifically to the emerging adulthood population as well as the failure to launch phenomenon, there was much research of note on mentorship being related to positive outcomes in populations such as young children, adolescents, and adults in different careers. Many of these positive outcomes either explicitly acknowledged or indirectly inferred a potential relationship with, both, wellness factors and adult criteria as previously discussed. This included social relations

that fostered a better understanding of self, teachable coping mechanisms, and guidance and support through normative developmental transitions to name a few. That said, the following section further looked to explore the literature on mentorship and its potential connection to the construct of wellness and the failure to launch phenomenon.

Mentorship

Social exchange theory, as previously addressed in the theoretical foundation section of this chapter, was the most common theoretical framework in which mentorship was addressed in the literature (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Fiske, 2014; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2002; Rhodes et al., 2006). The term "mentor" has its roots in Greek mythology as this was the name given to the man charged with acting as a role model, counselor, and guide to Homer's son, Telemachus (Thomas, 2006). Like the relationship from that mythology, Eller et al. (2014) defined eight key components of an effective mentoring relationship including open communication and accessibility, having goals and challenges, passion and inspiration, having a caring personal relationship, mutual respect and trust, exchange of knowledge, independence and collaboration, and role modeling. These findings were in line with a vast majority of the prior research on mentorship as much of the literature agreed that the mentor-mentee relationship was one of the strongest predictors which accounted for positive outcomes in mentees. Some of these positive outcomes included higher levels of well-being, higher levels of self-esteem, higher life satisfaction, higher levels of self-acceptance, and lower levels of depressive symptoms (Brady, Dolan, & Canavan, 2017; Codier & Wilson, 2014; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005;

Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2002). This was of interest to the current study as the factors research points to mentorship as having had a positive impact on are factors not only related to the literature on and goals of achieving wellness, but also ones identified as historically being difficult to achieve in the failure to launch population (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009).

The benefits of mentorship were found to transcend the nature of the mentor-mentee relationship; that is, the benefits remained regardless of whether the mentor was professionally hired to serve in that role or if it was a naturally occurring nonparental relationship between a mentee and someone they looked to as a guide and support system (Abby, Eby, & Lentz, 2006; Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Brady et al., 2017; DuBois & Siverthorn, 2005; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Rhodes & DuBois, 2008). Ultimately, research found that – in line with social exchange theory – the relationship itself was the greatest catalyst to eliciting positive change in both mentor and mentee (Gettings & Wilson, 2014; Rhodes, Schwartz, Willis, & Wu, 2017). This was true throughout youth, adolescent, and adult populations so, while there was no readily available research that addressed this topic and its potential connection to the emerging adulthood population and failure to launch phenomenon, it could have been inferred at the very least that this population may have experienced similar benefits.

DuBois and Silverthorn (2005) examined the effects of mentorship on adolescent health with potential implications pertaining to wellness and the failure to launch

phenomenon. The authors found significant relationships between having a mentor relationship and higher likelihood of these adolescents completing high school, attending college, working greater than ten-hours per week, greater well-being, higher self-esteem levels, higher levels of life satisfaction, and reduced problem behaviors including gang membership, physical fighting, or risk taking. Larson (2006) found similar results in studying mentorship in the youth population including how the presence of a mentor led to increased levels of motivation and supported a positive developmental process for the youth mentees. Phillips et al. (2008) conducted telephone interviews with parents of mentees who reported a positive impact on their children's self-esteem, well-being, happiness, identity, and behaviors after engaging in a mentorship program in the United Kingdom. In Ireland, Brady et al. (2017) conducted 66 semi structured interviews between youth mentees, parents of the mentees, mentors, and caseworkers and found that mentorship once again had a positive impact on well-being and reported a meaningful change among the youth mentees.

The literature cited above also supported the idea of the mentor-mentee relationship being at the forefront of the positive changes and outcomes; though, the literature also found that relationships that were not as strong did not yield the same benefits (DeWit et al., 2016). DeWit et al. (2016) found that early terminations in mentoring relationships – specifically those of a programmatic nature – did not tend to produce the same level of positive outcomes. Much of this was due to external variables including youth reporting they felt forced to join the program, youth reporting they felt little parental support of the mentor, youth reporting they felt little social support from

the parent, and not a high enough frequency of contact (less than once per week) with the mentor. Additional research focused on how to better cultivate and support mentoring programs, including an emphasis on cultivating strong mentor-mentee relationships through differentiated processes of matching mentors with mentees as well as the better education of mentors (Allen et al., 2006; Chen, Ellsworth, & Schwartz, 2015; Chen, Watson, & Hilton, 2016; Cordier & Wilson, 2014; Desmarais, Sacco-Dion, Sacco, & Deoteau, 2014; Greenwood & Habibi, 2014; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Rhodes & DuBois, 2008; Rhodes et al., 2017; Rhodes et al., 2006; Weiler, Zarich, Haddock, Krafchick, & Zimmerman, 2014; Weiler, Zimmerman, Haddock, & Krofchick, 2014).

Not all the literature on mentorship focused on youth and adolescent populations, however, as there were equally great benefits to be had in the adult population; including those who, by all accounts, had successfully launched and would have been considered independent (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Dawley et al., 2010; Eller et al., 2014; Hultgren, Palmer, & O'Riordan, 2013; Lapointe & Vandenberghe, 2017; Majiros, 2013; Rutti et al., 2013; van Emmerick, 2008). While mentorship in the adult population and in the workplace was different in utility – Boniwell, Osin, and Sircova (2014) utilized time perspective coaching in their study to help professionals garner a better relationship with time, for example – the positive yields from mentorship were still seen, nonetheless. Lapointe and Vandenberghe (2017) found career and development opportunities interacted with affective commitment in predicting less job turnover in 228 business alumni who received supervisory mentoring. Dawley et al. (2010) found similar results in their study among 610 employees split among three different companies; finding that

those employees who reported receiving some form of mentoring on the job (formal or informal, alike) experienced increased levels of perceived organizational support, supervisor support, and job fit.

Similarly, Bendini and Anderson (2003) found significant increases in job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors in randomly selected therapeutic recreation practitioners from the National Council on Therapeutic Recreation Certification membership list who reported receiving some form of mentorship on the job versus those who did not report having any form of mentorship. The research conducted by van Emmerick (2008) found that teachers who had a mentor scored higher on self-reported job performance and perception of team performance. The last two findings were of note as therapeutic recreational practitioners and teachers alike often work, in many ways, as mentors to those that they serve including clients and students, respectively. In diving deeper, there was additional literature that identified that mentors, or those who worked in a field that served others (teachers, recreational practitioners, volunteers or charity workers, medical field practitioners, etc.), tended to have a reciprocal relationship with those that they served or helped (Daskivich et al., 2015; Greenwald & Habibi, 2014; Karcher & Lindwall, 2003; Shifron & Rasmussen, 2009; Sobowale et al., 2014; Weiler et al., 2014; Woodyard & Grable, 2014). That was, not only did the mentor-mentee relationship yield a give and take – in line with social exchange theory – on both sides, but that these relationships were also, at times, predictive of wellness.

Daskivich et al. (2015) argued for the need to reform national policy on supporting wellness in physicians in training – a population that has historically been at high risk for depression (Sobowale et al., 2014) – through the implementation and benefits of mentorship. Similarly, Edwards et al. (2001) addressed the connection between social exchange, such as the presence or absence of a mentor-like figure, and wellness in university students. The researchers found that negative social exchange predicted more variance in physical health symptoms than daily hassles or live-event stress. Woodyard and Grable (2014) reported on the other side of this spectrum, having found that positive social exchange, such as charitable activity, related to higher levels of wellness. It became apparent, through the literature, that Adlerian theory and social exchange theory were not mutually exclusive and, in fact, a focus on social exchange theory – and effective application through something such as mentoring – was potentially beneficial to meeting the needs identified through Adlerian theory; ultimately, leading to greater levels of wellness (Bitter, 2007; Daskivich et al., 2015; Edwards et al., 2001; Ergüner-Tekinalp et al., 2018; Karcher & Lindwall, 2003; Shifron & Rasmussen, 2009; Sobowale et al., 2014).

Having addressed mentorship through the lens of social exchange theory and Adlerian theory (through the lens of wellness), the biggest question that remained was how mentorship may support the specific emerging adulthood population and failure to launch phenomenon. While no research specific to this population existed, there was a variety of research that supported the positive effects of mentorship on job acquisition and sustainability; something that those who fall into the failure to launch phenomenon

have historically struggled with (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2015; Arnett & Fishell, 2014; Carnivale et al., 2013; Cobigo, Lachapelle, & Morin, 2010; Gomes, 2017; Jaimet, 2016; Lawson & Myers, 2011; O'Mally & Antonelli, 2016; Wilmarth, Nielson, & Futris, 2014; Wright, 2005). One of the variables addressed in the failure to launch phenomenon was the economy in that this population was increasingly dependent on parents or relatives for financial stability, living situations, or both (Carnivale et al., 2013; Bell et al., 2007; Xiao et al., 2014). The findings of Wilmarth et al. (2014) supported this in their findings of the relationship between financial wellness and communication patterns. The researchers asserted that financial wellness was positively associated with positive communication patterns and negatively associated with negative communication patterns; that is, those who felt financially stable also had a greater social awareness (social exchange theory) and led to greater relationship satisfaction (one of the pillars of wellness). It was inferred, then, that if the emerging adulthood population was lacking in wellness and struggling to acquire full financial and housing independence, that mentorship (and its roots in social exchange theory as addressed) might have been the missing link which may potentially help to mitigate both issues.

This theory was supported by the literature as researchers sought different methods of assisting in a job search process that would be sustainable and fulfilling for those who were struggling to acquire a career (Cobigo, et al., 2010; Gomes, 2017; Jaimet, 2016). Gomes (2017) commented on a need for reform having argued that mentors for minority high school students may positively impact graduation rates. For those already in the job hunt, Cobigo et al. (2010) qualitatively reported that job coaches could be

better utilized but that many may also need additional quantitative instruments to help in their assessment. The authors found that job coaches who attempted to estimate vocational interests based on emotional responses, refusals, or off-task behaviors tended to lack a concise understanding of their clients' interests and potential best fits. O'Mally and Antonelli (2016) found significant positive increases in job-seeking self-efficacy, career adaptability, and assertiveness in job-hunting in those who had the support of a career mentor versus those who only received traditional job-search resources. Even those in highly skilled positions, such as nurses in Canada as studied by Jaimet (2016), have reported difficulties in finding and building their ideal careers without guidance. Jaimet found that the nursing students all felt as though they would have benefitted from additional guidance from a nursing professor, manager, or mentor. For those already in the workplace, Wright (2005) posited a continued need for workplace coaching in helping individuals to improve job performance and enhance the overall quality of their lives in supporting professional and personal fulfillment through this support. It was clear, through the literature, that not only was mentorship positively associated with wellness but also a valuable resource through each phase of the job-hunt process – in having supported academic and vocational goals – which the failure to launch population has historically struggled with. While these inferences became clear in the continued examination of literature, there was very little in the way of empirically supporting these claims to date.

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter identified the knowledge from previous literature on the failure to launch phenomenon, wellness, and mentorship (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; Bell et al., 2007; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hattie et al., 2004; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Mykyta, 2012; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006; Roscoe, 2009). Research on the emerging adulthood population showed that there was still much to be learned as far as potential psychological variables that may be influencing this growing problematic phenomenon of failure to launch. The research on wellness, and its subsequent operationalization and development as a construct, shed light on some variables that may interact with this phenomenon but only modestly, as no empirical data existed that compared the relationship between failure to launch and wellness factors. Diving deeper still, the literature on mentorship shed light, using social exchange theory, on ways in which wellness in youth, adolescent, and adult populations had been positively affected by the presence of a mentor figure. Again, no literature existed that specifically studied the emerging adulthood population, nor ways in which to mitigate the failure to launch phenomenon, but it provided useful insight as to mentorship potentially serving as a moderating variable in the equation. That was to say, when combining the findings of all the above literature, it could be inferred that since mentorship supported better wellness, wellness supported higher self-efficacy, and higher self-efficacy supported increased motivation levels, that wellness and mentorship were variables in need of more research to better understand the failure to launch phenomenon. The following chapter will

outline the current research design, methodology, data analysis plan, and any threats to validity in attempting to fill this gap and extend knowledge in the discipline.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

I used a quantitative survey design for this study because this approach aligned best with the research questions, hypotheses, and variables (see Burkholder, Cox, & Crawford, 2016; Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Warner, 2013). With each research question, I sought to identify relationships or effects between and among quantitatively measured variables. The study was also cross-sectional in nature and, as no intervention was used, the study was considered nonexperimental in design. In this chapter, I explore the research design, methodology, data analysis plan, and any threats to validity.

As for recruitment, the only information available to me about participants during this study was the unique MTURK ID numbers, which were a random combination of numbers and letters provided to participants via MTURK software. While MTURK can link those ID numbers to participants, for the purposes of financial compensation, I was unable to connect any identities to survey data. As an added layer of protection and confidentiality, MTURK software was only utilized to provide the participation invite letter and letter of consent that then linked participants to the demographic survey on SurveyMonkey and 5F-WEL on Mind Garden, respectively. Therefore, MTURK did not receive any survey data and was only informed if participants completed the surveys for the purposes of providing compensation. Both SurveyMonkey and Mind Garden were only provided with participants' MTURK ID numbers but had no way of connecting those ID numbers to participants' identities.

Research Design and Rationale

In this study, the research questions, hypotheses, and variables aligned best with a quantitative approach (see Burkholder et al., 2016; Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Warner, 2013). There were two independent variables: the failure to launch variable (FTL) and mentorship. FTL was measured as a binary categorical level measurement (i.e., A_1 – has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood and A_2 – has not successfully transitioned into independent adulthood). The operational definition of successfully transitioning into independent adulthood was a person aged 18 to 34 years old who were neither financially dependent on parents or relatives nor dependent on parents or relatives for housing (see Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

Mentorship – operationalized to include any person the participant deemed as an adviser, guide, or life coach and not limited to professionals or professional services rendered but also including natural relationships – was utilized and measured as a categorical variable to serve as the second independent variable. The four ordinal categories of mentorship included the following: 0 = never had someone I considered a mentor, 1 = had someone I considered a mentor but am no longer in touch with, 2 = currently have someone I consider a mentor but have infrequent contact with, and 3 = currently have someone I consider a mentor and have frequent contact with (see Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Holtbrügge & Ambrosius, 2015; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Karcher, 2003; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006). This

second independent variable allowed me to investigate how mentorship may moderate the relationship between wellness and FTL.

The dependent variables consisted of the higher order primary total wellness factor and the five second-order factors in the 5F-WEL (see Myers & Sweeney, 2005). The total wellness factor is a quantitative measurement of wellness that is measured and weighed through the cumulative scores of the five second-order factors which, in turn, are measured and weighed through the cumulative scores of the respective discreet scales of each second-order factor:

- the creative self, which encompasses discreet scales of thinking, emotion, control, work, and positive humor;
- the coping self, which encompasses discreet scales of leisure, stress-management, self-worth, and realistic beliefs;
- the essential self, which encompasses discreet scales of spirituality, gender identity, cultural identity, and self-care;
- the social self, which encompasses discreet scales of friendship and love; and
- physical self, which encompasses discreet scales of exercise and nutrition (Hattie et al., 2004; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Myers & Williard, 2003; Roscoe, 2009).

Scores on the total wellness factor included the weighted sum of each of the five second-order factors. I obtained scores of each of the five second-order factors through the sum of all 4-point, Likert scale items within their associated discreet scales. Each of the 17 discreet scales encompassed in the five second-order factors of wellness singularly

load into their respective second-order factor (i.e., the 17 discreet scales each load into their respective second-order factor at which point the sum of all five second-order factors culminates in the total wellness score).

Lastly, I used demographic information obtained from the survey as control variables. Using control variables was helpful in addressing potential confounds to the study. A copy of the survey, including all provided answer choices, can be found in the appendices (see Appendix A). These control variables included sex, age, ethnicity, location, marital status, highest level of education completed, educational status, housing status, employment status, and income.

The use of online surveys helped to mitigate time and resource constraints, specifically in obtaining a large enough sample size wherein the resulting analysis could be considered reliable and meaningful to the field of study. Similarly, the online survey design allowed for a much wider reaching and diverse population (i.e., as it pertained to different locations) to sample from within the identified target population of young adults (i.e., those aged 18 to 34 years old). This not only afforded me a greater opportunity of obtaining a larger sample size but also served to help mitigate potential confounding variables, such as location settings; therefore, the results of this study could be more readily generalizable among the target population.

Methodology

Population

Research on the FTL phenomenon has highlighted the young and emerging adult population, between 18 to 34 years of age, which was the specific target population I was

focused on in this study (see Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). In the literature review, I identified this phenomenon as being problematic in Western culture, specifically for the purposes of this research in the United States, so the sampling pool included any U.S. citizen between the ages of 18 to 34 years old. I will provide more details on the sampling pool in the following subsection. The United States Census Bureau (2017) reported that 34.1% of this target population lived with their parents as of 2015. According to data from the United States and World Population Clock (n.d.), in 2017, approximately 23.3% of the total U.S. population fell within the targeted ages of 18 to 34 years old. This population was almost exactly evenly split between males and females with approximately 11.9% of the total U.S. population being females in this age range and approximately 11.4% of the total U.S. population being males in the same age range (United States and World Population Clock, n.d.). Therefore, among the target population, there was approximately a 51% female to 49% male ratio.

Sampling and Sampling Procedures

I used probability sampling via MTURK for this research, specifically stratified sampling, which was aimed to divide the population into the subgroups of launched versus failure to launch (see Amazon MTURK, n.d.; Creswell, 2014). MTURK is a service offered by Amazon that allows anybody with an account to volunteer time participating in surveys, virtual tasks, moderate content, and more for monetary compensation per task. The MTURK service charges "requesters" for the utilization of gathering participants, then subsequently pays the monetary compensation to those

workers who participate in completing the task (Amazon MTURK, n.d.). Amazon (n.d.) estimated that there are anywhere between 100,000 to 200,000 unique workers, and at any given time, there are about 2,000 to 5,000 actively looking for tasks. A human intelligence interaction (HIT) is MTURK's language for a task, and the number of assignments indicates how many workers can accept and accomplish said task (Amazon MTURK, n.d.). This service gives researchers a wide net in which to gather participants from all over the world; although, for the purposes of this study, it was limited to U.S. citizens. MTURK assisted in ensuring only U.S. citizens were chosen through the use of a "system location" qualifier that only allowed MTURK participants in the United States to take the survey, ensuring the first inclusion criteria was met for participation. The "system location" qualifier was included in the first HIT, which contained the demographic survey for the purposes of gathering a large sampling pool. I hoped this sampling pool would include enough of a diverse population to proportionately stratify from so the sample would be truly representative of their respective stratum. As such, the demographic survey itself consisted of all demographic variables and was used to gather information pertaining to the FTL and mentorship variables. This included operationalizing the qualifications for failure to launch versus successful launching as:

- Failure to launch includes any person who is either financially dependent on parents or relatives or dependent on family or relatives for housing.
- Successful launching includes any person who is neither financially dependent on parents or relatives nor dependent on family or relatives for housing.

The first HIT included 500 initial assignments, which meant that the first 500 random workers on MTURK who volunteered to take the survey were compensated $0.20 for taking the brief survey. This was the recommended compensation provided by MTURK (n.d.). Instructions on the first HIT, in taking the demographic survey, specified that some participants may be randomly selected to participate in a follow-up survey; yet, for the purposes of hoping to keep participants honest, continued participation criteria was not specified or disclosed. However, for the purposes of the study, I used the demographic survey questions to gather information on the following exclusion criteria:

- Any person who fell outside of the 18- to 34-year-old age range.
- Any non-U.S. citizen.
- Any person who did not live in the United States.
- Any person who reported currently or historically being diagnosed with any form of mental illness, specifically in a yes or no binary fashion. Due to the sensitive nature of this question, I did not collect any identifying information that required potential participants to disclose this personal information and a response to this question was not required by any participant. However, for the purposes of this research, a nonresponse omitted participants from continuing to the second survey, but they were still compensated for their time in taking the demographic survey.
- Any person who was currently in a normative educational path, even if they were still dependent on parents or relatives financially or for living arrangements (i.e., those individuals who went to college directly from high

school and had never taken a break, medical leave, academic leave, and were on track for earning their degrees within the specified normative time-frame per their respective program). I chose this last exclusion criterion because, while these individuals had technically not transitioned into independent adulthood, they also had not necessarily failed to meet criteria seeing as they were amid the actual transition; therefore, it would have been difficult to assess whether they would successfully transition or not following the completion of their programs and this study was not designed to be longitudinal.

Once the larger sample pool of 500 was collected, I dismissed all participants who met any of the exclusion criteria from the participant pool. From there, four more HITs were designed to proportionately stratify the sample. I will describe this this in more detail in the procedures for recruitment, participation, and data collection subsection to come. The number of required participants was determined by a power analysis, and I used the random proportionate sampling procedure. The original sample pool of 500 included enough participants who met the criteria for participation and, therefore, no second grouping of additional HITs were necessary.

In determining the participation criteria, first a power analysis needed to be conducted to determine the necessary sample size. No prior research existed that indicated a potential effect size to draw from, therefore research has suggested a small to medium effect size would be appropriate (Cohen, 1998; Ellis, 2010; Walden University, 2014b, 2016). Identifying the appropriate power and effect size in research is critical in

balancing the risk between Type 1 and Type 2 errors; however, with limited prior research to draw on, it is suggested that power levels can be lowered as the potential of a Type 2 error would be preferred over higher potential of a Type 1 error. That is, the preference would be to rule out the possibility of falsely rejecting a true null hypothesis (Type 1 error) rather than failing to reject a false null hypothesis (Type 2 error). Typically, a power level of .80 ($\beta = 0.20$) is commonly accepted, which indicates a 20% chance of committing a Type 2 error. In the current study, the slightly higher chance of committing a Type 2 error was preferred as it allowed the sample size to be far more manageable from a resource perspective as well as ensuring that the risk of a Type 1 error would not increase; keeping the traditional alpha threshold of 0.05.

A small effect ($\omega 2 = 0.04$) with the traditional alpha threshold ($\alpha = 0.05$) and power of .80 ($\beta = 0.20$) would require 59 total participants (Cohen, 1998; Ellis, 2010; Walden University, 2014b, 2016). A medium effect ($\omega 2 = 0.06$) with the traditional alpha threshold ($\alpha = 0.05$) and power of .80 ($\beta = 0.20$) would require 39 total participants. As the research attempted to safely assume a small to medium effect and utilize stratified proportionate random sampling, the sample number chosen within these limits was 50 ($n = 50$). The desired sample was designed to have a slightly lower number of males ($n = 24$; 48% compared to the target population's actual 49%) to females ($n = 26$; 52% compared to the target population's actual 51%) in representing, as closely as possible, the appropriate proportions of the entire population both in gender and in the failure to launch versus successful launching proportions. As such, the sample was proportionately representative of those who have failed to launch ($n = 17$; 34.1% of 50; 9 females to 8

males) versus those who have successfully launched (n = 33; 65.9% of 50; 17 females to 16 males) based on the 34.1% of this population that still lived with their parents as of 2015 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

Amazon MTURK (n.d.) was the online resource utilized for recruitment of all participants (MTURK, n.d.). Different iterations of HITs (as described in the sampling procedure) were posted that hoped to divide the sample into the appropriate proportions prior to assigning them to take the 5F-WEL on the Mind Garden website (Mind Garden, 2018). The original HIT of the demographic survey was administered through SurveyMonkey, an online survey software (Amazon MTURK, n.d.; SurveyMonkey, n.d.). For the first HIT (MTURK's language for a task), a $0.20 incentive was given to the first 500 random participants who completed the demographic survey; which was the suggested compensation per MTURK based on the length of survey. This survey included demographic info, failure to launch criteria, mentorship criteria, and exclusion criteria, and took participants an average of between 1-3 minutes to complete (as tracked by MTURK). Instructions in the survey informed participants that they may be contacted regarding a follow-up survey, the 5F-WEL, wherein they would have an opportunity to earn additional financial compensation for their time (Amazon MTURK, n.d.; Mind Garden, 2018; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; SurveyMonkey, n.d.). However, no information was given pertaining to the desired criteria for follow up as an attempt to keep participants honest in the original demographic survey

Additionally, mentorship – defined by the *Merriam-Webster Dictionary* (n.d.) as, "a trusted counselor or guide" – was operationalized to include any person the participant deemed as an adviser, guide, or life coach; not limited to professionals or professional services rendered, but also including natural relationships. This definition, along with the subsequent categorization (0 = never had someone I considered a mentor, 1 = had someone I considered a mentor but am no longer in touch with, 2 = currently have someone I consider a mentor but have infrequent contact with, 3 = currently have someone I consider a mentor and have frequent contact with), was also included in the demographic survey. Lastly, the failure to launch variable (FTL) was included in the demographic survey and operationalized as any individual who is either financially dependent on parents or relatives or dependent on parents or relatives for housing. All demographic, mentorship, and FTL data were obtained online through MTURK and SurveyMonkey (Amazon MTURK, n.d.; SurveyMonkey, n.d.). Once the larger sampling pool was gathered, participants who met any of the exclusion criteria were dismissed from continued participation.

From there, four more HITs were designed to proportionately stratify the sample (Amazon MTURK, n.d.). Each new HIT included a link to complete the 5F-WEL on the Mind Garden website wherein, upon completion, participants were rewarded an additional $3.00; which was MTURK's suggested incentive as the 5F-WEL typically takes between 20-to-25 minutes to complete (Amazon MTURK, n.d.; Mind Garden, 2018; Myers & Sweeney, 2005). The custom qualification of "has been granted" was utilized for all four of these HITs as MTURK allows researchers to assign HITs to

designated workers. The workers were chosen based off the necessary proportions to be representative of the larger population. MTURK assignments were utilized to specify how many participants can work on the same HIT. That is, the number of assignments in any given HIT determined how many participants can participate in the task. Thus, the initial survey randomly gathered participants and each individual to have completed the demographic survey meeting the requirements necessary for their respective group were invited to take the 5F-WEL representing their respective group on a first come basis, and so on until all required participants were obtained. This helped to proportionately stratify the population as it allowed a random gathering of participants but still only included the needed sample proportions for the purposes of the study.

- The first HIT included eight assignments and, along with the exclusion criteria above, required:
  - Participants must be male.
  - Participants must fall into the failure to launch category; operationally defined as either being financially dependent on parents or relatives or being dependent on parents or relatives for housing.
- The second HIT included nine assignments and, along with the exclusion criteria above, required:
  - Participants must be female.
  - Participants must fall into the failure to launch category; operationally defined as either being financially dependent on parents or relatives or being dependent on parents or relatives for housing.

- The third HIT included 16 assignments and, along with the exclusion criteria above, required:
  - Participants must be male.
  - Participants must fall into the successfully launched category; operationally defined as neither being financially dependent on parents or relatives nor being dependent on parents or relatives for housing.
- The fourth HIT included 17 assignments and, along with the exclusion criteria above, required:
  - Participants must be female.
  - Participants must fall into the successfully launched category; operationally defined as neither being financially dependent on parents or relatives nor being dependent on parents or relatives for housing.

The utilization of the HITs in this manner hoped to ensure that, not only were the required number of participants (n = 50) obtained, but that they were proportionately stratified to represent the larger population in terms of gender, males (n = 24; 48% compared to the target population's actual 49%) to females (n = 26; 52% compared to the target population's actual 51%), as well as the proportion of those who have failed to launch (n = 17; 34% of 50; 9 females to 8 males) versus those who have successfully launched (n = 33; 66% of 50; 17 females to 16 males) based on the 34.1% of this population that still lived with their parents as of 2015 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). The added benefit of creating assignments for HITs was that it also allowed for researcher approval for the workers and had a worker not completed an assignment within the given

timeframe, they were automatically be removed and the assignment became available for another worker to accept.

Prior to participating in the survey, participants were provided with a letter of informed consent to ensure they were aware of all potential benefits and risks for participating in the study (Walden University, 2014a). Participants were also informed that they were free to exit the study at any time should they choose not to complete the survey or 5F-WEL for any reason. Participants were debriefed as to the purposes of the research following the survey (for those who are excluded from taking the 5F-WEL) or after their completion of the 5F-WEL via MTURK software which allowed them to contact this researcher if they had any further questions or concerns. Participants were also provided with information for national educational, vocational, financial, and housing resources (Appendix B) upon request. No additional follow-up procedures were necessary as the study is cross-sectional in nature.

Instrumentation and Operationalization of Constructs

Five-Factor Wellness Inventory (5F-WEL):

The 5F-WEL was developed by Myers and Sweeney (2005) through an evidence-based factor model of wellness, the wheel of wellness (Abrahams & Balkin, 2006; Hattie et al., 2004; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2005; Myers et al., 1998). The framework from which the construct of wellness was operationalized stemmed from Adlerian theory; specifically, the five major life tasks of work, friendship, love, self, and spirit. This, as well as extensive research and testing as to the efficacy of the factor-models of wellness, including the wheel of wellness, was what Myers and Sweeney (2005) utilized in

establishing the five second-order factors of wellness that are tested for in the 5F-WEL. These second-order factors included the creative self which encompassed thinking, emotion, control, work, and positive humor; the coping self which encompassed leisure, stress-management, self-worth, and realistic beliefs; the essential self which encompassed spirituality, gender identity, cultural identity, and self-care; the social self which encompassed friendship and love; and the physical self which encompassed exercise and nutrition.

The 5F-WEL was an appropriate instrument to measure the dependent variable of wellness as not only did it operationalize the construct of wellness in an evidence-based empirical manner, but also served to quantitatively measure all the second-order factors of wellness along with a quantitative measurement of total wellness score ($\alpha = 0.98$). This research utilized the 5F-WEL-A, which was the adult version of the instrument. This aligned with the current study as the normative sample used was collected from adults ranging from 18-70 years old ($n = 3343$); thus, the targeted population age range of 18-34 was appropriate for this version of the instrument. Permission to utilize the 5F-WEL was granted by the authors through Mind Garden (Appendix C); where online licensing was purchased for the use of the instrument (Mind Garden, 2018; Myers & Sweeney, 2005).

Prior to publishing the 5F-WEL, the authors tested for reliability (Abrahams & Balkin, 2006; Myers & Sweeney, 2005). Cronbach's coefficient alpha for each of the five second-order factors of wellness tested in the 5F-WEL-A were all found between 0.89 and 0.96, indicating strong internal consistency (Abrahams & Balkin, 2006;

Anastasi & Urbina, 1997;; Cortina, 1993; Myers & Sweeney, 2005). The total wellness score coefficient alpha was 0.98. Structural equation modeling was utilized to test for the validity of the 5F-WEL and additional construct validity was established through the literature used in forming the 5F-WEL as well as literature that continued to substantiate the construct validity of this factor model of wellness (Abrahams & Balkin, 2006; Hattie et al., 2004; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2005; Roscoe, 2009).

The 5F-WeEL-A was normed on a large sample of adults (n = 3,343) ranging from 18-70 years old (Myers & Sweeney, 2005). The ethnic population of the 5F-WEL-A norming sample included 43.3% White, 27.5% African American, 1.6% Hispanic, 2.4% Native American, and 8.3% Asian. Males were underrepresented at 35% and traditional university students accounted for 29% of the sample population. The underrepresentation of ethnic minorities other than African Americans as well as males may potentially hinder the 5F-WEL's generalizability based on the sample for study.

Demographic Survey:

A basic demographic survey (Appendix A) was created on and to be administered through SurveyMonkey (n.d.) including data gathering questions pertaining to the failure to launch and mentorship variables. The basic demographic data included in the survey was age, sex, ethnicity, location, marital status, highest level of education completed, educational status, housing status, employment status, and income. Demographic data was included for the purposes of analyzing whether any of these variables needed to be controlled for in examining the significance, or lack thereof, of findings.

For the failure to launch variable (FTL), data obtained included questions pertaining to financial and housing dependence or independence (see Appendix A, Questions 11 and 14). Within the literature on the failure to launch phenomenon, the two criteria that have consistently been agreed upon was an individual's inability to become financially independent from parents or relatives or support their own housing independent of parents or relatives (Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). Thus, any response that indicated any level of financial or housing independence, per the options in Questions 11 and 14 of the demographic survey (Appendix A), loaded into the failure to launch category.

Two additional questions were also added to serve as exclusion criteria, "I have been diagnosed with a mental or physical illness that has hindered my normative development in educational or work settings," and "I am currently still a student and am on track to graduate or obtain my certificate within the normative timeframe for my program of study having never taken any form of leave of absence"; with a "yes" response on either question serving as exclusion criteria for the study. The first exclusion criteria question was included to account for extraneous physical and mental variables that could prevent normative development and, thus, corroborate failure to launch. The phrasing of this question was carefully chosen as it did not require participants to disclose any personal or identifying information; thus, respecting their autonomy and anonymity. Similarly, a response to this question was not required by any participant; however, non-answers were excluded from continuing to the 5F-WEL. The second question was included because an individual who was currently on a normative educational path (even

if they were still dependent on parents or relatives) cannot necessarily be considered predictive of succeeding to launch, but also cannot be said to have failed to launch having been currently in a normative developmental path (Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

Lastly, data on mentorship were included in the survey with a mentor being defined within the question as an adviser, guide, or life coach; not limited to professionals or professional services rendered, but also including natural relationships. This definition, along with the subsequent categorization:

- 0 = never had someone I considered a mentor
- 1 = had someone I considered a mentor but am no longer in touch with
- 2 = currently have someone I consider a mentor but have infrequent contact with
- 3 = currently have someone I consider a mentor and have frequent contact with

was used to identify the presence, or lack thereof, of a mentor and the quality of that relationship. The corresponding number from the ordinal scale selection was utilized as a mentorship scale; that is, the higher the number associated with the answer, the higher the quality of relationship with the mentor is or was. The reasoning for scaling mentorship in this manner was that most of the literature on mentorship was grounded in social exchange theory and posited that the quality of mentor-mentee relationship was the greatest variable in affecting positive change (Bedini & Anderson, 2003; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Hurd & Zimmerman, 2014; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2006).

Thus, rather than keeping the construct binary (did or did not have a mentor) it felt that the literature could benefit more through having this item rated in a Likert scale fashion. All questions on the survey were close ended, quantitative, questions in alignment with the research design.

While the 5F-WEL was researched extensively in the literature and found to have high levels of reliability and validity, the same cannot be said for the created demographic survey including the FTL and mentorship variables. One of the potential limitations to the current study was a lack of empirical instruments that already existed in the literature to measure the FTL and mentorship variables; therefore, the survey included items based on how literature defined both constructs. The survey sought to operationalize the variables in an easily accessible and understandable manner for participants so as not to confuse the constructs. The questions were phrased in a manner that loaned itself to high face validity to answer questions specific to the constructs. The instruments attempted to define and answer questions pertaining to the failure to launch phenomenon, quality of mentor-mentee relationship (if one existed), and quantitative data from the 5F-WEL on factors of wellness in searching for the relationship between and among all three variables.

Data Analysis Plan

IBM's Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was utilized to test for and analyze collected quantitative data from the 5F-WEL and demographic survey. The demographic survey, including the failure to launch (FTL) and mentorship variables, was exported directly into SPSS and scores on total wellness and the five

second-order factors of wellness from the 5F-WEL were manually imported as well after being converted to an Excel file. SPSS was also used to clean the data prior to running analyses (Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Warner, 2013). Frequency statistics were examined to explore whether there was any missing data, of which there was none. Participants who failed to answer any of the necessary exclusion criteria items on the demographic survey were dismissed from continuing to take the 5F-WEL; thus, ensuring that all required information was gathered per each participant. Once all item values were screened in SPSS, a series of MANOVAs and chi-square analyses were conducted to examine the research questions:

Research Question 1: What is the relationship between primary and second-order wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood?

$H_0$1: There are no significant differences in primary and second-order wellness factors between those who have failed to launch and those who have successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1a: The total wellness factor scores will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1b: The factor of creative self (i.e., thinking, emotion, control, work, and positive humor) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1c: The factor of coping self (i.e., leisure, stress-management, self-worth, and realistic beliefs) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1d: The factor of essential self (i.e., spirituality, gender identity, cultural identity, and self-care) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1e: The factor of social self (i.e., friendship and love) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

H_a1f: The factor of physical self (i.e., exercise and nutrition) will be significantly higher in the group that has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

Research Question 2: What is the relationship between mentorship and the successful transition into independent adulthood?

$H_0$2: There is no significant relationship between a person's exposure to mentorship and their successful transition into independent adulthood.

H_a2: There will be a significantly greater likelihood that a person who has successfully transitioned into independent adulthood has had more exposure to mentors than a person who has not successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

Research Question 3: What is the effect of mentorship on the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood?

$H_0$3: Mentorship will have no effect on the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood.

H_a3: Mentorship will moderate the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood.

A MANOVA was the preferred method for quantitatively testing the first research question as there were several measures of the dependent variable, wellness, in the total wellness factor as well as the five second-order factors (Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Warner, 2013). Similarly, the literature on wellness had established statistically significant relationships among these five second-order factors, culminating in total wellness, and thus the linearity of the dependent variables could be safely assumed which appropriately aligned with a MANOVA design (Abrahams & Balkin, 2006; Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Hattie et al., 2004; Lawson & Myers, 2011; Myers & Sweeney, 2004, 2005; Roscoe, 2009; Warner, 2013).

For the first research question – "What is the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood?" – a MANOVA was utilized to identify differing wellness profiles of subjects who are regarded as failure to launch versus not failure to launch (Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Warner, 2013). As mentorship was a categorical variable, a chi-square analysis was utilized for the second research question– "What is the relationship between mentorship and the successful transition into independent adulthood?" – to identify whether there was a significant difference on the mentorship scale between the two groups of successfully launched versus FTL. For the third research question – "What is the effect of mentorship on the relationship between wellness factors and successful

transition into independent adulthood?" – an additional two-way MANOVA was utilized but with also including mentorship as a categorical independent variable. These tests sought to identify whether mentorship moderated the relationship between the independent (FTL) and dependent (wellness factors) variables. The two categorical variables of FTL and mentorship were utilized as the independent variables. In testing for statistical significance, or lack thereof, of these relationships, a 95% confidence interval and traditional alpha threshold of 0.05 was utilized (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Warner, 2013).

Treats to Validity

External Validity

External validity was an important consideration in hoping to make the research generalizable (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015). One potential threat to external validity included the sampling procedure as it was completed online through MTURK (Amazon MTURK, n.d.). Not having face to face interaction with any of the participants made it difficult to verify much of the demographic variables; specifically, age. The target sampling population was chosen specifically as it aligned with the literature on failure to launch; focusing on the 18-to-34-year-old population (Bell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012). An online research environment did, unfortunately, open room for dishonesty not only in age, but in other demographic variables as well including the possibility of both intentional and unintentional misreporting. While the survey requested respondents to be as truthful as possible and ensure anonymity to the best of ability in the hope of incentivizing this

honesty, there was no foolproof method to ensure the complete transparency and trustworthiness of respondents.

The use of a web-based survey was another potential threat to external validity; first, due to the nature of surveys not providing exact measurements and, also, due to the potential of low response rates (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Burkholder et al., 2016; Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Warner, 2013). Surveys are not built for exact quantitative measurements but, rather, typically serve to get a general idea about a specific variable. This was no exception in the current study as there was no exact measurement associated with failing to launch or successful launching; instead, just a binary categorization. The same was true for the mentorship scale as it served as a general assumption around the quality of mentor-mentee relationship. Response rates were another consideration regarding external validity because there was nothing to suggest what differentiated individuals who choose to participate versus those who do not; again, making generalizability difficult. This could be due to a variety of reasons such as not having access to internet connection, differences in understanding of the variables, differences in resources to access and participate in the study, differences in interest (or lack thereof) level of the study, or bias; all of which may potentially serve as confounding variables related to the phenomena and variables being studied. The decision to utilize a web-based survey to save time, money, and additional resources came at the price of threatening external validity for the reasons stated above. Therefore, it should be noted that generalizability will also be threatened in this study and the subsequent results should be understood with this limitation in mind.

Internal Validity

Along with threatening generalizability, the use of a web-based survey design may have limited internal validity as well (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Burkholder et al., 2016; Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015). Potential confounding variables included not having access to the portion of the population who did not have internet access, uncertainty around whether participants understand the variables being measured, and additional demographic, ethnic, or bias issues that may confound results. To mitigate potential confounding variables and threats to internal validity, the current study attempted to clearly define and operationalize the variables in an accessible manner. Subsequently, once operationalized for participants, the survey questions pertaining to FTL and mentorship were designed in a highly face-valid manner. The questions were asked in a direct manner that sought to eliminate any confusion as to what was being asked and the questions asked were designed to only examine the effects of the variables being studied.

Similarly, the lack of an appropriately aligned empirical measurement for FTL and mentorship in previous literature served as a threat to internal and construct validity (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education, 2014; Anastasi, 1986; Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Burkholder et al., 2016; Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Whitely, 1983). The designation of a created survey instrument in measuring for variables was not only a threat to validity but also to reliability as there was no empirical evidence for the use of these measures prior to the current study. While

the questions had high face validity, this was still another concern to the current research that should be considered when addressing the results. To help mitigate these concerns, an expert panel was formed to help review the identified criteria for FTL and the mentorship scales. This panel included the dissertation chair, Dr. Monny Sklov; committee member, Dr. Carolyn King; and fellow doctoral candidates from Dr. Sklov's dissertation lab.

Construct Validity

Construct validity deals with validity on a higher level than would be required of face validity, content validity, or criterion-related validity as it goes beyond measuring specific items and instead looks to assess theoretical constructs and traits (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education, 2014; Anastasi, 1986; Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Whitely, 1983). Construct validity dives deeper into the realm of theory in assessing hypotheses pertaining to what constitutes the makeup of a specific construct and how a researcher can accurately measure said construct. It was through this knowledge that the survey questions pertaining to failure to launch and mentorship were developed. As described above, the questions pertaining to those variables have high face validity based on the theoretical underpinnings of each construct found within the literature.

However, the fact remained that there were no empirical measurements for either the failure to launch or mentorship variables in prior studies that aligned with this research; threatening the construct validity of the current study (American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on

Measurement in Education, 2014; Anastasi, 1986; Anastasi & Urbina, 1997; Whitely, 1983). Careful consideration was taken in the creation of the survey items pertaining to the FTL and mentorship variables, but that did not altogether mitigate this threat to validity. Without an empirically tested quantitative instrument to measure either of these variables, the external and internal validity were also threatened for reasons mentioned in their respective sections. The expert panel was formed and utilized as a method of checks and balances to help lessen these potential validity issues; however, it did not entirely mitigate all concerns. This, along with the other threats to validity as mentioned in this section, should be considered when analyzing the results of this study.

Ethical Procedures

All participants were provided with and required to sign informed consent forms prior to participating in the research (Walden University, 2014). The Institutional Review Board (IRB) set forth strict ethical codes and guidelines to protect participants and researchers, alike. The IRB asserted that there were three primary ethical principles which guided these regulations; justice, beneficence, and respect for persons. The idea of minimal risk infers that we, as the prospective researchers, have an ethical obligation to protect our participants and minimize any potential harm; be it physical or psychological (Walden University, 2014). The IRB asserted that there were several methods to minimize risk including protecting the privacy of participants, not exposing them to physical or psychological harm, utilizing sound empirical research methods and designs, and ensuring the protection of participants' standing in their personal, professional, and communal lives. The IRB created a comprehensive checklist which posited 40 ethical

considerations to have made prior to embarking on the research (Walden University, 2014, n.d.). The IRB also accounted for the fact that some research may still potentially, by nature, expose participants to some level of risk; in which case they asserted that the potential beneficial outcomes of the research must significantly outweigh these potential risks. Through this understanding, IRB approval was granted for this study prior to engaging in any sampling procedures to gather participants or subsequent collection of data. Upon review, IRB granted permission (Approval Number 05-30-19-0663740) to conduct this study on 5/30/2019, at which point I began participant and data collection.

For the current study, participants were provided with informed consent forms to ensure that they were aware of all potential benefits and risks for participating in the study prior to their participation (Walden University, 2014). Participants were made aware of the purposes of the research including how their information will be obtained, stored, protected, utilized, and properly disposed of following the conclusion of the study. Participants were also made aware that they were free to exit the study at any time should they choose not to complete the survey and 5F-WEL for any reason. Participants were provided with information for national educational, vocational, financial, and housing resources upon request (Appendix B). No additional follow-up procedures were necessary as the study was cross-sectional in nature.

Summary

In this chapter, the quantitative methodology and rationale for its implementation in this study was examined. A nonexperimental, cross-sectional, survey design best aligned to the goals of the current study in addressing each hypothesis. The dependent

(wellness), independent (FTL), and covariate (mentorship) variables were defined and operationalized quantitatively for use in the current research. Their operationalization was justified through prior literature including independent research on each variable. The utilization of MTURK was addressed as the method of obtaining participants while SurveyMonkey and Mind Garden were stated as the methods for data collection in the demographic survey and 5F-WEL, respectively (Amazon MTURK, n.d.; Mind Garden, 2018; SurveyMonkey, n.d.). The research questions and hypotheses clearly outlined the purposes of this research following the background and identified significance of this study in Chapters 1 and 2. Lastly, threats to validity and the ethical considerations per the chosen methods were addressed. Chapter 3 hoped to serve as an introduction and explanation to the data analysis to come in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to test for psychological factors that may be contributing to the failure to launch phenomenon, including measures of wellness and mentorship (Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2015; Arnett & Fishell, 2014; Furstenberg et al., 2005; Fussell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; Sachs, 2010; Settersten et al., 2008; Settersten & Ray, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). There were three research questions addressed in this study. The first tested for a relationship between the failure to launch variable (FTL) and wellness factors, while the second tested for a relationship between FTL and mentorship. With the third research question, I looked to test for the mediating effects of mentorship on the relationship between FTL and wellness. I used a demographic survey and the 5F-WEL to collect data related to these phenomena for the subsequent analyses (see Burkholder et al., 2016; Creswell, 2014; Frankfort-Nachmias & Leon-Guerrero, 2015; Myers & Sweeney, 2005; Warner, 2013). The results of the analyses indicated little in the way of a statistically significant relationship between FTL and wellness factors. While some second-order factors and discreet scales approached significance, there was not much that suggested measurements of wellness were predictive of FTL. There was, however, a connection between FTL and mentorship found within the data collected. In this chapter, I describe the data collection process, demographic frequencies, and analyses of the research findings.

Data Collection

I collected data for this study through online software as described in Chapter 3, comprising MTURK for the recruitment of participants; SurveyMonkey to gather the demographic survey data, including FTL and mentorship data; and Mind Garden to gather the 5F-WEL data (see Amazon MTURK, n.d.; Mind Garden, 2018; SurveyMonkey, n.d.). Approximately 600 participants completed the demographic survey over the first night of collection. From there, the surveys were filtered to remove any participant who met the exclusion criteria outlined in Chapter 3, leaving a pool of 336 eligible participants, which is displayed by gender and FTL in Table 1. The relationship between gender and FTL was not statistically significant, $\chi 2(1) = 0.009$, $p = 1.000$.

Descriptive Statistics and Frequencies

Table 1

Sample Pool: Failure to Launch by Gender Frequencies

	Successfully Launched	Failed to Launch	Total
Male	87	55	142 (42.3%)
Female	122	72	194 (57.7%)
Total	209 (62.2%)	127 (37.8%)	336

Of the 336 participants aged 18 to 34 years old, 127 (i.e., 37.8%) were classified as “failed to launch.” The 95% confidence interval around the sample proportion of 37.8% (+/- .052%) included the population proportion of failed to launch (i.e., 34%) as

reported by the U.S. Census Bureau (2018). As can be seen in Table 1, the gender breakdown of the sample of 366 included 42.3% male and 57.7% female. As for age, a higher number of participants fell into the 25- to 34-year-old age range (n = 292; 86.9 %) versus those in the 18- to 24-year-old age range (n = 44; 13.1 %; Table 2). For ethnicity (Table 3), the majority of participants fell into the White ethnic group (n = 250; see Table 3). This group accounted for approximately 68% of the total participants with Black or African (n = 42; 12.5%) being the next closest at approximately 12%.

Table 2

Sample Pool: Age Frequencies

	Frequency	Percent
18-24 years	44	13.1%
25-34 years	292	86.9%
Total	336	100%

Table 3

Sample Pool: Ethnicity Frequencies

	Frequency	Percent
White	229	68.2%
Black or African	42	12.5%
Other	65	19.4%
Total	336	100%

I invited all 336 participants to take the 5F-WEL on a first-come-first-serve basis over the course of the next day, leaving the final sample of 50, which was stratified by

gender and FTL to maintain representative cell frequencies. The frequencies by gender and FTL are presented in Table 4. Tables 5-6 also provide age and ethnic information for the final sample. All data were collected in approximately a 2-day span.

Table 4

Final Sample: Failure to Launch by Gender Frequencies

	Successfully Launched	Failed to Launch	Total
Male	16	8	24
Female	17	9	26
Total	33	17	50

Table 5

Final Sample: Age Frequencies

	Frequency	Percent
18-24 years	6	12.0%
25-34 years	44	88.0%
Total	50	100%

Table 6

Final Sample: Ethnicity Frequencies

	Frequency	Percent
White	32	64.0%
Black or African	6	12.0%
Other	12	24.0%
Total	50	100%

Study Results

As outlined, the final sample consisted of 50 total participants. There were 26 females (i.e., 52%) and 24 males (i.e., 48%). Of the total participants, 17 fell into the FTL group (i.e., 34%) and 33 fell into the successfully launched group (i.e., 66%). Each group had one more female than male. I conducted each analysis using a 95% confidence interval and traditional alpha threshold (i.e., $p < 0.05$) to test for significance. Each research question was analyzed per the proposed method outlined in Chapter 3. In the following subsections, I explore each research question, subsequent analysis, and additional analyses where appropriate. Each analysis is accompanied by the appropriate and respective tables for further review.

Research Question 1

I conducted a MANOVA (see Tables 7 through 9) to answer the first research question: What is the relationship between primary and second-order wellness factors and

successful transition into independent adulthood? It was hypothesized that wellness factors would have a significant relationship with the FTL variable. The MANOVA showed that Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was not found to be statistically significant, F (21, 3976.471) = 1.095, p = 0.344. Similarly, Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (see Table 8) was not found to be significant among any of the wellness factors, which indicated no violation of homogeneity of variance assumption. As such, I analyzed the rest of the results of the MANOVA. Wilk's Lambda (see Table 7) did not reveal a statistically significant relationship between the main effect of FTL and wellness factors, though it did approach significance, $\Lambda = 0.768$, F (6, 43) = 2.163, p = 0.065, $\eta^2 = 0.232$. While the results did not meet the alpha threshold of $p < 0.05$, there was a small effect found and, therefore, the tests of between-subjects effects for each wellness factor (see Table 9) were examined. None of the wellness factors were shown to be significantly related to the FTL variable; however, there were two second-order factors that approached significance, which were the social self, F (1, 48) = 3.700, p = 0.060, $\eta^2 = 0.072$, and the coping self, F (1, 48) = 3.220, p = 0.079, $\eta^2 = 0.063$. For the purposes of this study, the results did not provide support that total wellness or second-order wellness factors differ between those who have failed to launch and those who have successfully transitioned into independent adulthood.

MANOVA – Wellness and Failure to Launch (FTL) Tables

Table 7

Wellness and FTL Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	*F*	Hypothesis *df*	Error *df*	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pilal's Trace	0.986	488.826	6.000	43.000	0.000	0.986
	Wilk's Lambda	0.014	488.826	6.000	43.000	0.000	0.986
Failed to launch	Pilal's Trace	0.232	2.163	6.000	43.000	0.065	0.232
	Wilk's Lambda	0.768	2.163	6.000	43.000	0.065	0.232

Table 8

Wellness and FTL Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	Levine Statistic	*df*1	*df*2	Sig.
Total wellness	0.994	1	48	0.324
Creative self	0.109	1	48	0.743
Coping self	0.543	1	48	0.731
Social self	1.355	1	48	0.250
Physical self	0.026	1	48	0.872
Essential self	0.063	1	48	0.879

Table 9

Wellness and FTL Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.	Partial ETA Squared
Corrected model	Total wellness	92.376	1	92.376	1.104	0.299	0.022
	Creative self	88.200	1	88.200	0.836	0.365	0.017
	Coping self	362.602	1	362.602	3.220	0.079	0.063
	Social self	472.668	1	472.668	3.700	0.060	0.072
	Physical self	126.675	1	126.675	0.534	0.468	0.011
	Essential self	25.419	1	25.419	0.160	0.691	0.003

Research Question 2

I used a chi-square analysis (see Tables 10 through 12) to test the second research question: What is the relationship between mentorship and the successful transition into independent adulthood? It was hypothesized that mentorship would have a significant relationship with the FTL variable. Expected cell frequencies were examined to see whether there were any frequencies with an expected value of less than 5, of which there were three. As such, the analysis was conducted adding the Fisher's Exact Test to the analysis (see Table 11). The cross-tabulation (see Table 10) shows the relationship between level of mentorship and the FTL variable. Of the 17 participants who fell into the FTL category, only three (i.e., 17.7%) reported having a mentor at the time of data collection. Over half of the FTL group (n = 9; 52.9%) reported never having had a mentor and the remainder of that group (n = 5; 29.4%) reported having had a mentor but no longer being in contact with them; therefore, approximately 82% of the failed to launch group had no current exposure to mentors and less than half reported ever having had a mentor. The successfully launched group, on the other hand, reported a much higher exposure to mentors as only 6.1% of this group (n = 2) had never had someone they considered a mentor. The rest of the successfully launched group reported having a mentor with frequent contact (n = 9; 27.3%), having a mentor with infrequent contact (n = 8; 24.2%), and having had a mentor but no longer being in contact with (n = 14; 42.4%), which accounted for approximately 94% of this group having been exposed to mentors on some level. I found a statistically significant relationship between FTL and

mentorship, $\chi 2(3) = 16.567$, $p < 0.000$. The results of Fisher's Exact Test also aligned with this significant finding, $p = 0.001$, rejecting the null hypothesis.

Failure to Launch x Mentor Chi-Square

Table 10

Failure to Launch x Mentor Crosstabulation

	Never had a mentor	Had a mentor, no longer in contact with	Have a mentor but infrequent contact	Have mentor with frequent contact	Total
Successfully launched	2	14	8	9	33
% within Successfully launched	6.1%	42.4%	24.2%	27.3%	100%
Failed to launch	9	5	3	0	17
% within Failed to launch	52.9%	29.4%	17.6%	0.0%	100%

Table 11

Failure to Launch x Mentor Chi-Square

	Value	*df*	Exact Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	16.567	3	0.001
Likelihood Ratio	18.881	3	0.000
Fisher's Exact Test	15.831		0.001

Table 12

Failure to Launch x Mentor Symmetric Measures

	Value	Approximate Significance	Exact Significance
Phi	0.576	0.001	0.000
Cramer's V	0.576	0.001	0.000

Research Question 3

A two-way MANOVA (see Table 13) was utilized to answer the last research question: What is the effect of mentorship on the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood? This was run similarly to the analysis for the first research question, except with adding mentorship as a second categorical independent variable. The FTL by mentorship interaction effect is sensitive to a change in the relationship between FTL and wellness among those who have had varying experiences with mentors. No significant interaction effect was found for this analysis, therefore, the relationship between FTL and wellness factors was not moderated by the presence or lack of a mentor, $\Lambda = 0.855$, F (12, 74) = 0.515, $p = 0.899$, $\eta^2 = 0.075$ As was the case in the first MANOVA, there was no significant relationship found between FTL and wellness factors, $\Lambda = 0.755$, F (6, 38) = 2.054, $p = 0.082$, $\eta^2 = 0.245$; though, it did approach significance. The multivariate test also showed no significant relationship between mentorship and wellness factors, $\Lambda = 0.785$, F (18, 108) = 0.537, $p = 0.934$, $\eta^2 = 0.078$.

Two-Way MANOVA Mentorship on FTL and Wellness

Table 13

Failure to Launch, Mentorship, and Wellness Multivariate Tests

Effect		Value	*F*	Hypothesis df	Error *df*	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pilal's Trace	0.982	353.252	6.000	38.000	0.000	0.982
	Wilk's Lambda	0.014	353.252	6.000	38.000	0.000	0.982
Failed to launch	Pilal's Trace	0.245	2.054	6.000	38.000	0.082	0.245
	Wilk's Lambda	0.755	2.054	6.000	38.000	0.082	0.245
Mentor	Pilal's Trace	0.231	0.555	18.000	120.000	0.924	0.077
	Wilk's Lambda	0.785	0.537	18.000	107.966	0.934	0.078
Failed to launch x Mentor	Pilal's Trace	0.150	0.526	12.000	78.000	0.892	0.075
	Wilk's Lambda	0.855	0.515	12.000	76.000	0.899	0.075

Additional Hypotheses that Emerged and Statistical Tests

While no significant multivariate relationship was found between wellness factors and FTL, the p value ($p = .0650$) was close enough to statistical significance ($p < .05$) to warrant a further investigation into some of the discreet scales of wellness. As such, an additional MANOVA (see Tables 14 through 16) was conducted using the discreet scales within the social self (friendship, love) and coping self (leisure, stress management, self-

worth, and realistic beliefs). Wilks Lambda (Table 14) revealed a statistically significant main effect of FTL, $\Lambda = 0.749$, F (6, 43) = 2.398, $p = 0.044$, $\eta^2 = 0.251$. While Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances (Table 15) was not found to be significant, Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was found to be statistically significant, F (21, 3976.471) = 1.566, $p = 0.048$, indicating a potential violation of the equality of covariance matrices assumption. Of the discreet scales, two were found to be significantly related ($p < .05$) to FTL; realistic beliefs F (1, 48) = 4.351, $p = 0.042$, $\eta^2 = 0.083$, and self-worth F (1, 48) = 4.060, $p = 0.050$, $\eta^2 = 0.078$.

Discreet Scales MANOVA

Table 14

Discreet Scales Multivariate Test

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pilal's Trace	0.987	557.998	6.000	43.000	0.000	0.987
	Wilk's Lambda	0.014	557.998	6.000	43.000	0.000	0.987
Failed to launch	Pilal's Trace	0.251	2.398	6.000	43.000	0.044	0.251
	Wilk's Lambda	0.749	2.398	6.000	43.000	0.044	0.251

Table 15

Discreet Scales Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	Levine Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Leisure	0.432	1	48	0.514
Stress management	0.028	1	48	0.867
Self worth	0.475	1	48	0.494
Realistic beliefs	0.156	1	48	0.695
Friendship	0.844	1	48	0.363
Love	0.001	1	48	0.978

Table 16

Discreet Scales Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial ETA Squared
Corrected Model	Leisure	169.644	1	169.644	0.795	0.377	0.016
	Stress management	92.226	1	92.226	0.307	0.582	0.006
	Self worth	704.101	1	704.101	4.060	0.050	0.078
	Realistic beliefs	782.504	1	782.504	4.351	0.042	0.083
	Friendship	551.658	1	551.658	2.975	0.091	0.058
	Love	398.657	1	398.657	2.661	0.019	0.053

As FTL is comprised of two discreet variables, financial dependence and housing dependence, the results of the first two MANOVAs were intriguing enough to continue further exploring the data. As such, two new variables were created to account for each independently. A variable was created to dichotomize financial dependence versus financial independence. Likewise, a variable was created to dichotomize housing dependence versus housing independence. From there, two additional MANOVAs were run, this time utilizing the two new created variables. The results of the first MANOVA (see Tables 17 through 19) revealed a significant main effect of financial dependence on two of the wellness factors, $\Lambda = 0.721$, $F\ (6, 43) = 2.771$, $p = 0.023$, $\eta^2 = 0.279$. Neither nor Levene's test of equality of error variances (see Table 18) were found to be significant; thus, there was no violation the assumptions of equality of covariance

matrices and homogeneity of variance. In further analyzing the between-subjects effects (Table 19), two of the second-order factors of wellness were found to have a statistically significant relationship with financial dependence. Financial dependence accounted for approximately 10% of the variance in social self, F (1, 48) = 5.264, p = 0.026, η^2 = 0.099. Similarly, financial dependence accounted for approximately 9% of the variance in coping self, F (1, 48) = 4.754, p = 0.034, η^2 = 0.090. There were no significant effects found between housing dependence and wellness factors.

Financial Dependence and Failure to Launch MANOVA

Table 17

Financial Dependence Multivariate Test

Effect		Value	*F*	Hypothesis *df*	Error *df*	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Intercept	Pilal's Trace	0.985	471.889	6.000	43.000	0.000	0.985
	Wilk's Lambda	0.015	471.889	6.000	43.000	0.000	0.985
DepFinance	Pilal's Trace	0.279	2.771	6.000	43.000	0.023	0.279
	Wilk's Lambda	0.721	2.771	6.000	43.000	0.023	0.279

Table 18

Financial Dep Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

	Levine Statistic	*df*1	*df*2	Sig.
Total wellness	0.335	1	48	0.565
Creative self	0.426	1	48	0.584
Coping self	0.710	1	48	0.404
Social self	1.853	1	48	0.180
Physical self	0.000	1	48	0.995
Essential self	0.848	1	48	0.362

Table 19

Financial Dependence Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	Sig.	Partial ETA Squared
Corrected model	Total wellness	233.640	1	233.640	2.895	0.095	0.057
	Creative self	147.169	1	147.169	1.412	0.241	0.029
	Coping self	519.834	1	519.834	4.754	0.034	0.090
	Social self	652.622	1	652.622	5.264	0.026	0.099
	Physical self	390.095	1	390.095	1.684	0.201	0.034
	Essential self	290.825	1	290.825	1.898	0.175	0.038

While the second hypothesis regarding the relationship between FTL and mentorship was statistically significant, an additional chi-square analysis was conducted to address the violation of an assumption of chi-square concerning small sample sizes within cells. First, a new variable was created in SPSS that dichotomized whether participants currently had mentors or not. This new variable effectively dichotomized the four categories of mentorship in half. The first group consisted of those who reported never having a mentor and those who had a mentor but were no longer in contact with. The second group consisted of those who currently had a mentor but with infrequent contact as well as those who reported currently having a mentor with whom they had frequent contact. The subsequent chi-square analysis (see Tables 20 through 22) revealed a significant relationship between this new variable "current mentor" and FTL, $\chi 2(1) = 5.362$, $p = 0.032$.

Failure to Launch x Current Mentor Chi-Square

Table 20

Failure to Launch x Current Mentor Crosstabulation

	Don't currently have a mentor	Currently have a mentor	Total
Successfully launched	16	17	33
% within successfully launched	48.5%	51.5%	100%
Failed to launch	14	3	17
% within failed to launch	82.4%	17.6%	100%

Table 21

Failure to Launch x Current Mentor Chi-Square

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	5.362	1	0.021	0.032	0.020
Likelihood Ratio	5.740	1	0.044		
Fisher's Exact Test			0.022	0.032	0.020

Table 22

Failure to Launch x Current Mentor Symmetric Measures

	Value	Asymptotic Standard Error	Approximate Significance	Exact Significance
Phi	-0.327		0.021	0.032
Cramer's V	0.327		0.021	0.032
Pearson's R	-0.327	0.122	0.020	0.032
Spearman Correlation	-0.327	0.122	0.020	0.032

Next, a second new variable was created using SPSS to dichotomize ever having had a mentor versus never having had a mentor. A new chi-square analysis (see Tables 23 through 25) was conducted with this new variable and, again, a significant relationship was found between ever having had a mentor and FTL, $\chi 2(1) = 14.370$, $p = 0.000$.

Table 23

Failure to Launch x Ever has had a Mentor Crosstabulation

	Never has had a mentor	Has or has had a mentor	Total
Successfully launched	2	31	33
% within successfully launched	6.1%	93.9%	100%
Failed to launch	9	8	17
% within Failed to launch	52.9%	47.1%	100%

Table 24

Failure to Launch x Ever has had a Mentor Chi-Square

	Value	*df*	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	14.370	1	0.000	0.000	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	14.093	1	0.000	0.000	0.000
Fisher's Exact Test				0.000	0.000

Table 25

Failure to Launch x Ever has had a Mentor Symmetric Measures

	Value	Asymptotic Standard Error	Approximate Significance	Exact Significance
Phi	-0.536		0.000	0.000
Cramer's V	0.536		0.000	0.000
Pearson's R	-0.536	0.125	0.000	0.000
Spearman Correlation	-0.536	0.125	0.000	0.000

Summary

A MANOVA was used to test the first research question: What is the relationship between primary and second-order wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood? The null hypothesis was not rejected, as neither the total wellness factor nor any of the second-order factors of wellness were shown to have a statistically significant relationship with FTL. There were, however, two of the second-order factors that approached significance, the coping self ($p = 0.079$) and the social self ($p = 0.060$).

A chi-square analysis was conducted to test the second research question: What is the relationship between mentorship and the successful transition into independent adulthood? The null hypothesis was rejected as a significant relationship was found between mentorship and FTL ($p < 0.000$). Those who had reported successfully launching were shown to have a much higher exposure, both past and present, to mentors than the failure to launch group. It is worth noting that one of the limitations to this

analysis was the distributions amongst groups; that is, three of the groups had an expected cell frequency of less than five. To account for this, Fisher's exact test was used, and significance was still found ($p = 0.001$). This was, however, the only research question in the current study for which a null hypothesis was rejected.

A Two-Way MANOVA was utilized to test the third research question: What is the effect of mentorship on the relationship between wellness factors and successful transition into independent adulthood? Again, the null hypothesis was not rejected as there was no significant moderating effect of mentorship on the relationship between FTL and wellness factors ($p = 0.899$). Mentorship was not related to the total wellness nor second-order wellness factors ($p = 0.934$). In all, the wellness factors were unrelated to the FTL phenomenon and mentorship.

While Chapter 5 will speak more to the limitations of generalizability, the consequences of violating a chi-square analysis assumption concerned with low expected cell frequencies was addressed. Two new nonorthogonal mentorship variables were created in SPSS to clarify the relationship between mentorship and FTL. First, mentorship was dichotomized between those who currently had a mentor and those who did not. A significant relationship was found between this new variable "current mentor" and FTL, $p = 0.032$. The second dichotomy for mentorship was also created to compare those who never had any experience with a mentor with those who had. A significant relationship was also found for the relationship of "ever had a mentor" and FTL, $p = 0.000$.

Likewise, the analyses between FTL and wellness factors did show variables approaching significance that were worth further exploration. As such, another MANOVA was conducted to test for a relationship between the specific discreet scales within the coping self (leisure, stress management, self-worth, and realistic beliefs) and social self (friendship and love). There was a significant main effect found ($p = 0.044$), and further examination revealed that self-worth ($p = 0.050$) and realistic beliefs ($p = 0.042$) were both significantly related to FTL. During this testing, a question arose around the FTL variable itself in that it is comprised of two separate phenomena; financial dependence and housing dependence. Using SPSS, two new variables were created to represent both factors of the FTL variable independently. Two additional MANOVAs were conducted with total wellness and the five second-order factors of wellness serving as dependent variables in both. The first MANOVA had financial dependence serve as the independent variable and the second had housing dependence serve as the independent variable. The reason for conducting two one-way MANOVAs in this manner was that the interaction effect between financial dependence and housing dependence was already explored as these comprised the FTL variable to begin with. Financial dependence was shown to have a significant main effect ($p = 0.023$) and further analysis revealed a significant relationship between financial dependence and coping self ($p = 0.034$) as well as social self ($p = 0.026$). There were no significant findings for the relationship between wellness factors and housing dependence. The following section will further interpret these findings as well as address the limitations, recommendations, and implication for future studies.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to empirically identify factors outside of economic variables that may be contributing to the failure to launch phenomenon (see Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2015; Arnett & Fishell, 2014; Furstenberg et al., 2005; Fussell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; Sachs, 2010; Settersten et al., 2008; Settersten & Ray, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). I hypothesized that wellness factors would be higher in the group that successfully launched when compared to those who fell into the failure to launch group as defined through the literature explored in Chapter 2. Additionally, the presence or lack thereof a mentor was hypothesized to be a correlate of FTL as well as moderate the relationship between wellness factors and FTL. The results of this study showed that wellness factors were not significantly related to FTL, specifically as it pertained to the criteria of dependent housing. There was a significant, but weak, relationship between financial dependence and factors of wellness including the coping self ($p = 0.034$) and social self ($p = 0.026$). The presence of and frequency of contact with mentors, on the other hand, was shown to be significantly related to FTL ($p = 0.001$). Higher levels of mentorship were found in the successfully launched group than the failure to launch group. Mentorship was not found to be related to any wellness factors or did it moderate the relationship between such factors and FTL. In this chapter, I further interpret these findings as well as identify the limitations, recommendations, and the implications of the study to further research.

Interpretation of Findings

The results of this study neither confirmed nor denied the findings of the prior literature because there was no existing empirical research that connected the failure to launch phenomenon with wellness factors or mentorship when the current study was conducted (see Allen, 2017; Arnett, 2015; Arnett & Fishell, 2014; Furstenberg et al., 2005; Fussell et al., 2007; Kins & Beyers, 2010; Mykyta, 2012; Sachs, 2010; Settersten et al., 2008; Settersten & Ray, 2010; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017). I drew my hypotheses in this study from propositions in the failure to launch literature that suggested variables outside of economic factors may play a role in the successful or unsuccessful launching of this population into independent adulthood. For instance, Kins and Beyers (2010) and Baggio et al. (2017) only modestly measured factors of well-being quantitatively, and both groups of researchers acknowledged this as a limitation specifically in addressing the connection between wellness and the failure to launch phenomenon. As a result, I looked to extend the knowledge of the failure to launch phenomenon and wellness in this study through using a more comprehensive measurement of wellness, the 5F-WEL (Myers & Sweeney, 2004). The results of this study did not support the ideas of prior failure to launch literature because no statistically significant connection was found between wellness factors and the FTL variable. While some factors of wellness approached significance, these connections remained weak at best and did not offer enough empirical evidence to support the first hypothesis, in that there would be a connection between total wellness as well as the second-order factors of wellness and FTL.

With a larger sample size, the results may have possibly shown more significance. This was worth acknowledging as a potential limitation to this study and will be addressed in the next section. Variation in the overall wellness factors could in part be explained by the main effect of FTL, though the effect was not statistically significant (p = .065). Similarly, two second-order factors, the social self (p = 0.060) and the coping self (p = 0.079), also approached statistical significance. That being the case, further exploration seemed warranted for the purposes of this study in addressing these factors to better understand the nature of these potential effects. This led to the discovery of some significant findings as FTL related to the discreet scales of self-worth (p = 0.050) and realistic beliefs (p = 0.042). As for self-worth, per the operational definitions of these discreet scales on the 5F-WEL, these results suggested that individuals who failed to launch seemed to struggle more in areas of self-acceptance, valuing themselves as a unique individual, and acceptance of their own imperfections than those who had successfully launched. Similarly, those who successfully launched appeared to have a stronger acceptance of reality as it truly was and the discrepancies between that and what they desired, better ability in separating rationality from emotional responses, and were less prone to distorted and wishful manners of thinking such as "what should or ought to be" than those who failed to launch.

In this study, I continued to explore these themes by conducting additional MANOVAs to better understand the results. One such test was in separating the two criteria of FTL, financial dependence versus housing dependence, to see if either were more significantly connected to the wellness factors. This was the case because housing

dependence had a nonsignificant relationship with wellness factors, but financial dependence was shown to have a significant main effect ($p = 0.023$) as well as significant relationships with the second-order factors of the coping self ($p = 0.034$) and social self ($p = 0.026$). This not only confirmed prior literature on the connection between the failure to launch phenomenon and economic factors but also expanded this knowledge in addressing the areas of wellness that were also affected. These results showed that individuals who endorsed being financially dependent on parents or relatives also reported decreased satisfaction in interpersonal areas, such as friendship and love, than their counterparts who were financially independent. Similarly, those who were financially independent endorsed higher levels of efficiently managing leisure time, greater ability in effectively managing stress, higher self-worth, and more realistic beliefs than those who were financially dependent on parents or relatives. These results indicated a dichotomy in the failure to launch group being that housing dependence was not a significant factor of this group – specifically, as it related to areas of wellness – but financial dependence was.

Outside of these findings, wellness factors were not shown to have any significant relationship with FTL ($p = 0.082$) or mentorship ($p = 0.934$). In the two-way (i.e., FTL X mentorship) MANOVA, wellness factors revealed no relationship to mentorship. However, these findings were not entirely contradictory to the five major life tasks of work, friendship, love, self, and spirit from Adlerian theory. For instance, the social self, which encompasses friendship and love, was higher in those who were financially independent than those who were financially dependent. Similarly, self-worth scores

were lower for the failure to launch group versus the successfully launched group. Therefore, the wellness factors that I found to be significant, or that approached significance, were all related to the major life tasks of Adlerian theory except for spirit. Still, Adlerian theory in isolation, specifically in addressing wellness factors, did not account for enough of the variance in FTL to be considered significant. It was, instead, social exchange theory – specifically, mentorship – wherein I found a significant variance between the FTL and successfully launched groups.

With the second research question, I assessed the relationship between mentorship and the successful transition into independent adulthood. A significant relationship was found between mentorship and FTL ($p < 0.001$). Specifically, those who reported greater levels of mentorship were also more likely to have successfully launched to independent adulthood. These findings aligned with the prior literature on social exchange theory because those who had greater levels of exchanges with those considered an adviser, guide, or life coach (i.e., mentor) were far more likely to have gained the skills and tools necessary for them to have successfully launched into independent adulthood (Brady et al., 2017; Codier & Wilson, 2014; DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Phillips et al., 2008; Rhodes et al., 2002). While these findings were important, and their implications and recommendations will be discussed in further sections, they should first be understood within the scope of the limitations of the current study, specifically as it pertained to small cell frequencies for the chi-square analysis. To account for this, I conducted two additional chi-square analyses by regrouping levels of mentorship. The first new mentorship variable dichotomized the sample into one group who either never had a

mentor or had one at one time, and a second group who currently had a mentor but with variable contact. The second new mentorship variable dichotomized whether participants ever had mentors at one time or still currently had a mentor but with variable contact, and a second group who never had a mentor. Both analyses revealed significant relationships because having a current mentor ($p = 0.032$) and whether an individual ever had a mentor ($p = 0.000$) were statistically significantly related to FTL.

While the successfully launched group was almost evenly distributed between having (51.5%; $n = 17$) versus not having a current mentor (48.5%; $n = 16$), I found the FTL group to have significantly fewer current relationships with mentors at the time of data collection. Only 3 of the 17 FTL group participants (i.e., 17.6%) reported currently having a mentor (e.g., Chapter 4, Table 11). As for the dichotomy of ever having had a mentor versus never having had a mentor, 93.9% of the successfully launched group was accounted for by participants who reported exposure to mentors, past or current, while only 6.1% of this group reported never having had a mentor (e.g., Chapter 4, Table 11). This was not the case for the failed to launch group, which was close to evenly distributed between ever having had a mentor (52.9%; $n = 8$) and never having had a mentor (47.1%; $n = 9$).

Thus, while those who successfully launched were approximately evenly split amongst currently having versus not currently having a mentor, almost the entirety of this group did endorse having had exposure to mentors at some point. On the other hand, while those who failed to launch were approximately evenly split amongst ever having had a mentor versus never having had a mentor, almost the entirety of this group reported

not currently having a mentor. A possible inference to draw from these results suggested that it may be far more important for those who are still currently attempting to launch to have mentorship relationships, whereas these relationships become less significant once the individual does successfully launch. In other words, having a mentor may significantly impact an individual's ability to successfully transition to independent adulthood, and once this transition is accomplished, the individual may then also become less dependent on the relationship with their mentor.

Limitations of the Study

There were some potential limitations noted in Chapter 1 that should be readdressed following the conclusion of the data collection and analysis. The greatest limitation to this study was the sample size (n = 50). While G*Power indicated this would be a large enough sample size, the chi-square analysis regarding mentorship levels and FTL, specifically, suffered in having three of the cells have frequencies below three. I used Fisher's Exact Test to account for this issue; however, conducting that test did not negate this issue from having been a limitation to the generalizability of this study.

Similarly, there was a disproportionate percentage of those who fell into the 25- to 34-year-old age range versus the 18- to 24-year-old age range. In fact, only six participants (i.e., 12%) fell into the 18- to 24-year-old age range, which left much to be desired as far as understanding how wellness factors and mentorship related to the failure to or successful launching in this group. While the 95% confidence interval around the sample proportion of 37.8% (+/- .052%) included the population proportion of failed to launch (i.e., 34%) as reported by the U.S. Census Bureau (2018), this may have still been

a limitation given that I hoped to identify mitigating factors to the FTL phenomenon in this study and the 18- to 24-year-old age range, specifically, would be considered the beginning phases of this issue.

The use of online sampling, surveying, and data collection did not prove to be a limitation to the current study as I took measures within the participation letter and letter of informed consent so as not to introduce any bias or make potential participants aware of the criteria being sought for them to advance to the 5F-WEL for additional compensation. Still, given the anonymity of MTURK (i.e., only unique MTURK ID numbers consisting of a combination of random numbers and letters were used), there was no measure to ensure the honesty of participants, which was worth noting. While this last limitation would be difficult to control for, given the nature of the study, some of the other limitations could be accounted for in future studies.

Recommendations

Having noted the limitations of this study, my recommendations for future studies would first include recruiting a larger sample. While G*Power indicated a sample of 50 would be sufficient to indicate a weak-to-moderate effect, this study did have issues of generalizability due to the uneven cell frequencies as a result of using a sample this size. Two variables should be more carefully addressed in future studies: the mentorship variable and the age group variable.

While the current study intended to proportionally stratify the failure to launch versus successfully launched groups, having only 17 participants in the failure to launch group (34%) divided across four levels of mentorship was difficult to account for.

Having a larger sample would help to mitigate the issues around small cell sizes when analyzing the levels of mentorship in the failure to launch population. Not only could this help identify a more accurate effect but, in doing so, it would also increase the generalizability of the study.

Another suggestion for future studies may be to utilize age as a ratio level measurement rather than grouping them into the categories used in the current study (18-24 versus 25-34). An issue that occurred in the current study was the population of MTURK users who were looking to take surveys seemed to be far more skewed toward the 25-34 age range and may not be representative of the population as a whole. While the current study wanted to be inclusive of the entire age range of this population, the data collection methods were unable to account for the skew wherein only six of the participants (12%) fell into the 18-24 age range. Thus, the results of the current study should be understood within the limitation of the data being more representative of the portion of the failure to launch population over the age of 24. While it was beneficial to understand the 25-34 age group, specifically in addressing factors that may have helped them launch, the current study did not effectively address the experiences of the younger age range of 18-24. It stands to reason, though, that in attempting to mitigate the failure to launch phenomenon, data related to those who are entering or in the beginning phases of the emerging adulthood phase could help better understand this issue.

As for the relationship that was found between FTL and mentorship, there was also much to be desired regarding why this relationship existed as well as what some of the other potential variables contributing to it may be. Thus, future studies should not

only look to gather a greater sample but also begin addressing the ways in which having a mentor has helped this population successfully transition into independent adulthood. While the prior literature on social exchange theory has helped inform the benefits of these socially driven transactions, the current study did not endorse any relationship between mentorship and wellness factors as was hypothesized. Still, higher levels of engagement with mentors were shown to be positively correlated with successful launching to independent adulthood.

Similarly, as the current study did not differentiate between a natural relationship or professional relationship with mentors, understanding the other potential variables outside of wellness factors could also inform programs that utilize professional mentors. If the presence of a mentor was enough to influence successful launching, then these programs should look to better understand what specific qualities of these relationships are most important in mitigating failure to launch. As the failure to launch phenomenon is largely defined by an individual's inability to independently provide for their own finances or housing, these programs may look to train mentors in helping emerging adults around skills related to job acquisition, financial responsibility, and other independent life skills.

Lastly, it may also be worthwhile to reassess the effects of FTL on wellness factors given the results of the current study while being mindful of the sample size limitation. Specifically, financial dependence was shown to have a statistically significant relationship which accounted for some variance among wellness factors whereas housing dependence did not show any meaningful results. Future studies which

address the effects on this population that are financially dependent, specifically as it related to the factors of coping self and social self, could also serve to better inform this field of study.

Implications

While more research is needed, the current study did shed light on some potential implications for mitigating the failure to launch phenomenon. The most significant finding of the current study was the relationship between levels of mentorship and FTL. That is, those who successfully launched reported more exposure and frequency of contact to those they considered mentors. On the individual level, the study also revealed that those who were financially independent – one of the conditions defined for successful launching – also endorsed higher levels of social self and coping self. These individuals felt more fulfilled in their relationships as well as a greater ability to effectively manage stress, higher self-worth, more realistic beliefs, and a greater ability to manage leisure time than their counterparts who had failed to launch. While mentorship was not directly related to these wellness factors, nor did it moderate the relationship of FTL and these wellness factors, the implications suggested that mentorship may be a mitigating factor for failing to launch; thus, also indirectly influencing positive change in these specific wellness factors.

These findings also had significant implications on the familial level seeing as the failure to launch phenomenon was largely defined by individuals who were dependent on parents or relatives financially or for housing. The inference was that the individuals who have failed to launch have also burdened the family seeing as they were responsible

for providing where these individuals could not provide for themselves. It stands to reason that, at the very least, helping individuals to successfully launch would be less of a financial drain on the family system. However, the current study did not look to specifically address this issue so any other implications for positive social change on this level should be addressed further in future studies.

Likewise, while the current study sought to address variables other than economic factors, there were societal implications to helping these individuals successfully launch. For individuals to have successfully launched, through being financially independent and securing their own housing independently, it could also be inferred that these individuals were positively contributing to the economy through paying taxes and being active in the housing market. Again, this was not the primary focus of the current study, and other studies have looked more into exploring the financial implications of the failure to launch phenomenon, but it was worth noting as the primary purpose of the current study was looking for ways to mitigate the failure to launch phenomenon to affect positive social change across individual, familial, and societal domains.

Perhaps the most significant implication of the current study is the call to better understand why exposure to mentors positively related to successful launching to independent adulthood. The current study did not support the relationship between wellness factors and mentors, thus, it is uncertain as to how these mentors are affecting positive change in this population outside of the theoretical lens of social exchange theory. Still, further research should address how it is, specifically, that these social exchanges are helping foster greater levels of independence. This may also necessitate

further exploration as to the nature of naturally occurring mentors versus professional services rendered. For the latter, policy and procedures should be addressed in creating mentorship programs to specifically help mitigate the failure to launch phenomenon. This may include training mentors to not only serve as positive role models, advisors, and guides but in also assessing their ability to provide and teach mentees the skills necessary for independent launching.

Conclusions

In this quantitative study, I sought to empirically identify psychological factors that may mitigate the growing failure to launch phenomenon. It was hypothesized that this issue would be related to factors of wellness as well as mentorship through the lens of Adlerian theory and social exchange theory, respectively. The current study did not reveal a significant relationship between wellness factors and FTL; though, there were significant findings as financial dependence related to higher levels of social self as well as coping self. There were, however, significant findings that indicated those who reported higher levels of mentorship were also more likely to have successfully launched into independent adulthood. This chapter further explored and interpreted these findings. This included addressing limitations to the current study as well as making recommendations for future studies based on the current findings. Likewise, the implications for positive social change on the individual, familial, and societal levels were addressed; including the call to better understand mentorship relationships as they occur naturally versus the recommendation for programs to train professional mentors to better serve this population. There is still much to be known about the connection

between mentorship and the failure to launch phenomenon, including additional variables that may moderate this relationship, but the current study was an important first step in beginning to empirically address strategies to mitigate this growing issue.

References

Abrahams, S., & Balkin, R. S. (2006). Review of the five factor wellness inventory (5F-WEL). Retrieved from Mind Garden, Inc.

Allen, P. (2017). Examining our assumptions about emerging adulthood: The "failure to launch" stereotype demeans young adults and provides a grossly distorted view of an exceedingly complicated developmental process. *Counseling Today*, *59*(12), 52–58. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Allen, T. D., Eby, L. T., & Lentz, E. (2006). Mentorship behaviors and mentorship quality associated with formal mentoring programs: Closing the gap between research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *91*(3), 567. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.3.567

Amazon Mechanical Turk. (n.d.). *Human intelligence through an API.* Retrieved from https://www.mturk.com/

American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

American Psychological Association. (2016). *PsycARTICLES*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/databases/psycarticles/index.aspx?utm_source=ljxpress&utm_medium=display_email&utm_campaign=psycarticles

Anastasi, A. (1986). Evolving concepts of test validation. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *37*(1), 1–15. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.37.1.1

Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological testing* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Arnett, J. J. (1998). Learning to stand alone: The contemporary American transition to adulthood in cultural and historical context. *Human Development*, *41*(5-6), 295-315. doi: 10.1159/000022591

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, *55*(5), 469-480. doi: 10.1037//0003-066x.55.5.469

Arnett, J. J. (2001). Conceptions of the transition to adulthood: Perspectives from adolescence through midlife. *Journal of adult development*, *8*(2), 133-143. doi: 10.1023/a:1026450103225

Arnett, J. J. (2003). Conceptions of the transition to adulthood among emerging adults in American ethnic groups. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, *100*, 63-76. doi: 10.1002/cd.75

Arnett, J. J. (2007). Suffering, selfish, slackers? Myths and reality about emerging adults. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *36*(1), 23-29. doi:10.1007/s10964-006-9157-z

Arnett, J. J. (2015). *Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties* (Vol. 2). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Arnett, J. J., & Fishel, E. (2014). *Getting to 30: A parent's guide to the 20-something years*. Workman Publishing.

Baggio, S., Studer, J., Iglesias, K., Daeppen, J.-B., & Gmel, G. (2017). Emerging adulthood: A time of changes in psychosocial well-being. *Evaluation & Health Professions*, *40*(4), 383–400. doi:10.1177/0163278716663602

Bedini, L. A., & Anderson, D. M. (2003). The benefits of formal mentoring for practitioners in therapeutic recreation. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*, *37*(3), 240-255. Retrieved from the National and Recreational Park Association http://www.nrpa.org/

Bell, L., Burtless, G., Gornick, J., & Smeeding, T. M. (2007). *Failure to launch: Cross-national trends in the transition to economic independence* (No. 456). LIS Working Paper Series. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10419/95476

Bitter, J. R. (2007). Review of boy smarts: Mentoring boys for success at school. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *63*(1), 118-120. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Boniwell, I., Osin, E., & Sircova, A. (2014). Introducing time perspective coaching: A new approach to improve time management and enhance well-being. *International Journal of Evidence Based Coaching and Mentoring*, *12*(2), 24. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Brady, B., Dolan, P., & Canavan, J. (2017). 'He told me to calm down and all that': A qualitative study of forms of social support in youth mentoring relationships. *Child & Family Social Work*, *22*(1), 266-274. doi: 10.1111/cfs.12235

Burkholder, G. J., Cox, K. A., & Crawford, L. M. (Eds.). (2016). *The scholar-practitioner's guide to research design*. Baltimore, MD: Laureate Publishing.

Burn, K., & Szoeke, C. (2016). Boomerang families and failure-to-launch: Commentary on adult children living at home. *Maturitas*, *83*, 9-12. doi: 10.1016/j.maturitas.2015.09.004

Carnevale, A. P., Hanson, A. R., & Gulish, A. (2013). Failure to launch: Structural shift and the new lost generation. *Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce*. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Chen, P., Ellsworth, P. C., & Schwarz, N. (2015). Finding a fit or developing it: Implicit theories about achieving passion for work. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *41*(10), 1411-1424. doi: 10.1177/0146167215596988

Chen, Y., Watson, R., & Hilton, A. (2016). A review of mentorship measurement tools. *Nurse Education Today*, *40*, 20-28. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2016.01.020

Cobigo, V., Lachapelle, Y., & Morin, D. (2010). Choice-making in vocational activities planning: Recommendations from job coaches. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, *7*(4), 245-249. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-1130.2010.00273.x

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Psychology Press, Taylor and Francis Group, LLC.

Cordier, R., & Wilson, N. J. (2014). Mentoring at Men's Sheds: An international survey about a community approach to health and well-being. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, *22*(3), 249-258. doi: 10.1111/hsc.12076

Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *78(*1), 98–104. doi: doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.78.1.98

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Daskivich, T. J., Jardine, D. A., Tseng, J., Correa, R., Stagg, B. C., Jacob, K. M., & Harwood, J. L. (2015). Promotion of wellness and mental health awareness among physicians in training: perspective of a national, multispecialty panel of residents and fellows. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, *7*(1), 143-147. doi: 10.4300/jgme-07-01-42

Dawley, D. D., Andrews, M. C., & Bucklew, N. S. (2010). Enhancing the ties that bind: Mentoring as a moderator. *Career Development International*, *15*(3), 259–278. doi: doi.org/10.1108/13620431011053730

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, *49*(3), 182. doi: 10.1037/a0012801

Desmarais, R., Sacco-Dion, C., Sacco, F. C., & Decoteau, N. (2014). Delinquency diversion using home-based psychotherapy and therapeutic mentoring. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, *11*(2), 163-171. doi: 10.1002/aps.1402

DeWit, D. J., DuBois, D., Erdem, G., Larose, S., Lipman, E. L., & Spencer, R. (2016). Mentoring relationship closures in Big Brothers Big Sisters community mentoring programs: Patterns and associated risk factors. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *57*(1-2), 60-72. doi: 10.1002/ajcp.12023

Dörnyei, Z. (2000). Motivation theories. In M. Byram (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of language teaching and learning* (pp. 432–435). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis Ltd..

DuBois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. (2005). Natural mentoring relationships and adolescent health: Evidence from a national study. *American Journal of Public Health*, *95*(3), 518-524. doi: 10.2105/ajph.2003.031476

Edwards, K. J., Hershberger, P. J., Russell, R. K., & Markert, R. J. (2001). Stress, negative social exchange, and health symptoms in university students. *Journal of American College Health*, *50*(2), 75-79. doi: 10.1080/07448480109596010

Eller, L. S., Lev, E. L., & Feurer, A. (2014). Key components of an effective mentoring relationship: A qualitative study. *Nurse Education Today*, *34*(5), 815-820. doi: 10.1016/j.nedt.2013.07.020

Ellis, P. D. (2010). *The essential guide to effect sizes: Statistical power, meta-analysis, and the interpretation of research results*. Cambridge, England. Cambridge University Press.

Ergüner-Tekinalp, B., Johnson-Migalski, L., & Belangee, S. E. (2018). Diversity and social justice: Applying theory and adapting practices. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, *74*(1), 1-3. doi: 10.1353/jip.2018.0000

Fiske, S. T. (2014). *Social beings: Core motives in social psychology* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Frankfort-Nachmias, C., & Leon-Guerrero, A. (2015). *Social statistics for a diverse society* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Furstenberg, F. F., Rumbaut, R. G., & Settersten, R. A. (2005). On the frontier of adulthood: Emerging themes and new directions. *Network to Transitions on Adulthood*, *(1)*, 3-25. doi: 10.7208/chicago/9780226748924.003.0001

Fussell, E., Gauthier, A. H., & Evans, A. (2007). Heterogeneity in the transition to adulthood: The cases of Australia, Canada, and the United States. *European Journal of Population/Revue Européenne de Démographie*, *23*(3-4), 389-414. doi: 10.1007/s10680-007-9136-4

Geen, R. G. (1984). Human motivation: New perspectives on old problems. In A. M. Rogers & C. Scheirer (Eds.), *The G. Stanley Hall lecture series, Vol. 4* (pp. 9–57). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved from PsycBOOKS.

Gettings, P. E., & Wilson, S. R. (n.d.). Examining commitment and relational maintenance in formal youth mentoring relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *31*(8), 1089–1115. doi:10.1177/0265407514522145

Glenn, L. A., & Van Wert, S. (2010). Failure to launch: Confronting the male college student achievement gap. *New England Journal of Higher Education*, *24*(3), 14-16. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Gomes, M. (2017). Problem unsolved: African-American male dropouts. *Principal Leadership, 18*(*1*), 51-53. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Google Scholar. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/

Greenwood, N., & Habibi, R. (2014). Carer mentoring: A mixed methods investigation of a carer mentoring service. *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, *51*(3), 359-369. doi: 10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2013.06.011

Hattie, J. A., Myers, J. E., & Sweeney, T. J. (2004). A factor structure of wellness: Theory, assessment, analysis, and practice. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *82*(3), 354-364. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2004.tb00321.x

Henig, R. M. (2010). The post-adolescent, pre-adult, not-quite-decided life stage. *The New York Times Magazine*, *22*, 30-37. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Holtbrügge, D., & Ambrosius, J. (2015). Mentoring, skill development, and career success of foreign expatriates. *Human Resource Development International*, *18*(3), 278-294. doi:10.1080/13678868.2015.1071989

Hultgren, U., Palmer, S., & O'Riordan, S. (2013). Can cognitive behavioural team coaching increase well-being. *The Coaching Psychologist*, *9*(2), 100-110. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Hurd, N. M., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2014). An analysis of natural mentoring relationship profiles and associations with mentees' mental health: Considering links via support from important others. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *53*(1-2), 25-36. doi: 10.1007/s10464-013-9598-y

Jaimet, K. (2016). Transitions: Adjusting to working life. *The Canadian Nurse*, *112*(4), 16. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Kaplan, J. (n.d.). Failure to launch: How to help your child avoid pitfalls and successfully transition to adulthood. Washington Anxiety Center of Capital Hill. Washington, DC.

Karcher, M. J., & Lindwall, J. (2003). Social interest, connectedness, and challenging experiences: What makes high school mentors persist?. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *59*(3), 293-315. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Kins, E., & Beyers, W. (2010). Failure to launch, failure to achieve criteria for adulthood?. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *25*(5), 743-777. doi: 10.1177/0743558410371126

Kline, T. (2005). *Psychological testing: A practical approach to design and evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lapointe, É., & Vandenberghe, C. (2017). Supervisory mentoring and employee affective commitment and turnover: The critical role of contextual factors. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *98*, 98–107. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2016.10.004

Larson, R. (2006). Positive youth development, willful adolescents, and mentoring. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *34*(6), 677-689. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20123

Lawson, G., & Myers, J. E. (2011). Wellness, professional quality of life, and career-sustaining behaviors: What keeps us well?. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *89*(2), 163-171. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00074.x

Maslow, A. (1965). Self-actualization and beyond. Retrieved from ERIC.

Majiros, C. (2013). Beyond social exchange theory: A theoretical shift for mentoring relationships in the federal workplace. *Advances in Social Work, 14*(2)*,* 531-543. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Merriam-Webster Dictionary. (n.d.). *Definition of mentor*. Retrieved from https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/mentor

Mind Garden. (2018). Retrieved from https://www.mindgarden.com/

Myers, J. E., Luecht, R. M., & Sweeney, T. J. (2004). The factor structure of wellness: Reexamining theoretical and empirical models underlying the wellness evaluation of lifestyle (WEL) and the five-factor wel. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, *36*(4), 194-208. doi: 10.1080/07481756.2004.11909742

Myers, J. E., & Sweeney, T. J. (2004). The indivisible self: An evidence-based model of wellness. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, *60*, 234-244. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Myers, J., & Sweeney, T. (2005). *Five factor wellness inventory: Adult, teenage, and elementary school versions*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden, Inc.

Myers, J. E., & Sweeney, T. J. (2008). Wellness counseling: The evidence base for practice. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *86*(4), 482-493. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2008.tb00536.x

Myers, J.E., Sweeney, T.J., &Witmer, J.M. (1998). *The wellness evaluation of lifestyle.* Greensboro, NC: Authors.

Myers, J. E., & Williard, K. (2003). Integrating spirituality into counselor preparation: A developmental, wellness approach. *Counseling and Values*, *47*(2), 142-155. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-007x.2003.tb00231.x

Myers, J. E., Willse, J. T., & Villalba, J. A. (2011). Promoting self-esteem in adolescents: the influence of wellness factors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *89*(1), 28-36. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2011.tb00058.x

Mykyta, L. (2012). Economic downturns and the failure to launch: The living arrangements of young adults in the US 1995-2011. *US Census Bureau Social, Economic and Housing Statistics Division (SEHSD) Working Paper*, *24*. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

O'Mally, J., & Antonelli, K. (2016). The effect of career mentoring on employment outcomes for college students who are legally blind. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, *110*(5), 295-307. doi: 10.1177/0145482x1611000502

Peng, C. J., Long, H., & Abaci, S. (2012). Power analysis software for educational researchers. *Journal of Experimental Education, 80*(2), 113-136. doi:10.1080/00220973.2011.647115

Phillips, D., Hagan, T., Bodfield, E., Woodthorpe, K., & Grimsley, M. (2008). Exploring the impact of group work and mentoring for multiple heritage children's self-esteem, well-being and behaviour. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, *16*(3), 310-321. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2524.2008.00761.x

Pomeroy, H., & Clark, A. J. (2015). Self-efficacy and early recollections in the context of Adlerian and wellness theory. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *71*(1), 24–33. doi: 10.1353/jip.2015.0005

Rachele, J. N., Cuddihy, T. F., Washington, T. L., & McPhail, S. M. (2013). Reliability of the five factor wellness inventory among male adolescents. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, *69*(2). Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Rhodes, J. E., Bogat, G. A., Roffman, J., Edelman, P., & Galasso, L. (2002). Youth mentoring in perspective: Introduction to the special issue. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 30*(2), 149-155. doi: 10.1023/a:1014676726644

Rhodes, J. E., & DuBois, D. L. (2008). Mentoring relationships and programs for youth. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *17*(4), 254-258. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00585.x

Rhodes, J. E., Schwartz, S. E., Willis, M. M., & Wu, M. B. (2017). Validating a mentoring relationship quality scale: Does match strength predict match length?. *Youth & Society*, *49*(4), 415-437. doi: 10.1177/0044118X14531604

Rhodes, J. E., Spencer, R., Keller, T. E., Liang, B., & Noam, G. (2006). A model for the influence of mentoring relationships on youth development. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *34*(6), 691-707. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20124

Roscoe, L. J. (2009). Wellness: A review of theory and measurement for counselors. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *87*(2), 216-226. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2009.tb00570.x

Rutti, R.M., Helms, M.M. and Rose, L.C. (2013). Changing the lens: Viewing the mentoring relationship as relational structures in a social exchange framework. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, (5), 446. doi: 10.1108/LODJ-11-0097

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, *55*(1), 68. doi: 10.1037//0003-066x.55.1.68

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. *Handbook of Self-Determination Research*, 3-33. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Sachs, B. (2010). *Emptying the nest: Launching your young adult toward success and self-reliance*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.

Sax, L. (2009). *Boys adrift: The five factors driving the growing epidemic of unmotivated boys and underachieving young men*. Findaway World LLC. doi: 10.1001/jama.298.22.2684

Settersten Jr, R. A., Furstenberg, F. F., & Rumbaut, R. G. (Eds.). (2008). *On the frontier of adulthood: Theory, research, and public policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Settersten Jr, R. A., & Ray, B. (2010). What's going on with young people today? The long and twisting path to adulthood. *The Future of Children*, 19-41. doi: 10.1353/foc.0.0044

Shifron, R., & Rasmussen, P. R. (2009). Advice from the masters I: Mica Katz. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, *65*(1), 90-96. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Sobowale, K., Zhou, A. N., Fan, J., Liu, N., & Sherer, R. (2014). Depression and suicidal ideation in medical students in China: A call for wellness curricula. *International Journal of Medical Education*, *5*, 31-36. doi: 10.5116/ijme.52e3.a465

Stavredes, T. (2011). *Effective online teaching: Foundations and strategies for student success*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Survey Monkey. (n.d.). *Power your curiosity with our data platform*. Retrieved from https://www.surveymonkey.com/

Sweeney, T. J., & Witmer, J. M. (1991). Beyond social interest: Striving toward optimum health and wellness. *Individual Psychology: Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research & Practice, 47*(4), 527-540. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Thomas, A. M. (2006). Technology: Friend or foe of mentoring relationships? *Educational Media & Technology Yearbook*, *31*, 153–164. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). More than one-third of young adults live at home. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2017/comm/young-adults.html

U.S. and World Population Clock. (n.d.). *United states population by age and sex.* Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/populationwidget/popclock/

van Emmerik, I. J. H. (2008). It is not only mentoring: The combined influences of individual-level and team-level support on job performance. *Career Development International*, *13*(7), 575–593. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Walden University. (2014a). Office of research integrity and compliance: Institutional review board for ethical standards in research. Retrieved from http://academicguides.waldenu.edu/researchcenter/orec

Walden University. (2014b). The importance of power and sample size to research conducted. *Walden University Academic Skills Center.* Retrieved from https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/ASCstats/samplesize

Walden University. (2014c). Library: *Keyword Searching*. Retrieved from http://academicguides.waldenu.edu/keyword

Walden University. (2016). Effect size. *Walden University Academic Skills Center.* Retrieved from https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/ld.php?content_id=33847167

Walden University Library. (n.d.-a) *Databases by name.* Retrieved from http://academicguides.waldenu.edu/az.php

Walden University. (n.d.-b). Research ethics planning worksheet. Retrieved from https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/researchcenter/orec/application

Warner, R. M. (2013). *Applied statistics: From bivariate through multivariate techniques* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Watson, J. C., & Kissinger, D. B. (2007). Athletic participation and wellness: Implications for counseling college student-athletes. *Journal of College Counseling*, *10*(2), 153-162. doi: 10.1002/j.2161-1882.2007.tb00015.x

Weiler, L. M., Zarich, K. J., Haddock, S. A., Krafchick, J. L., & Zimmerman, T. S. (2014). A comprehensive model of mentor experiences: Perceptions, strategies, and outcomes. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *42*(5), 593-608. doi: 10.1002/jcop.21640

Weiler, L. M., Zimmerman, T. S., Haddock, S., & Krafchick, J. (2014). Understanding the experience of mentor families in therapeutic youth mentoring. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *42*(1), 80-98. doi: 10.1002/jcop.21595

Wells, T., Fishman, E. K., Horton, K. M., & Raman, S. P. (2015). Millennial mind-set: Pursuing the next generation of consumers. *Journal of the American College of Radiology*, *12*(7), 742-744. doi: 10.1016/j.jacr.2015.03.031

Whitely, S. E. (1983). Construct validity: Construct representation versus nomothetic span. *Psychological Bulletin*, *93*(1), 179–197. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.93.1.179

Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2000). Expectancy–value theory of achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *25*(1), 68-81. doi: 10.1006/ceps.1999.1015

Wilmarth, M. J., Nielsen, R. B., & Futris, T. G. (2014). Financial wellness and relationship satisfaction: Does communication f?. *Family & Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, *43*(2), 131. doi:10.1111/fcsr.12092

Woodyard, A., & Grable, J. (2014). Doing good and feeling well: Exploring the relationship between charitable activity and perceived personal wellness. *Voluntas: International Journal Of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations*, *25*(4), 905-928. doi:10.1007/s11266-013-9382-5

Wright, J. (2005). Workplace coaching: what's it all about?. *Work*, *24*(3), 325-328. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.

Xiao, J. J., Chatterjee, S., & Kim, J. (2014). Factors associated with financial independence of young adults. *International Journal of Consumer Studies, 38*(4), 394–403. doi: 10.1111/ijcs.12106

Appendix A: Demographic Survey

1. Please *ONLY* provide your unique Mechanical Turk (MTurk) Worker ID.

2. Are you currently a U.S. Citizen living in the United States of America?

- Yes
- No

3. Which box below best represents your current age?

- Under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35+

4. Which box below best represents your biological birth sex?

- Male
- Female

5. Which box below best represents the ethnicity you most identify with?

- White or Caucasian
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- Asian or Asian American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Another race

6. Which box below best represents your current location setting?

- Rural
- Suburban
- Urban/City

7. Which box below best represents your current marital status?

- Single
- In a relationship
- Married
- Divorced
- Annulled
- Separated
- Widowed

8. Which box below best represents your highest level of education completed?

- No high school
- Some high school
- General Education Diploma (GED)
- High School Diploma
- Some college
- Bachelors
- Masters
- Doctorate

9. I am currently a student.

- Yes
- No

10. If you answered "yes" to being a student: I am currently still a student and am on track to graduate or obtain my certificate within the normative timeframe for my program of study having never taken any form of leave of absence.

- Yes
- No
- N/A - I am not currently a student

11. Which box below best represents your current housing situation?

- I live with my parents or relatives who provide for my housing
- I do not live with my parents or relatives, but they provide for my housing (either financially or by providing the housing for me)

- I do not live with my parents or relatives nor do they provide for my housing in any way
- I live with my parents or relatives, but I provide their housing without any support from them

12. Which box below best represents your employment status?

- Unemployed
- Self-employed part-time
- Self-employed full-time
- Part-time
- Full-time
- Retired

13. Which box below best represents your socio-economic status?

- Lower (less than $30,000 household income)
- Lower-Middle ($30,000 to $50,000 household income)
- Middle ($50,000 to $100,000 household income)
- Upper-Middle ($100,000 to $350,000 household income)
- Upper ($350,000+ household income)

14. Which box below best represents your current financial situation?

- I am financially dependent on parents or relatives for mostly everything
- I am financially dependent on parents or relatives for some things
- I am not financially dependent on parents or relatives for anything/I am completely financially independent

15. Which box below best represents your experience(s) with a mentor? (A mentor is defined as an adviser, guide, or life coach; not limited to professionals or professional services rendered, but also including natural relationships)

- I have never had someone I considered a mentor
- I had someone I considered a mentor but am no longer in touch with
- I currently have someone I consider a mentor, but have infrequent contact with
- I currently have someone I consider a mentor and have frequent contact with

16. I have been diagnosed with a mental or physical illness that has hindered my normative development in educational or work settings (Please note: a response to this question is NOT required to complete this survey).

- Yes
- No

Appendix B: Postsurvey Resources for Participants

US Housing Resources: https://www.usa.gov/housing

US Financial Resources (including funding for business, education, home, and personal needs)**:** http://www.usfinancialresources.net/

Appendix C: Permission to Use Five-Factor Wellness Inventory

Permission for Adriano Marcoccia to reproduce 1 copy within one year of May 1, 2019

For Publications:

We understand situations exist where you may want sample test questions for various fair use situations such as academic, scientific or commentary purposes. No items from this instrument may be included in any publication without the prior express written permission from Mind Garden, Inc. Please understand that disclosing more than we have authorized will compromise the integrity and value of the test.

For Dissertation and Thesis Appendices:

You may not include an entire instrument in your thesis or dissertation, however you may use the four sample items specified by Mind Garden. Academic committees understand the requirements of copyright and are satisfied with sample items for appendices and tables. For customers needing permission to reproduce the four sample items in a thesis or dissertation, the following page includes the permission letter and reference information needed to satisfy the requirements of an academic committee.

Online Use of Mind Garden Instruments:

Online administration and scoring of the Five Factor Wellness Inventory is available from Mind Garden, (https://www.mindgarden.com/99-five-factorwellness-inventory). Mind Garden provides services to add items and demographics to the Five Factor Wellness Inventory. Reports are available for the Five Factor Wellness Inventory.

If your research uses an online survey platform other than the Mind Garden Transform survey system, you will need to meet Mind Garden's requirements by following the procedure described at mindgarden.com/mind-garden-forms/58remote-online-use-application.html.

All Other Special Reproductions:

For any other special purposes requiring permissions for reproduction of this instrument, please contact info@mindgarden.com.

www.mindgarden.com

To Whom It May Concern,

The above-named person has made a license purchase from Mind Garden, Inc. and has permission to administer the following copyrighted instrument up to that quantity purchased:

Five Factor Wellness Inventory

The four sample items only from this instrument as specified below may be included in your thesis or dissertation. Any other use must receive prior written permission from Mind Garden. The entire instrument form may not be included or reproduced at any time in any other published material. Please understand that disclosing more than we have authorized will compromise the integrity and value of the test.

Citation of the instrument must include the applicable copyright statement listed below.
Sample Items:

I engage in a leisure activity in which I lose myself and feel like time stands still.

I am satisfied with how I cope with stress.

I eat a healthy amount of vitamins, minerals, and fiber each day. I often

see humor even when doing a serious task.

Sincerely,

Robert Most
Mind Garden, Inc. www.mindgarden.com