MOTIVATED IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION IN A CULTURAL CONTEXT

MARIANA MARTIN

FEBRUARY 2014

MOTIVATED IDENTITY CONSTRUCTION IN A CULTURAL CONTEXT

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS (CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY)

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA

BY

MARIANA MARTIN

FEBRUARY 2014

SUPERVISOR: DR ARMAS E. E. SHIKONGO

ABSTRACT

The present study investigated the concept of motivated identity construction, using a sample of 104 participants who were recruited through convenient sampling. The following motives were selected: self-esteem, continuity, belonging, efficacy, distinctiveness and meaning. These were the motives that previous studies found to be centrally involved in the process of identity construction. The key role of culture in identity construction was also critically investigated. The study used a quantitative approach and employed an already existing questionnaire for data collection. The participants' cultural orientation towards individualism/ collectivism was determined by measuring their beliefs about personhood and their degree of religiosity. The data was analysed using independent-samples t-tests and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). The study found statistically significant differences between males and females in relation to the motive of efficacy. In terms of age, the study also found a statistically significant difference between the participants who were below 18 years of age and those who were at least 18 years of age when the two age groups were compared in relation to the meaning motive. However, the magnitude of the differences in the means was small. The study did not find any statistically significant differences in relation to the following motives: belonging, continuity, distinctiveness, efficacy, meaning and positive self-esteem between the various cultural groupings compared. These findings suggest that those identity motives seem to be equally applicable to individuals from different cultural backgrounds.

DECLARATIONS

I, Mariana Martin, declare hereby that this study is a true reflection of my own research, and that this work, or part thereof has not been submitted for a degree in any other institution of higher education.

……. Date……..

Mariana Martin

DEDICATION

This thesis is primarily dedicated to my beloved late sister, Maria-Goretti Amutse, for having believed in my ability to excel and for the immense love she has shown me. This thesis is, further, dedicated to my mother, Rosina Ipumbu, for being an exemplary person, to my sister Frederika Shigwedha (Amutse) for her faith in me and to my sister Esther Itoolwa (Kotze) for propelling me to be the individual she can look up to.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

"One piece of log creates a small fire, adequate to warm you up, add just a few more pieces to blast an immense bonfire, large enough to warm up your entire circle of friends; needless to say that individuality counts, but teamwork dynamites". ~ Jin Kwon

To Dr Maja Becker, Miss Ellinor Owe and Dr Vivian L. Vignoles from the University of Sussex, UK for firstly inciting my interest in the field of identity construction and for your tireless mentoring. Without you, the motives of identity construction might have remained unexplored in the Namibian context.

To my supervisor, Dr A. Shikongo, for your readiness to jump aboard the last minute. The role you played in guiding me with the formation of this thesis has been crucial to its materialisation. My heartfelt gratitude goes out to you.

To the principals of the A. Shipena Secondary School, Augustineum Secondary School, David Bezuidenhout High School and the Jakob Marengo Tutorial College for allowing me to conduct my study at their schools. Additionally, my gratitude is extended to the grade 11 teachers of these schools for their assistance in the distribution and collection of the questionnaires and to the grade 11 students of the same schools for using their valuable time to participate in the study.

Finally, to all my friends, family, colleagues and everyone that has encouraged, supported me or has in any way contributed to the development of this thesis.

Above all, I thank the heavenly Father for the strength, perseverance and countless blessings bestowed upon me during this testing time

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

This thesis is a report of a study on the motives involved in the construction of identities. The first chapter of the thesis provides a point of reference for this study. It introduces the orientation of the study and presents the problem statement. The chapter also provides justification for the present study and highlights the research questions along with the objectives of the study and hypotheses of the study. Additionally, this chapter provides the conceptual and operational definitions of the key terms of the study.

1.1 Orientation of Study

Identity shapes the basis of every individual's character as a human being. Identities convey information about who people are, what they are all about, and help to set apart one individual from the other, making people truly unique beings. From Erik Erikson's (1950, 1968) theory on identity development it is grasped that the accomplishment of a sense of identity leads to people feeling rejuvenated and acceptable (Santrock, 2008). On the other hand, failure to gain a sense of who one is, or failure to gain a sense of direction during adolescence can result in identity confusion. This either results in adolescents retreating and distancing themselves from their friends and their family members, or in them engrossing themselves in the world of their peers, thereby losing their identities to the groups they are a part of through identity diffusion (Santrock, 2008).The process of identity development is,

thus, crucial to the existence of human beings and is known to play a significant function not only during adolescence, but also from infancy to old age (Erikson, 1950; 1968: in Santrock, 2008).

Not only do individuals tend to focus on formulating as well as upholding a sense of positive self-regard or self-esteem when developing their identities, but they also pay more attention to findings that uphold a positive self-evaluation. This is the conclusion drawn by various social psychologists (Vignoles, Regalia, Manzi, Golledge & Scabini, 2006). It is detailed that people commonly use approaches that improve themselves when making interpersonal and intergroup social comparisons. People are also inclined to positively appraise themselves as well as members of their group on a variety of aspects. As is further elucidated, a threatened self-esteem may lead to sadness or depression, or to efforts to decrease harm done to identities, either through the modification of thoughts or behaviour, or through aggressive acts towards the source of threat (Sedikides & Gregg, 2003). Amongst others, the motive of self-esteem is, therefore, considered to greatly contribute to the processes involved in identity construction.

Apart from the self-esteem motive, many arguments were also raised that additional motives may be as responsible for processes related to identity and subsequent behaviours (Aharpour & Brown, 2002; Breakwell, 1987; Capozza, Brown, Aharpour & Falvo, 2006). As such, studies that centre on self-evaluation have now shifted to include the motivational processes of self-enhancement, self-verification, self-assessment and sometimes also, self-improvement (Dauenheimer, Stahlberg, Spreemann, & Sedikides, 2002). For example, Vignoles et al. (2006) demonstrated that other than the self-esteem motive, motives for continuity,

distinctiveness, meaning, belonging, and efficacy each play a role in guiding the processes by which people construct their identities. This was found to be the case among various populations. The implication could, thus, be made that the same processes are involved in identity constructions amongst individuals, irrespective of the specific groups or populations they may find themselves part of.

1.2 Problem Statement

Recent studies by Vignoles et.al (2006) concluded that the process of identity construction is influenced by motives for distinctiveness, belonging, meaning, self-esteem, continuity and efficacy. In spite of extending their studies over six decades of the life span as well as making comparisons between males and females, and despite focusing on two different countries, the studies of Vignoles et.al exclusively centred on participants from European countries. Vignoles et.al, hence, proposed that the above motives generally influence identity construction in all individuals without extending their research to individuals residing outside cultural contexts that are typically individualistic.

The universalistic notions of identity motives without more inclusive research could, thus, easily mask the role of socio-cultural influences on the process of identity construction.

To address this problem, the present study focused on resolving the following question: What is the role of culture in the motives of identity construction in a non-European context, specifically in an African context?

1.3 Justification of the Study

Justification for the present study is partly based on its novelty, as it was observed that very little research on the motives of identity construction has been conducted in Africa, particularly in Namibia.

Despite a number of studies being conducted in Africa with regards to identity construction in general, such studies are largely concerned with issues of the development of national, racial or ethnic identities after colonialism. An example of such a study is that by Snyman (2005), which documents the development of identities in post-apartheid South Africa. Studies on identity construction in the region now also seem to be centred on the effects of HIV/AIDS on the development of identities. To illustrate, Breidlid and Baxen (2010) documented how HIV/AIDS amongst other factors shapes individual and collective identities.

In Namibia, a research trend similar to those of other African countries is observable. Efforts on investigating identity construction rest with a look at how identity development of individuals living along the Namibian border is affected by colonial influences (Dobler, 2010). The development of a national identity in post-colonial Namibia (Sixtensson & Hamma, 2005) has also been investigated. One also finds research on the identity development of young postcolonial Namibians (Fairweather, 2006) amongst others. However, there seem to be no studies conducted with Namibian participants concerning the motives behind identity construction.

At the same time, the present study is also expected to fill a gap in academic research by extending the knowledge base that currently exists in the field of motivated identity construction in Namibia and in the African context in general.

1.4 Research Objectives

The overall objectives of the present were to;

1.4.1 Investigate whether the findings of Vignoles et al. (2006) - that people value those identity elements that provide a greater sense of self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, and meaning - are universally applicable and to

1.4.2 Establish whether predictions that ways of satisfying motives for positive self-regard, continuity, distinctiveness, belonging, efficacy, meaning, self-improvement, security and broadening perspective vary meaningfully among different socio-cultural groups.

1.5 Research Hypotheses

In order to achieve this study's research objectives, the following hypothesis were tested:

H1: Individuals from a collectivistic culture are more likely to construct their identities around the motive of belonging as compared to individuals from an individualistic culture.

H2: Individuals from an individualistic culture are more likely to construct their identities around the motive of distinctiveness as compared to individuals from a collectivistic culture.

H3: Individuals from a collectivistic culture are more likely to construct their identities around the motive of continuity as compared to individuals from an individualistic culture.

H4: Individuals from an individualistic culture are more likely to construct their identities around the motive of efficacy as compared to individuals from a collectivistic culture.

H5: There will be no significant difference between individuals from individualistic and collectivistic cultures in relation to their focus on the motive of self-esteem when constructing their identities.

H6: There will be no significant difference between individuals from individualistic and collectivistic cultures in relation to their search for meaning when constructing their identities.

H7: There will be significant differences between individuals with different demographics in relation to the involvement of the motives of belonging, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, meaning and self-esteem in the construction of their identities.

1.6 Definition and Operationalisation of Key Terms

1.6.1. *Identity*

Conceptually, identity is defined by Santrock (2008) as a sense of self, which persists through time within a social world. According to Santrock, this personal description of an individual by him/herself includes vocational, political, religious, relational, intellectual, sexual, physical and personality aspects, amongst others. The present study takes on this definition and adopts a comprehensive definition of 'identity', considering depictions at the personal and collective levels of self-presentation (Jameson, 2007; Zhang & Huxham, 2009). The study also defines 'identity' as based

on the subjective psychological experiences of a person, which include cognitive, emotional and social interactional aspects (Vignoles et al., 2006), instead of on objective observations (Jameson, 2007). Further included in this definition are social and cultural aspects (Jameson, 2007; Vignoles et al., 2006) including role identity (Desrochers, Andreassi & Thompson, 2002).

Operationally, this study measured the participants identities through the answers generated from the question "who are you?", which is incorporated into the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* that was used in this study.

1.6.2. Identity Construction

Conceptually, this study defined identity construction as the practice of endlessly developing or shaping, reinforcing, modifying, improving, or upholding an awareness of being consistently unique. This is the definition adopted from Traavik (2010). Identity construction is further regarded by this study as both a process as well as a product (Zhang & Huxham, 2009; Schachter, 2005) of any event leading to the attainment of a particular identity.

Operationally, this study also measured identity construction through the answers generated from the question "who are you?", which is incorporated into the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* that was used in this study. The responses the participants gave to this question were rated in relation to their perceived centrality (how important the statement is in defining who they are), positive affect (how happy or unhappy they feel about each of their given responses things), and identity enactment (how much they show people in their everyday actions that they are each of the things they described in response to the given question). The scores on these

dimensions were subsequently used to calculate a composite measure of identity priority, which reflects processes involved in the construction of the particular individuals' identities.

1.6.3. Culture

Conceptually, this study defined culture by classifying it to encompass biological factors such as race, age, sex (Jameson, 2007) and the system of shared beliefs, values, customs, behaviours, and other products of a particular group. A broad conceptualisation of culture, incorporating in its definition elements such as socioeconomic status, religion (Santrock, 2008) gender, age (Jameson, 2007), ethnicity, and orientation towards individualism/ collectivism (Hofstede, 1991) was adopted.

Operationally, this study measured culture with respect to the above specified attributes. Qualitatively, culture was derived from the participants' indications of their gender, ethnicity and age in a section in the *Identity Motives Questionnaire*, which collects the participants' demographic characteristics. Quantitatively, culture was measured by assessing the participants' levels of religiosity and lay contextualism, which were used as indicators of collectivism/ individualism. Lay contextualism reflects the importance people place on social and background characteristics in their self-definitions, while religiosity taps into both subjective religious experience and behavioural aspects related to religious activity.

With regards to contextualism, participants graded their agreement/disagreement with statements such as "to understand a person well, it is essential to know about which social groups he/she is a member of". As far as

religiosity is concerned, this was measured by the importance the participants placed on religion to them, how much they perceived religion to influence their everyday behaviour, the frequency at which they reported to attend religious activities, and the frequency at which they reported to engage in prayer or meditation.

1.6.4 Cultural Orientation: Individualistic and Collectivistic Continuum

Conceptually, cultural orientation was regarded by this study to describe a person's inclination towards Gert Hofstede's dimension of collectivism versus individualism (Hofstede, 1991). This dimension refers to the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups such that people in an individualistic environment would regard their individual rights as more important than those of the groups that they may belong to, whereas a collectivistic environment is made up of people born into strong extended families or tribal communities with paramount loyalties.

Operationally, this study measured cultural orientation in terms of levels of Hofstede's (1991) dimensions of individualism/ collectivism. Like culture, cultural orientation was also expressed through the participants' evaluations of the importance of social and societal characteristics in their self-definitions, together with their subjective religious experiences and behavioural aspects related to religious activity. Again, participants assessed their agreement/disagreement with statements such as "to understand a person well, it is essential to know about which social groups he/she is a member of" to indicate their level of contextualism. Also, as an alternative indication of orientation towards individualism/ collectivism, religiosity was measured by the importance the participants placed on religion to them, how much they perceived religion to influence their everyday behaviour, the

frequency at which they reported to attend religious activities, and the frequency at which they reported to engage in prayer or meditation.

1.6.5. Identity Motives

Conceptually, this study defined identity motive as a demand to see oneself in any particular manner (Vignoles et al., 2006). It is assumed that identity aspects providing greater motive satisfaction will be perceived as more central and enacted publicly to a greater extent than those providing lesser motive satisfaction. Hence, motive satisfaction associated with aspects of identity can be used to predict their relative centrality within people's subjective identity structures, as well as the extent to which people enact them in their everyday lives.

Operationally, the presence of the identity motives was determined by respectively associating each of the identity aspects generated with the question "who are you?" with feelings of distinctiveness, continuity, self-esteem, belonging, efficacy and meaning. To achieve this, the following questions were used: "How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you, in any sense, from other people?", "How much does each of these things give you a sense of continuity, between past, present and future, in your life?", "How much does each of these things make you see yourself positively?", "How much does each of these things make you feel you belong, that you are included among or accepted by people who matter to you?", "How much does each of these things make you feel competent and capable?", "How much does each of these things give you the sense that your life is meaningful?" (Vignoles et al., 2006).

The identity motives that were focused on by this study are described below:

- *Self-Esteem Motive*

The self-esteem motive was used in this study to refer to inducements to uphold positive notions of the person (Gecas, 1982: in Vignoles et al., 2006). The self-esteem motive was measured in this study by the following question: "How much does each of these things make you see yourself positively?"

- *Continuity Motive*

The continuity motive was used in this study to describe the necessity to have a feeling of connection between one's past, present and future within one's identity (Breakwell, 1986: in Vignoles et al., 2006). The continuity motive was measured in this study by the following question: "How much does each of these things give you a sense of continuity—between past, present and future—in your life?"

- *Belonging Motive*

As used in this study, the belonging motive refers to the desire to experience closeness to as well as acceptance by other people (Baumeister & Leary, 1995: in Vignoles et al., 2006). The belonging motive was measured in this study by the following question: "How much does each of these things make you feel you "belong"—that you are included among or accepted by people who matter to you?"

- *Distinctiveness Motive*

For the purposes of this study, the distinctiveness motive was regarded as the need to uphold an awareness of separation from other people (Vignoles, Chryssochoou, & Breakwell, 2000: in Vignoles et al., 2006). The distinctiveness motive was measured in this study by the following question: "How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you—in any sense—from other people?"

- *Meaning Motive*

The meaning motive was used in this study to indicate the need to feel that one's life has intent and value (Baumeister, 1991: in Vignoles et al., 2006). The meaning motive was measured in this study by the following question: "How much does each of these things give you the sense that your life is 'meaningful'?"

- *Efficacy Motive*

The efficacy motive, as used in this study, describes the requirement to feel capable to manage and direct one's life (Breakwell, 1993: in Vignoles et al., 2006). The efficacy motive was measured in this study by the following question: "How much does each of these things make you feel competent and capable?"

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter gives an overview of the literature related to the key variables of this study. Since this study investigated the motives of identity construction from a cultural perspective, literature in the field of culture and cultural orientation, identity and identity construction, as well as identity motives is examined.

2.1 Culture

The world 'culture' may signify different things for different people. This researcher came across views that culture concerns mental occurrences, while others argued that culture is about shared behavioural patterns (Strauss, 1992). There were also those that maintained that culture is more than just either one of the two. In Strauss (1992), Geertz (1973c) insisted that culture is something that is social as well as public in the sense that it is shared by groups of people and is expressed through rituals, artefacts, and so forth. So, although Hall (1959) asserted in Jameson (2007) that culture, as influential a force as it might be, is invisible, Geertz did not regard culture as an abstract entity. He declared that it is a combination of observable conducts, items and symbols, and private psychological processes giving meaning to these practices and objects.

Similarly, culture is explained by the Roshan Cultural Heritage Institute (2001) to refer to language, the social aspects of human contact and to the ways in which people perceive, interpret, and understand the world around them. As further elucidated by the Institute, culture can also be regarded to include expressions

through arts and sciences, the shared social pursuits within a community, as well as to spirituality. Culture is also habitually used to symbolize race (Lifschitz & Oosthuizen, 2001) and is found in various literary pieces to be based on the practices and beliefs that become associated with an ethnic group.

Hofstede (1991) asserted that people have unique ways of thinking, feeling and acting that are acquired through learning. He defined culture as consisting of such shared experiences that discern groups of individuals from others, and recognised five dimensions along which the particular differences are expected to occur. One of Hofstede's five cultural dimensions centres on collectivism versus individualism. This dimension refers to the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups such that people in an individualistic environment would regard their individual rights as more important than those of the groups that they may belong to, whereas a collectivistic environment is made up of people born into strong extended families or tribal communities with paramount loyalties.

Although many researchers adopted an inclusive definition of culture, culture was not always operationalised in a broad, comprehensive manner. As brought to attention by Jameson (2007), Hofstede (1980) only attended to national differences while studying differences between cultures. Yet, he defined culture as the "collective programming of the mind" (p. 13). Similarly, Haworth and Savage (1989): in Jameson (2007) also limited the focus of the pictures representing their channel-ratio model for intercultural communication to variations in nationality. However, the model seemed applicable to different cultural contexts.

Gudykunst and Kim (1992): in Jameson (2007) also limited their focus on nationality when they investigated culture even though they refer to culture as a

"'systems of knowledge' shared by a relatively large group of people" (p. 13). Furthermore, Hecht, Collier and Ribeau (1993): in Jameson, as well as Trompenaars (1994): in Jameson also restricted their concentration on certain aspects of the culture despite recognising the wider meaning of the term.

It, therefore, appears that it was the trend to concentrate on a single part of culture, especially when it comes to studies of identity. This inclination was explained by Jameson, (2007) to be partly due to practical reasons. She explained that because data about participants' socioeconomic class, ethnicity, religion, and other elements of cultural identity are not always accessible, it is less problematic and demanding to use information relating to nationality. Jameson also explained that using different variables such as religion and socioeconomic class, amongst others, in studies of culture makes the methodology and interpretation of results more difficult.

Another reason for the inclination to only focus on selected cultural aspects where studies of the identity are concerned could be the view that some researchers might have that cultural identity is split into disassociated parts. According to Jameson (2007), Collier and Thomas (1988) as well as Hecht et al. (1993) considered gender, racial, ethnic and national identities as alternating to take centre stage depending on the situation at hand as opposed to these identities helping to form as sense of the complete person in combination.

It could be inferred from Jameson (2007) that studying culture inclusively is important as every aspect of an individual's background plays a role in the sense of self that gets established in a person. Also, people regard themselves as having integrated identities. Therefore, a cohesive concept of cultural identity needed to be

opted for (Jameson, 2007). Failure to incorporate different cultural elements in studies of the identity also presents a number of shortfalls. According to Jameson, one of them is that few people consider nationality and ethnicity, which are commonly used to represent culture, when describing who they are. Thus, focusing only on nationality or ethnicity could result in important facets of people's sense of identities being missed.

Economic, social and educational class all have a bearing on the values, behaviour, and attitudes of people. Because people sharing any one of these characteristics often have similar thought patterns, values and behaviours that are different from those of people from other classes, individuals often have cultural traditions not specific to their national or ethnic backgrounds (Jameson, 2007). Similarly, as is additionally learnt from Jameson, language also helps create particular cultures not necessarily representative of certain ethnic groups or nationalities. This is to a degree because communication styles and dialects help to characterise a person's connection to a particular group.

Apart from language and class, biological factors such as race, age, sex also contribute to cultural identity, mainly because of the common beliefs and perceptions that people with similar biological features adopt through social interaction. Religion is another cultural factor identified by Jameson (2007) to transcend beyond nationality and ethnicity. So aside from nationality and ethnicity a host of elements can evidently be used to describe culture. Despite there being various approaches to looking at culture, the notion that culture refers to shared practices was continuously implied.

Also clearly stressed is the significant role played by cultural factors in

stimulating the development of certain identities. The study of Banerjee and Dittmar (2007) was amongst the various that demonstrated a direct link between social factors and the motives behind identity construction. Banerjee and Dittmar found that as a result of peer group processes, the motives of the elementary school children that participated in their research were in the main materialistic. They explained that a key conceptualisation of materialism puts forward that individuals that are greatly materialistic are not only convinced that obtaining material goods is a primary life goal, but they actually perceive the act of obtaining material goods as central to their self-definitions. In this instance it became evident that social factors play a big role in guiding identity motives.

Like Banerjee and Dittmar (2007), Klein, Spears and Reicher (2007) also observed identity construction to be largely influenced by social factors. Klein et al. brought to view that the self-concepts of individuals are affected by the behaviours of audiences as the definitions and the content of identities rely on how these identities are articulated through group behaviour. They explained that an identity only bears weight if it can be expressed in practice and acknowledged by others. Thus, they asserted that the construction of identities greatly depends on other people's reactions to the identities formulated.

2.2 Cultural Orientations: Individualist and Collectivist

Literature suggests that individuals can be orientated towards a cultural dimension not characteristic of the wider group to which they belong or, display cultural traits in conflict with those expected from their cultural backgrounds. This became apparent from a study by Mpofu (1994): in Foster (2005), in which a group of Shona

individuals from Zimbabwe in the main displayed individualistic characteristics, whereas the wider Shona population is known to be principally collectivistic. Foster explained that it is to be expected for some individuals to be more oriented towards individualism even in collectivistic cultures as culture is fluid and can change following contact with other cultures through colonisation, modernisation, globalisation and westernisation. As Foster explained, education, urbanisation and industrialisation can lead to individuals from typically collectivistic cultures developing individualistic tendencies.

Triandis (1995) also supported the idea that all people and countries have individualistic and collectivistic tendencies, with the difference simply arising from the extents to which these inclinations are portrayed in individuals. He explained that factors such as levels of education and generational experiences of individuals contribute to variations in orientations towards individualism or collectivism of people with the same ethnic or national background. Triandis also explained that it is mostly the case that people from higher social classes turn out to be individualistic, while those from lower social classes tend to be collectivistic.

It was, thus, recognised that it could not be expected that individuals from typically collectivistic or individualistic cultures would only engage in behaviour that is in accordance with collectivistic or individualistic themes, or that collectivistic nations would not hold any individualistic values and vice versa (Triandis, 1995). For this reason, it was expected that variation in individualistic/ collectivistic cultural orientation could exist within the participants of this study. This is especially in light of the fact that aside from a multitude of ethnic groups and languages existing in the country, a lot of racial integration has also taken place in Namibia both before and

after independence (Tapscott, 2001).Furthermore, a fusion between orientation towards collectivism/ individualism is also expected to exist in Namibia as a result of big differences in demographic factors such as levels of education and generational experiences (Triandis, 1995).

The expectation that there could be cultural differences between Namibians of different generations in terms of collectivistic versus individualistic orientation is drawn from the findings of Triandis (1995) when he compared the values of Japanese people born soon after World War II and their much later born children who were not exposed to the hardships of the war. Triandis reported that older generations generally tend to be more collectivistic than younger ones as a result of the opportunity to develop a sense of common fate. Similarly, as a result of limitations placed by the apartheid era, Namibians that have lived through the apartheid experience may have developed a sense of common fate with others of their groupings, resulting in tendencies towards collectivism. On the other hand, Namibians born after independence may have no need to experience a 'sense of common fate' and may, thus, be inclined to be more individualistic in their behaviour.

The rise of the independence of Namibia also enabled many Black people to move to suburbs previously considered as solely White and for children of Black people to be sent to formerly exclusively White schools and to be instructed in European languages (Tapscott, 2001). This is likely to have followed the creation of the *Constitution of Namibia*, which allows for the freedom to study in higher institutions of choice and the freedom to move freely (*The Constitution of Namibia*, Art. 21, Sec.1, Cl. b., *The Constitution of Namibia*, Art. 21, Sec.1, Cl. g.). Now,

twenty years after independence, racial and ethnic integration is expected to be even more outstanding, meaning that tendencies towards particular ways of seeing things that might have been caused by ethnic and racial socialisation may be more diffused. The possibility for Black Namibians to economically advance after independence also means that social status changed from primarily being determined by racial and ethnic boundaries to being influenced by education (Tapscott, 2001). This factor increases the likelihood that there would be variation in the collectivism versus individualism orientation of individuals sharing the same ethnic or national background.

To further support the stance that it is feasible for there to be great differences in how Namibian may perceive, interpret, and understand the world around them, the educational arena in Namibia can be explored. According to Haugh (2007), the younger Namibian generation frequently travels through the country in search for work and study opportunities. This phenomenon can again be attributed to the provision for "freedom of thought, conscience and belief, which shall include academic freedom in institutions of higher learning" (*The Constitution of Namibia*, Art. 21, Sec.1, Cl. b.) and the right to "move freely throughout Namibia" (*The Constitution of Namibia*, Art. 21, Sec.1, Cl. g.). As a result, the towns, large workplaces such as the mines and fisheries, and the tertiary institutions have become ethnically integrated (Haugh, 2007). This naturally also means a bigger opportunity for the exchange of cultural beliefs and values.

This led to the conclusion that there are likely to be both individualistic as well as collectivistic influences in how many Namibians construct their identities, albeit on different scales, as a result of education, age, socio-economic status, and

migration amongst others. This is despite many ethnic groups in Namibia possibly being traditionally geared towards collectivism, as the country is classified to be collectivistic on the basis of its geographic location, which is associated with tight family attachments and great obedience towards authority figures, (Aykin, 2007; Triandis, 1995).

Literature also reveals that many researchers seem to include orientation towards individualism/ collectivism when making cultural comparisons. Cukur, De Guzman and Carlo (2004) for example established that a parallel exists between values, as measures of culture, and certain facets of individualism/ collectivism. Owe et al. (2010) were further able to demonstrate that specific facets of individualism/collectivism, such as contextualism beliefs, are useful in tapping into cultural patterns, thereby also highlighting the importance of investigating levels of individualism versus collectivism as important when making cultural comparisons. Measures of individualism/ collectivism were also relied on by Becker et al. (2010) in their study of "*Culture and the Distinctiveness Motive".*

In spite of the above, researchers such as Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier (2002) raised concerns that assessments of individualism and collectivism are inadequate measures of cultures as differences in the constructs are not as big and as general as it is commonly believed (Schimmack, Oishi & Diener, 2005). Schimmack et al. further created the awareness that some individuals predicted the abandonment of these constructs for more specific ones, whereas others were less drastic and suggested instead that efforts should rather be made in improving the existing methods of assessing individualism and collectivism. However, after careful consideration of the above views, Schimmack et al.

demonstrated that measuring individualism or collectivism is a powerful tool to help gain insight into culture, provided that such an assessment is done properly.

Still, literature also reveals that it is not always enough to only rely on orientation towards individualism/ collectivism when making cultural comparisons (Hermans & Kempen, 1998; Hofstede, 1980), which suggests that additional factors should be considered, whence the present study's inclusion of demographic factors in its cultural comparisons.

2.3 Identity and Identity Construction

Although some researchers such as Stevens (1996) made the effort to differentiate between identity, self, self-concept and the self-identity, not many seemed to follow this trend. Those that did seemed to be doing it to increase insight into the specific implications of each of these terms, but did not seem to really regard identity as different from self, self-concept or self-identity or vice versa. Differences in how identity is defined mostly seem to be in the theoretical perspective from which the term was studied.

For example, while Lalljee (1996) only focused on the individual when describing the identity as the sense of self or the discernment of being a distinct entity with unique characteristics, others go further to also recognise the social dimensions associated with the existence of an identity. According to the concept that Zhang and Huxham (2009) adopted from Mead (1934) and Goffman (1959, 1967), identity equally refers to psychological and social aspects of the self. They explained that the identity comprises of a sense of "I" that is established in accordance with the attitudes of others, and an awareness of "me" that depends on an

individual's thoughts about what others think of the individual. It can also be derived from Zhang and Huxham that this sense of self can occur at the individual level and also at the group level where the "I" gets transformed to "we".

While it may seem like Vignoles et al. (2006) did not recognise the social connection to the identity when they described it as the personal notion that an individual has of him/herself, this is far from the truth. Just like Zhang and Huxham (2009) who focused on both individual and collective aspects of the self, Vignoles et al. highlighted that identity is a subjective experience which is equally brought about by cognitive, affective and social interaction processes, which are guided by cultural and local circumstances.

Jameson (2007), who also linked identity to social processes, provided the most detailed and inclusive description of the identity. She pointed out that under the broad concept of identity are objective and subjective identities. While the objective identity refers to tangible items such as the birth certificate, passport, credit report, voter's registration, tax returns, and other official records of an individual, subjective identity is about who an individual perceives her/himself to be as a person.

As influenced by Triandis (1989), Jameson (2007) further divided the subjective identity into the personal and the collective identity. She cited Ting-Toomey (2005) to argue that personal identity concerns the aspects that make an individual distinct such as the person's personality and style. With regards to the collective identity, this component of the identity refers to the sense of self that one obtains from being part of a group. Thus, both cultural and social identities form part of the collective identity.

The difference between social and cultural identity is that the former is based on temporary set of conditions such as being unemployed or a student, while the latter is based on a more stable and enduring sense of who a person is as established from values and beliefs passed on from generation to generation.

From the above descriptions, it becomes apparent that identity is not only recognised as being influenced by social practices, but the conscious basis of the sense of self is also acknowledged. Based on the above cited definitions of Lalljee (1996), Zhang and Huxham (2009), Vignoles et al. (2006), and Jameson (2007) the significance of experience to the identity was stressed.

This was also done by Griswold (1994) who, in addition to observing that identity develops through the interactions with other people, also advocated the idea that identity arises as a result of projections of meanings onto people that are interacted with as well from the interpretations of such meanings. Similarly, Stevens (1996), who related identity to be a primary facet of conscious awareness, explained that people are cognisant of the fact that they are distinct individuals with inner thoughts and feelings that are connected to the world.

Works on the topic of identity construction have also either considered identity construction as a process or as a product of certain events (Zhang & Huxham, 2009; Schachter, 2005). Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) is exemplary of early theorists who adopted the latter stance. Using a different term, the ego, to describe the identity (Kuther, 2001), Freud's views were that the identities of adults are established based on how early childhood experiences are dealt with (Santrock, 2008).In other words, Freud alluded to the idea that childhood experiences greatly shape adult personality functioning. This gives the impression that as identities of

adults have their foundations in childhood, they are well established by the time individuals reach adulthood.

On the other hand, one observes that many contemporary researchers seem to regard identity construction as a process instead of an endpoint. For example, while looking at the internalization of cultural practices, identity, and well-being, Chirkov, Ryan and Willness (2005) pointed out that "the feeling of identity with one's culture may be associated with the autonomous regulation of different practices, either horizontal or vertical" (p. 438). From this, a notion that identity is adaptable was derived.

There were also researchers that embraced the idea of identity construction as both a process as well as an outcome. As a case in point, Zhang and Huxham (2009) considered the role that communication between participants can play in the development of their identities, thereby acknowledging the possibility of identities to change according to circumstances. At the same time, the study of Zhang and Huxham acknowledged that the identities of its participants may also be firmly rooted in their social as well as cultural backgrounds. They consequently came to the conclusion that identity in the main can to an extent be fixed and stable and simultaneously also be transformable depending on a host of factors.

It also became apparent that studies on identity construction did not only focus on the development of the identity in itself, but many researchers further seemed to have been interested in how the identity further linked to the development of other behaviours. For example, Zhang and Huxham (2009) investigated the relationship between the construction of identities and the building of trust in the development of international collaborations. They argued that knowledge of the

development of identities is significant in the understanding of the nature of trust building. In consequence, they came to the conclusion that identity construction plays a pivotal role in the relationships of international collaborators. To clarify, they exemplified that the factionalism of "us" in opposition to "them", which takes place as a result of the social categorisation of identity, has the potential to affect trust between collaborators should they not have shared understanding and appreciation.

The connection between identity construction and other behaviours was also noted by Roeser et al. (2008). Roeser et al. hypothesised that there is a relationship between achieving a balance between one's various identity representations and the ensuing experience of achievement and wellbeing such that a difficulty to achieve this balance was expected to result in school-related difficulties or problems with wellbeing, or even both. Their research observations confirmed this idea, supporting the notion of identity construction as having the ability to influence the development of successive behaviours.

2.4 Theories on Identity Construction

Various theories in the literature can be used to explain the present study's stance on identity construction, amongst them the Social Identity Theory, the Social Constructivist Theory, the Identity Theory, the Theory of Self-Development, the Developmental Theory of Vygotsky, as well as the Systems, Ecological and Self-Representation theories.

2.4.1 Social Identity Theory

The Social Identity Theory posits that identity formation is an "end-product" or "outcome" of certain events (Zhang and Huxham, 2009). As derived from the Social Identity Theory, this study acknowledged that identities are relatively stable. However, the Social Identity Theory also recognises the role of social experiences in identity construction when it is applies to group processes. According to Hammack (2008), underlying the Social Identity Theory of Tajfel (1978a, 1981, 1982a, 1982b; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) is the idea that group relations have an impact on the behaviour of people. As Abrams (2009) cites Hogg and Abrams (1988), Tajfel and Turner (1979), as well as Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher and Wetherell (1987), the social identity approach to group processes postulates that individuals psychologically incorporate the social groups to which they belong in their identities. This follows that a person's social identity can then be defined as the component of a person's sense of self that originates from an awareness of being a member of a social group (or groups), together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership (Tajfel, 1978: in Abrams, 2009).

Additionally, Social Identity Theory posits that identities only become meaningful if they can be put into practice as their validity and natures rely on the reactions of other people (Klein et al., 2007). In agreement, Desrochers et al. (2002) cites Hogg, Terry and White (1995) to explain that individuals' identities can be derived from the groups to which they belong. The Social Identity Theory particularly contributed to this study by forming the basis of the conceptualisation of identity to include an individual's conception of him or herself as a group member.

2.4.2 Social Constructivist Theory

This study also greatly adopts its approach on identity construction from the Social Constructivist Theory. As much as it is acknowledged that identities are relatively stable, as derived from the Social Identity Theory, it is also accepted that identities are capable of change, particularly in different contexts. This is the deduction made from the Social Constructivist Theory, which, according to Teague (2000), was developed by theorists like Gergen (1995). Shunk (2000): in Kim (2001) further brings to light that the Social Constructivist theory is influenced by the developmental theories of Vygotsky and Bruner, and the social cognitive theory of Bandura. According to Derry (1999): in Kim (2001) as well as McMahon (1997): in Kim (2001), the Social Constructivist Theory stresses the role played by culture and context in making sense of behaviour. The Social Constructivist Theory also perceives knowledge, in general, to result from social interaction and other social practices (Teague, 2000).

2.4.3 Identity Theory

The Identity Theory was developed by Stryker (1968) and emphasises the various identities that can be held by a single individual (Desrochers et al., 2002). Although Identity Theory is similar to the Social Constructionist and Social Identity Theories in its recognition of social relationships in identity construction, it brings forth an extra outlook that is also fundamental to the way identity is conceptualised by this study. Unlike the Social Identity Theory that only relates individuals to the groups to which they belong such as nationality and political affiliation, and thereby only focusing on group processes and intergroup relations, the identity Theory stresses

role behaviour by centring on identity with respect to the roles that a person takes up such as being a mother, friend, employee and student (Desrochers et al.). Role identity is incorporated into this study's conceptualisation of identity.

2.4.4 Theory of Self-Development

The Theory of Self-Development provides support for this study's position that identity construction includes social interactional aspects by positing that identity results from dialogue between a person and his or her environment. This theory, which was developed by George Herbert Mead (1934), is based on the idea of Cooley (1902), who put forward that identity is formed through the reflections that people receive when they engage socially (Hammack, 2008). As Hammack explains, what is core to the Theory of Self-Development is the idea of interaction as interaction is regarded to greatly impact on who a person is, because a sense of identity can only exist in relation to others. This follows that identity is considered to be socially mediated, as identity is not only constructed during the process of social interaction, but it also develops as an act for other people.

2.4.5 Developmental Theory of Vygotsky

Although Vygotsky's (1934/1986, 1978) theory of development does not directly relate to identity construction, his viewpoint that development is influenced by cultural "tools" can be linked to identity construction, resulting in the perception that cultural and historical factors are fundamental to the construction of identities (Penuel and Wertsch, 1995: in Hammack, 2008). Vygotsky's reference to "inner speech" and "social speech" can also be used to understand identity construction as

being an interplay between the individual and the social as it is the inner speech that constructs personal identity as it is internally "sensed", while social speech is the medium through which identity is articulated, exposed and also re-established (Hammack, 2008).

2.4.6 Systems Theory, Ecological Theory & Self-Representation Theory

The idea that identity construction occurs in context also seems to be supported by the Systems Theory, which stresses the need to consider context in the understanding of behaviour (Magnussen, 2003: in Faircloth, 2009). Similarly, Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Theory draws attention to the importance of contexts in the development of individuals (Bronfenbrenner1989: in Faircloth; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998: in Faircloth). Additionally, the Self-Representation Theory of Gregg (1991) is consistent with the perception of identity that is taken by this study as it accommodates identity construction as influenced by the macro-social system of which an individual is a part of (Hammack, 2008).

2.5 Identity Motives

The practice generally seems to be to understand behaviour as being affected by private interpretations of the contexts within which they occur instead of just perceiving it as simply being directed by socio-cultural factors (Strauss, 1992). Using culture as focal area, D'Andrade (1992) attributed variations in how individuals sharing a specific background would end up differently emphasising the practice of certain behaviours, to motivation. He explained that the environment itself is not sufficient to explain human behaviour. He argued that instead of culture being

responsible for human actions it only serves as stimulus, while there are other explanations to why certain environmental factors are embraced by some individuals, yet rejected by others. Citing Weiner (1992), Edwards (2005) explained that motivation is what gives life its significance through providing it with direction, vigour, zeal and intensity, as motivation is responsible for activating, upholding and guiding our thinking and behaviour.

Vignoles et al. (2006) clarified that although people may not necessarily be aware of it, there are certain motives or reasons behind why certain identities may be developed as opposed to others. They attributed this to various sources of pressures to portray oneself in a particular manner. It, therefore, follows that characteristics of the identity that meet the specific goals of the individual would be loved by the individual, would be deemed as crucial to the identity of the person, or would be highlighted when the individual is interacting with others. On the other hand, features of the identity that disturb identity motives would be cognitively restricted. The study of Vignoles et al. (2006) was instrumental in showing that the cognitive, emotional and behavioural processes of people are guided by certain identity motives.

There seems to be a common view concerning what motives are in general. Literature seems to agree with the idea of D'Andrade (1992) that motives can by and large be described as desires that lead to a striving for something or as goal directed behaviour, which leads to either satisfaction if the goals get met, or otherwise a sense of failure. To demonstrate, Edwards (2005) described motivation as the diligent search or move towards particular incidences.

The acceptance of motives as goal-related instead of them simply being drive-related can further clearly be observed from Lalljee (1996). Lalljee referred to the need for control and the need for self-esteem when providing examples of motivational processes. This is in opposition to the Freudian psychodynamic theory, which regarded human behaviour as primarily being determined by biologically-based desires such as those of thirst, hunger and sex, amongst others (Thomas, 1996; Santrock, 2008).

The recognition of motives as goal-directed by many researchers in no way seemed to have discarded the idea that biological drives can also be determinants of human behaviour. One for example learnt from Edwards (2005) that motivational processes include both psychological as well as biological developments. Also, Vignoles et al. (2006) cited various individuals to highlight that identity motives in particular concern a range of behaviours including, but not limited to psychological and physical activities.

Upon inspection of the hierarchy of needs of Abraham Maslow (1908-1970): in Edwards (2005), who was a pioneer in the subject of needs or motivation, one also realises that in his identification of the human needs he too recognised an assortment of needs. His classification stretched from the physiological needs associated with human existence referred to as the deficiency needs to the non-biological needs such as the needs for meaning and spirituality, which he referred to as the being needs.

From the various references to the word “need” when clarifying what motives are (Maslow, 1908-1970: in Edwards, 2005), Vignoles et al., 2006; Lalljee, 1996) , and from the alternating use of the words motive and need particularly by Vignoles et al., it appears that motives seem to have been equated with needs. This deduction

could also be made from the identification of the compulsion to perceive oneself positively as the self-esteem motive by Vignoles et al. (2006), whereas the same act was referred to as the self-esteem need by Maslow as well as Strauss (1992).

In spite of the above tendency, some researchers made a clear distinction between a need that is a simple desire for something and a true motive. Using the achievement motive as an example, Edwards (2005) explained that this motive consists of the diligent and methodological pursuit to attain a goal, which is different from the desire to succeed. Also, Edwards pointed out that achievement motivation is much more than an aspiration to accomplish things for the mere purpose of satisfying other people. As Edwards (2005) clarified, achievement motivation was shown in a study by French (1995) to be a yearning to do well for the basic pleasure that comes out of succeeding.

Likewise, another researcher clearly stressed the distinction between motives and general goals. D'Andrade (1992) for instance explained that a goal, as in the case of a desire, only qualifies as a motive when it has a level of self-sufficiency. In other words, a goal cannot be called a motive if it only instigates action for secondary gains. On the other hand, a motive is an intent that has the power to direct behaviour for the mere purpose of having whatever is aimed for. The example that D'Andrade (1992) gave was that if one sets out to form a friendship with someone, then that goal only becomes a motive when one's only interest is in the establishment of the friendship and not in perhaps getting the other person to perform a service for you once you have become friends.

In a similar vein, Hedegaard (2005) seemed to support the idea that motives should not be understood as the same as goals. According to Hedegaard, goals or

intentions as she also termed them, feature in the daily activities of individuals and relate to peoples' aspirations in specific circumstances. On the other hand, she described motives as enduring, with a widespread influence on the person's personality and life.

Yet, there were those that did not make any distinction between motives and other forms of aspirations such as goals. According to D'Andrade (1992), Murray (1938) turned to the description of motives as 'goals" and even came up with a category system to describe different kinds of 'goal striving' as an attempt to divert from the tendency to observe motives as internal stimuli.

So, while there appeared to be consensus on what motives generally are, there on the other hand seemed to be conflicting ideas concerning the extent to which motives should be related to goals.

As far as identity motives are specifically concerned, it was difficult to make comparisons of how the term was defined as it was found that works focusing on motivation did not particularly pay attention to the direct definition of identity motives. There was a scarcity of literature that clearly describes an 'identity motive' as definitions commonly focused on the two terms separately. An exception was the study by Vignoles et al. (2006) that explicitly described an identity motive as a compulsion to perceive oneself in a particular manner. As Vignoles et al explained, the existence of identity motives can be picked up from the inclination of people to move towards and away from certain identity states. Although failing to give a distinct example, Vignoles et al. further went on to highlight that there are clear differences between identity motives and the other entire range of human motives, goals or needs.

It emerged that it was challenging to come up with a conclusive set of identity motives. While there were some similarities in the classes of motives that were attended to, it had to be concurred with Vignoles et al. (2006) that not much agreement existed about the assortment of motives expected to play a role in identity construction. This could possibly be as a result of the observation of Vignoles et al. that identity motives are not only limited to certain types of behaviours, but influence various developments from cognitive, emotional and physical circumstances to relational aspects.

A noted difference in the classification of the motives was that some researchers utilised many more categories than others, while there were also instances where it was not uncommon to come across a grouping that was not found in other works in a piece that identified even fewer motives. For instance, other than the motives identified by Triandis (1995) and Vignoles et al. (2006), Murray (1938): in D'Andrade (1992) recognised the needs for *deference*, which is the need to "admire and support a superior", *retention* or the need to "retain possession of things or be miserly" and that of *succorance*, which relates to the need to "have one's needs gratified by the sympathetic aid of allied others.

Also, amongst others, Murray (1938): in D'Andrade (1992) recognised the need to "seek and enjoy sensuous impressions", which he termed the need for *sentience* and the need for *orde*r, described as the need to "achieve cleanliness, organisation, neatness and precision". Likewise, the motives of *meaning* and *continuity* that were described in Vignoles et al. (2006) did not feature in the categories provided by Triandis (1995) or Murray.

Despite the variations existing in the number of motives discussed by the researchers interested in the subject as well as in the labels of the categories given to the motives, some similarities could be found concerning the latter. To exemplify, Murray (1938) in: D'Andrade (1992) identified motives of *achievement*, *affiliation*, *aggression*, *exhibition*, *nurturance*, *order*, *abasement* (described as a need to "submit passively to an external force"), as well as *contrarience*, which was explained as the need to act differently from others or to be unique". These were also amongst the motives recognised by Triandis (1995) to play a role in characteristics related to individualism and collectivism.

The motives of *belonging*, *distinctiveness*, *self-esteem* and *efficacy*, as identified by Vignoles et al. (2006), were also found to be closely linked to Murray's (1938): in D'Andrade (1992) motives of *affiliation*, *contrarience*, *infavoidance* (the need to "avoid humiliation or conditions which may lead to belittlement") and *achievement* respectively. In turn, striving towards uniqueness, which Triandis (1995) attributes to individualistic cultures, again linked to the above-mentioned motive of *distinctiveness.*

Still, because it was recognised that an assortment of motives may guide human behaviour and hence also identity construction, the study did not set out to build up a complete set of identity motives as this would, indeed, have been a tedious task. Instead, the focus of this study was on the motives linked to identity construction. In particular, focus was on the six motives as centred on by Vignoles et al. (2006). This was not only because the study of Vignoles et al. was the one on which the present research was based, but also because Vignoles et al. concluded that the motives of self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, belonging, efficacy, and

meaning were the ones that dominated the existing literature at the time their study was being carried out.

As defined by Vignoles et al. (2006), the motive of self-esteem is concerned with inducements to uphold positive notions of the self. On the other hand, the motive for continuity can be interpreted as being about remaining stable within a certain identity, while it is understood that the distinctiveness motive concerns a need to be different from others Vignoles et al.

With regards to the continuity motive, Vignoles et al. (2006) pointed out that people generally prefer information that validates the perceptions they have of themselves. Also, Vignoles et al. did not expect the distinctiveness motive to be characteristic of only Western societies as is put forward by some theorists, but believed it to be universal because of their conviction that a level of distinctiveness is needed for a meaningful sense of identity.

The belonging motive is described by Vignoles et al. (2006) as involving the need to be accepted by others or the need to belong. The motive for efficacy, on the other hand, involves the aspiration to be competent and in control, which is also recognised as a universal human motive. Finally, the motive for meaning concerns the effort to obtain a sense of purpose from one's life.

It is expected that those identity elements valued by individuals would be more prioritised and central to the construction of the participants' identities (Vignoles et al., 2006). For example, considering the self-esteem motive, people valuing hierarchy could derive a greater sense of positive self-regard from identity elements linked to higher social status. As a result, they would be more likely to regard such elements as crucial to their self-definition. Consequently, such

individuals would also be more likely to act out those identity elements in their everyday lives. Similarly, people who value harmony would be more likely to prioritise identity elements associated with more harmonious relationships (Vignoles et al.).

2.6 Theories on Identity Motives

Theorists have made varying assumptions concerning the role played by culture in the motives of identity construction. Where some theorists such as Brewer and Pickett (1999) have portrayed identity motives as universal human needs, others such as Breakwell (1987) regarded identity motives as cultural values internalised by individuals. It also appears that some theorists refrained from limiting themselves to either the Universalist or the Relativist views as far as the classification of identity motives goes. For example, D'Andrade's (1992) judgment was that although it is significant to regard motives as rooted in culture, their universality should also be taken into account. Thus, some models also occupied a 'middle ground' between the two theoretical extremes. This middle ground can be traced back to Erikson's (1963, 1968) ego identity idea, which postulated that the content of identity may vary from one cultural context to another, while the manner in which structural concepts of the identity are put into operation are universal. Erikson also stated that the direction in which identities develop is universal (Schachter, 2005).

The view of cultural psychology was by and large that even though there might be universality in how people develop, it is not expected that the specific themes of these developmental processes will be similar in every person (Hammack, 2008). Also in support of this middle ground was Strauss (1992) who explained that

all humans share the same motivational pool, but that the specific needs behind the motives, and the demand intensities to attain these motives may vary from culture to culture. The middle ground could, as a case in point, be illustrated using the motive for self-esteem.

According to Heine, Lehman, Markus and Kitayama (1999), the universality of the self-esteem motive had not too long ago been questioned, with arguments that self-esteem maintenance and enhancement processes may be specific to 'Western' cultures. Yet, subsequent research has suggested that people in different cultural contexts strive similarly for positive self-regard, but that they use different strategies (Muramoto, 2003) and emphasise different value dimensions (Brown & Kobayashi, 2002; Sedikides, Gaertner & Toguchi, 2003) in order to do so.

For example, it was presented that members of collectivistic cultures may derive positive self-regard by portraying themselves in a modest light. However, this suggested that acts of self-criticism may actually protect rather than undermine self-esteem (Kurman, 2003). Thus, it was regarded that very different cognitions and behaviours seemed to be manifestations of the same underlying motive operating in the context of different cultural meaning systems.

The idea of a middle ground could also be picked up from a study by Levine (1996): in Edwards (2005) that was conducted in Nigeria to compare the achievement motivation of boys from two ethnic groups. As brought to attention by Edwards, the study of Levine found that the boys that were from a culture that was more authoritarian had a lower motivation to achieve compared to their peers from the other ethnic group although the ethnic groups shared the same nationality. This supported the idea that motives may not necessarily be universal or that they may not

appear in same strengths in all populations, but could be in different variations depending on cultural orientation.

It seems that the identity motives recognised by Vignoles et al. (2006) follow the same logic of occupying a middle ground as some have also understood the motives as culturally specific (Breakwell, 1987), while arguments exist that each motive is adaptive or universal (Chandler, Lalonde, Sokol & Hallet, 2003).

2.7 Summary

It seems that the term culture represented different things to different researchers. Regardless of the tendency of many researchers to widely conceptualise the term, it was found that most studies focused on national or ethnic differences when making cultural comparisons instead of including other components of culture such as age, gender, socio-economic status, language, education or religiosity. Literature has also shown that it is common for studies on culture to focus on orientation towards collectivism/ individualism. This is despite the view of some researchers that the measurement of individualism/ collectivism is inadequate to assess culture. Furthermore, it was found that nationality and ethnicity are not enough to make assumptions about people's orientation towards collectivism/ individualism as factors such as socio-economic status, age, education, and religiosity can influence a person's orientation towards collectivism/ individualism.

It also seems like there are various ways in which identity is recognised. Descriptions of researchers ranged personal experiences of people and the meanings derived from such experiences to the social dimension of the construct. While attempt was made by some researchers to differentiate between identity, self, self-

concept and self-identity, not all seemed to follow this tendency. Furthermore, as particularly drawn from the Social Constructionist, Social Identity, Identity, Self-Development, Systems, Ecological and Self-Representation theories, as well as Vygotsky's theory of development, it appears that the construction of identities can be considered to be both a process as well as an outcome.

Regarding identity motives, it was widely accepted that particular motives are responsible for people developing specific identities as opposed to others. Yet, there seemed to be conflicting ideas concerning the extent to which motives should be related to goals. Theories on identity motives seem to support the idea that cultural factors should be considered in the understanding of identity motives, as there are theorists that take the position that identity motives are universal (Brewer & Pickett, 1999), that they are relative to context (Breakwell, 1987) and those that perceive them as both universal as well as culture-based (Hammack, 2008; Strauss, 1992).

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the empirical conceptualisation of the study. It describes the research setting and outlines the research design, population and sample, the measures and procedures employed for data collection, as well as information pertaining to the scoring and interpretation, and reliability and validity of the measuring instrument.

3.1 Research Setting

The data for this research was collected as from 13 July 2009 to 27 July 2009. Four high schools in the Katutura and Khomasdal suburbs of Windhoek were used as research setting. Windhoek is the capital city of Namibia with a population of 233 529 people (Namibia 2001 Population and Housing Census [NPHC]). According to the NPHC, the Khomas Region, where Windhoek is located, has a total population of 250 262, of which 123 613 individuals are female and 126 648 are male. This follows that the region has 102 males per 100 females.

The NPHC (2011) further brings to light that more than 90% of the Khomas region is made up of urban areas, with the rural areas in the region only making up 7% of the region. Although individuals from different ethnic and racial backgrounds are found in the region, 37 % of the region's population speaks Oshiwambo at home, while Afrikaans is spoken at home by 24% of the population. The third most spoken language at home is Damara/ Nama, which is spoken by 13 % of the region's population. The bulk of the region's population (67%) is made up of the 15-59 age

group. As a result, it can be said that the study was conducted in a setting offering relative cultural diversity.

3.2 Research Design

This research embodies the quantitative research perspective, which develops from a positivist epistemology and maintains that an objective reality exists that can be conveyed by numeric means (Glatthorn & Joyner, 2005). Because quantitative research methods require the collection of large amounts of data, they enable the generalisation of the research findings. Quantitative research methods also require complex structured methods to analyse the data, thereby limiting flexibility. As a result, bias is decreased in the presentation of the data (Gravetter & Forzano, 2006). The quantitative approach is not only additionally suitable for use when the intention of the research is to accept or reject a research hypothesis (Gravetter & Forzano), but it also allows for the collection of non-numeric information through open-ended questions (Blaxter, Hughes & Tight, 2001).

The survey method of data collection was selected as the most suitable method for this study. According to Gravetter and Forzano (2006), the basic idea behind the survey research method is that it allows the capture of information without having to make direct observations. It, therefore, provides access to information that is not easily observable, thereby simplifying the gathering of data. The survey method also enables the collection of extensive information concerning people's biographical details, their attitudes, opinions, personal characteristics and their behaviours from those directly involved. Thus, the purpose of the survey research method is to gain access to information that is as truthful as possible

(Gravetter & Forzano). Many researchers (Vignoles et al., 2006; Vignoles & Moncaster, 2007; Becker et al., 2010; Owe et al., 2010) relied on the survey method as the sole research mode to understand culture and the motives of identity construction.

3.3 Population and Sampling Technique

The target group for this study was high school students from the ages of 16 to 20. This population is believed to provide greater socioeconomic and ethnic diversity than university students. Also, the selected group was deemed to be easier to access than other groups.

The research participants, who were all grade 11 learners, were recruited through convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is a non-probability sampling technique that focuses on the participants who are most accessible and willing to participate in the study, providing they meet the characteristics of the target group (Wellmann & Kruger, 2001). Because it was safer to rely on previous research as a guide to sample sizes, a sample size of 100 participants was aimed for, using the study of Vignoles et al. (2006) as backdrop: Vignoles et al. found clear, replicable results conducting a similar study with 80 to 100 participants, and were able to detect even small group differences with around 100 to 120 participants. However, to allow for attrition, 250 questionnaires were handed of which 104 complete questionnaires were returned, as such, 104 individuals participated in the study.

3.4 Measures

The present study made use of an already existing questionnaire. This questionnaire is an extended form of the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* (IMQ). The IMQ was devised by Vignoles and his colleagues in 2002 (Vignoles et al., 2006).

The rationale behind using the IMQ is that the questionnaire generates the motive satisfaction ratings necessary to indicate motivational influences on identity construction. It achieves this by requiring that participants freely list aspects of identity content, and then to rate each of their responses for perceived centrality and enactment, and for satisfaction of each motive. The *Identity Motives Questionnaire* has been used by researchers such as Vignoles et al. (2006), Becker et al. (2010) to investigate the motives of identity construction.

The questionnaire consists of 10 sections, with all but one of the questions on the questionnaire being closed-ended. Although the participants completed all sections of the questionnaire, only sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 8 and 10 were relevant for purposes of this study. The first section of the questionnaire is made up of one open-ended question, which is derived from the Twenty Statements Test of Kuhn & McPartland (1954). In this section participants are asked to freely come up with ten answers to the question "who are you?" in order to generate identity elements that are rated further on in the questionnaire.

The second section is made up of the *identity priority measure*. This section comprises three items, which aim to measure perceived centrality (private self-concept), identity-related affect and identity enactment (public self-concept) by asking the questions "how important is each of these things in defining who you

are?", "how happy of unhappy do you feel about each of these things?", and "how much do you show people that you are each of these things in your everyday actions?" respectively.

Section 5, which rates the participants' *motive satisfaction* with respect to each identity aspect, consists of six questions. To assess feelings of *distinctiveness, continuity, self-esteem, belonging, efficacy,* and *meaning,* the following is asked: "How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you, in any sense, from other people?", "How much does each of these things give you a sense of continuity, between past, present and future, in your life?", "How much does each of these things make you see yourself positively?", "How much does each of these things make you feel you "belong", that you are included among or accepted by people who matter to you?", "How much does each of these things make you feel competent and capable?", and "How much does each of these things give you the sense that your life is 'meaningful'?".

Section 6, with 18 items, covers the participants' cultural beliefs about personhood or values, measured by assessing *lay contextualism*. Lay contextualism is the belief that people must be understood in terms of their contexts, as opposed to just focusing on their internal dispositions. Examples of items contained in this section include "to understand a person well, it is essential to know about his/her family" and "one can understand a person well without knowing about the place he/she comes from". As 8 of the items incorporated into this section assess immutability and are excluded in the analysis of this study, only 10 items are considered.

Section 8, with five items, comprises the *religiosity* scale, which also helps to tap into the participants' level of collectivism. The following questions make up the five items: "Do you belong to a religion or religious denomination? If yes, which one?", "How important is religion to you?", "How much does religion influence the way you act in everyday life?", "How often do you attend religious services and activities?" and "How often do you pray or meditate?" Finally, section 10 centres on the demographics of the participants. Section 10 has ten items.

3.5 Procedure

A number of ethical issues were taken into account in conducting, evaluating and reporting the research. The question "who are you" was translated from English into the local vernaculars using the forward-translation design. This design involves the use of one or more interpreters to translate an item from its language of origin to the desired language (Foxcroft & Roodt, 2009). Different bilingual experts from the University of Namibia were used to establish the uniformity of the original and translated versions of the question by looking the items over as suggested by Foxcroft and Roodt.

Because the participants were all students and some of them minors at the time of the study, consent was sought from the school principals of the schools concerned and then from the parents where necessary. The participants were then given a full description of the study before deciding to participate. They were briefed that the study concerns their beliefs, thoughts and feelings about themselves as well as other people. All participation in this research was voluntary and participants were required to sign informed consent forms before participating.

As the questionnaires were distributed in class and the study was not allowed to interfere with the lessons, the participants were instructed to take the questionnaires home and complete them in their free time. All of the data collected was treated in the strictest confidence and analysed only by the research team. The research participants were also made aware of their right to withdraw from the research at any time. Furthermore, the study was conducted in a straightforward manner ensuring that the participants were not in any manner deceived.

As earlier touched on, the participants were asked to generate ten identity elements in the first section of the questionnaire. This was done by getting them to freely list ten answers to the question "who are you?". Participants were then asked to rate their identity elements for perceived centrality, positive affect, as well as for identity enactment, and then for satisfaction of each of the motives. Following this, participants were asked to answer questions which assess the link between the generated identity aspects with feelings of self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, belonging, efficacy and meaning in other words, the identity motives. The participants were also asked to answer questions that assess their orientation towards individualism/ collectivism. This was done by determining their beliefs about contextualism as well as their religiosity.

All of the items in the first section, which measures the identity motives, were answered on a ten-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all important) to 10 (extremely important), or 0 (extremely unhappy) to 10 (extremely happy), or alternatively 0 (don't show this at all) to 10 (very definitely show this). Otherwise, such items were rated 0 (not at all) to 10 (extremely). All the items measuring lay contextualism were answered on a 6-point scale which is rated as follows: 1 = completely disagree, 2 =

moderately disagree, 3 = slightly disagree, 4 = slightly agree, 5 = moderately agree and 6 = completely agree. On the other hand, the items measuring religiosity were either answered not at all, slightly, moderately, very or extremely, or never, several times a year, about once a month, about once a week, every day, or several times each day.

3.6 Scoring and Interpretation

3.6.1 Motive Strength

The motive strength for each participant is derived at by firstly computing an 'identity priority' score. This is done by combining the cognitive, affective and behavioural dimensions of identity construction and then generating a mean score for these. Following this, compound correlations conducted between the identity motive satisfaction means and the identity priority score of an item lead to the motive strengths for each participant.

According to Vignoles et al. (2006), it is assumed that identity aspects providing greater motive satisfaction will be perceived as more central and enacted publicly to a greater extent than those providing lesser motive satisfaction. Hence, motive satisfaction associated with aspects of identity can be used to predict their relative centrality within people's subjective identity structures, as well as the extent to which people enact them in their everyday lives.

3.6.2 Lay Contextualism

Lay contextualism assesses cultural beliefs about personhood, in other words, the importance people place on social and societal characteristics in defining themselves. These beliefs about personhood are expected to provide information about the participants' orientation towards individualism versus collectivism orientation as contextualism is believed to reflect cultural collectivism (Owe et al. 2010). The *lay contextualism* measure is interpreted as follows: High scores reflect the importance of social and contextual attributes in defining a person and the opposite is true for low scores. The *lay contextualism* measure is also answered on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 6 (*completely agree*).

3.6.3 Religiosity

The *Religiosity measure* taps into both subjective experience and behavioural aspects of religiosity. High scores on this scale are linked to cultural collectivism. The religiosity measure uses two response formats. The first two items are rated not at all; slightly; moderately; very; extremely and the last two items are rated never; several times a year; about once a month; about once a week; every day; several times a day.

3.7 Reliability and Validity of Measuring Instrument

Information on the reliability and validity of the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* in general is not widespread as the measurement technique is relatively new. Also, it is not possible to calculate Cronbach's alpha for the entire questionnaire, because of the non-standard psychometric structure: A number of different dimensions of identity within the questionnaire are measured, but each dimension is measured with just one

or two items, each of which is applied by the individual to a large number of identity elements (V. L. Vignoles, personal communication, March 02, 2009).

However, there is test-retest reliability data for some of these ratings for UK university students: test-retest correlations over 2-3 months ranged from .56 to .78 (Vignoles et al., 2006). This seems acceptable, considering that some identity change would be expected to occur over this time period (V. L. Vignoles, personal communication, March 02, 2009). Also, some initial evidence of validity is provided by the use of the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* to look at individual differences in the strengths of different identity motives (Vignoles & Moncaster, 2007).

Individual difference measures derived from the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* are meaningfully associated with various outcomes, including relationship partner preferences, impression management, willingness to consider cosmetic surgery, and intergroup attitudes, and they are sensitive to threat manipulations designed to activate particular motives. However, they are unrelated to measures of the phenomenological importance of related constructs, such as 'need for uniqueness' or 'need to belong' scales. Hence, although relatively new to the literature, these variables appear to have predictive and discriminant validity as measures of individual differences in underlying identity motives, and not differences in subjective beliefs about one's motives (V. L. Vignoles, personal communication, March 02, 2009).

When the extended form of the *Identity Motives Questionnaire*, which was used in this study, was used to measure 'Culture and the Distinctiveness Motive', Becker et al. (2010) generated an identity priority score of $\alpha = .68$ when the relative priority of each identity aspect within participants' subjective identity structures was

measured. Becker et al. also found reliable alpha coefficients for the lay contextualism scale. The scale measured an overall alpha coefficient of .75 and a median alpha coefficient of .73.

Attempts were made by the current researcher to make the questionnaire as culturally sensitive as possible. Despite the questionnaire principally being in English, the question “who are you”, which was used at the very beginning of the questionnaire to generate the identity aspects on which many of the subsequent questions in the questionnaire are based, was translating into six of the local languages commonly spoken in Namibia, the country of the participants. Additionally, the religious categories used to assess religiosity were adapted to reflect the main denominations within the Namibian context. Furthermore, the demographics section of the questionnaire focused on providing a selection of the ethnic groups and languages found in Namibia and on ensuring that the response categories provided for the option that best describes the place where that participants live (in other words, whether city, rural, village or town) as judged appropriate for the Namibian context. The particular version of the IMQ used for this study was, thus, judged to be culturally appropriate based on the adaptations that were made to it (see Appendix: D).

3.8 Summary

Using the reviewed literature as foundation, this chapter has outlined the research methodology employed to conduct the study. It commenced with a description of the research setting followed by an outline of the research design and a depiction of the population and sample. The measures and procedures employed for data collection,

information pertaining to the scoring and interpretation, and the reliability and validity of the measuring instrument were then discussed.

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the present study. It provides the descriptive statistics and reports on the reliabilities of the scales used. The chapter then describes the techniques used to analyse the data. The findings of the analyses conducted to address each of the research questions are then related.

4.1 Characteristics of the Sample

The sample consisted of 104 participants. *Tables 4.1* to *4.5* detail the characteristics of the sample.

Table 4.1
Frequency Distribution of Sample by Gender (n = 104)

Category	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent
Male	40	38.5	38.5
Female	64	61.5	61.5

Table 4.1 shows that of the 104 participants making up the sample, 64 (61.5%) were females and 40 (38.5%) males.

Table 4.2
Frequency Distribution of Sample by Age (*n* = 104)

Category	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent
<18	48	46.2	46.2
18^{+}	56	53.8	53.8

Table 4.2 shows that the sample contained more participants that were at least 18 years old (*n*=56, 53.8%), than those younger than 18 years (*n*=48, 46.2%).

Table 4.3
Frequency Distribution of Sample by Ethnicity (*n* = 103)

Category	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent
Owambo	50	48.1	48.5
Herero	13	12.5	12.6
Baster/ Coloured	11	10.6	10.7
Damara/ Nama	12	11.5	11.7
Other	17	16.3	16.5

Table 4.3 shows that of the 92 participants who provided data about their ethnicity, a majority of the participants were from the 'Owambo' ethnic group (*n*=50, 54.3%). Other ethnic groups significantly represented include 'Herero' (*n*=13, 14.1%), 'Damara/ Nama' (*n*=12, 13%) and 'Baster/ Coloured' (*n*=11, 12.0%) respectively. The participants placed in the 'Other' category made up 6.5% of the sample (*n*=6).

Table 4.4
Frequency Distribution of Sample by Religiosity (*n* = 103)

Category	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent
<4.00	37	35.6	35.9
4.00+	66	63.5	64.1

Table 4.4 shows that 64.1% of the participants scored high (4.00+) on 'religiosity', while 35.9 % scored low (<4.00) on 'religiosity'.

Table 4.5
Frequency Distribution of Sample by Lay Contextualism (*n* = 96)

Category	Frequency	Per cent	Valid Per cent
<4.00	87	83.7	90.6
4.00+	9	8.7	9.4

Table 4.5 shows that a very small percentage of the participants (9.4%) scored high (4.00+) on 'lay contextualism'. In contrast, the majority of the participants (90.6%) scored low (<4.00) on 'lay contextualism'.

4.2 Reliability Results

Reliability tests were performed on the main scales used in this study, namely the Identity Priority, Lay Contextualism and Religiosity scales. *Table 4.6* presents the descriptive statistics and the Cronbach's alpha coefficients of the specific scales.

Table 4.6

Descriptive Statistics and Alpha Coefficients of the Identity Priority, Lay Contextualism and Religiosity Scales.

Scale	No. of Items	Mean	SD	α
Identity Priority	3	21.83	6.89	.64
Lay Contextualism	10	28.14	8.88	.73
Religiosity	4	16.44	3.82	.75

Table 4.6 shows that the present study recorded Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .64 for the identity priority and .73 for the lay contextualism scales respectively. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient of the religiosity scale was .75. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the present study was a bit low for identity priority. However, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients for all the scales signify that the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* demonstrates relative reliability within the Namibian context.

4.3 Data Analyses

Data was analysed using the SPSS programme, version 19.0 (SPSS, 2010). Firstly, the data was explored to test for the assumption of normality as precursor to the conducting of the analyses. The data was then explored for homogeneity of variance. The exploratory data analyses were performed to ensure that the data did not violate basic assumptions for the t-tests and ANOVA, which were the two primary methods of data analyses used to test the research hypotheses. To answer the particular research questions of the present study, independent-samples t-test analyses were carried out. In addition, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted in

the case where the mean scores of more than two groups were compared (Pallant, 2005).

4.3.1 Exploring the Data: Tests for Normality

Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro tests were used as goodness of fit tests to determine whether the data was normally distributed. *Tables 4.7* to *4.11* present the results.

Table 4.7
Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro Values for 'Religiosity' (*n* = 96)

Variable	Category	Kolmogorov- Smirnov p-value	Shark-Shapiro p-value
Distinctiveness	<4.00	.200	.627
	4.00+	.004	.009
Continuity	<4.00	.200	.739
	4.00+	.194	.158
Self-esteem	<4.00	.200	.449
	4.00+	.200	.027
Belonging	<4.00	.200	.577
	4.00+	.200	.299
Efficacy	<4.00	.200	.383
	4.00+	.200	.185
Meaning	<4.00	.200	.948
	4.00+	.200	.282

Table 4.7 shows that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro p-values for 'Religiosity' were generally greater than 0.05. This signifies that the data for 'Religiosity' followed a normal distribution.

Table 4.8
Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro Values for 'Lay Contextualism' (n = 92)

Variable	Category	Kolmogorov- Smirnov p-value	Shark-Shapiro p-value
Distinctiveness	<4.00	.172	.095
	4.00+	.200	.091
Continuity	<4.00	.045	.122
	4.00+	.200	.939
Self-esteem	<4.00	.194	.021
	4.00+	.200	.365
Belonging	<4.00	.200	.102
	4.00+	.198	.107
Efficacy	<4.00	.179	.073
	4.00+	.200	.434
Meaning	<4.00	.050	.325
	4.00+	.200	.258

Table 4.8 shows that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro p-values for 'Lay-Contextualism' were generally greater than 0.05. This signifies that the data for 'Lay- Contextualism' followed a normal distribution.

Table 4.9
Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro Values for ‘Age’
(*n* = 97)

Variable	Category	Kolmogorov- Smirnov p-value	Shark-Shapiro p-value
Distinctiveness	<18	.200	.247
	18+	.200	.104
Continuity	<18	.000	.029
	18+	.057	.040
Self-esteem	<18	.200	.276
	18+	.200	.036
Belonging	<18	.200	.521
	18+	.066	.075
Efficacy	<18	.200	.094
	18+	.200	.228
Meaning	<18	.200	.774
	18+	.169	.179

Table 4.9 shows that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro p-values for ‘Age’ were generally greater than 0.05. This signifies that the data for ‘Age’ followed a normal distribution.

Table 4.10
Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro Values for ‘Gender’
(*n* = 97)

Variable	Category	Kolmogorov- Smirnov p-value	Shark-Shapiro p-value
Distinctiveness	Male	.149	.146
	Female	.200(*)	.301
Continuity	Male	.200(*)	.510
	Female	.076	.047
Self-esteem	Male	.200(*)	.154
	Female	.200(*)	.091
Belonging	Male	.200(*)	.632
	Female	.200(*)	.083
Efficacy	Male	.200(*)	.221
	Female	.200(*)	.440
Meaning	Male	.048	.471
	Female	.200(*)	.833

Table 4.10 shows that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro p-values for ‘Gender’ were generally greater than 0.05. This signifies that the data for ‘Gender’ followed a normal distribution.

Table 4.11
Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro Values for 'Ethnicity'
(n = 96)

Variable	Category	Kolmogorov- Smirnov p-value	Shark-Shapiro p-value
Distinctiveness	Owambo	.200	.158
	Herero	.200	.618
	Baster/ Coloured	.200	.439
	Damara/ Nama	.200	.996
	Other	.200	.980
Continuity	Owambo	.200	.127
	Herero	.200	.251
	Baster/ Coloured	.200	.523
	Damara/ Nama	.200	.824
	Other	.200	.172
Self-esteem	Owambo	.200	.393
	Herero	.057	.044
	Baster/ Coloured	.200	.597
	Damara/ Nama	.200	.448
	Other	.200	.277

Table 4.11
Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro Values for 'Ethnicity'
(n = 96) *(Continued)*

Variable	Category	Kolmogorov- Smirnov p-value	Shark-Shapiro p-value
Belonging	Owambo	.200	.805
	Herero	.180	.177
	Baster/ Coloured	.200	.252
	Damara/ Nama	.200	.998
	Other	.200	.174
Efficacy	Owambo	.200	.249
	Herero	.200	.805
	Baster/ Coloured	.200	.160
	Damara/ Nama	.200	.875
	Other	.081	.084
Meaning	Owambo	.108	.267
	Herero	.067	.239
	Baster/ Coloured	.200	.287
	Damara/ Nama	.155	.223
	Other	.200	.976

Table 4.11 shows that the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shark-Shapiro p-values for 'Ethnicity' were generally greater than 0.05. This signifies that the data for 'Ethnicity' followed a normal distribution.

4.3.2 Exploring the Data: Homogeneity of Variance

To test for the assumption that the samples used were obtained from populations of equal variance, in other words that the variability of scores for each of the groups is similar, the Levene test for equality of variances was performed as part of the t-test and analysis of variances analyses. *Tables 4.12* to *4.16* present the results.

Table 4.12
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances Values for 'Religiosity'
(n = 96)

Variable	p-value
Distinctiveness	.423
Continuity	.293
Self-esteem	.392
Belonging	.062
Efficacy	.716
Meaning	.464

Table 4.12 shows that all the p-values are greater than 0.05. This indicates that the variances are equal across the two religiosity groups. Thus, the assumption that the samples are obtained from populations of equal variances was not violated.

Table 4.13
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances Values for ‘Lay Contextualism’
(*n* = 92)

Variable	p-value
Distinctiveness	.974
Continuity	.181
Self-esteem	.130
Belonging	.822
Efficacy	.076
Meaning	.082

Table 4.13 shows that all the p-values are greater than 0.05. This indicates that the variances are equal across the two lay contextualism groups. Thus, the assumption that the samples are obtained from populations of equal variances was not violated.

Table 4.14
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances Values for ‘Age’
(*n* = 97)

Variable	p-value
Distinctiveness	.283
Continuity	.499
Self-esteem	.390
Belonging	.928
Efficacy	.795
Meaning	.623

Table 4.14 shows that all the p-values are greater than 0.05. This indicates that the variances are equal across the two age groups. Thus, the assumption that the samples are obtained from populations of equal variances was not violated.

Table 4.15
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances Values for 'Gender'
(n = 97)

Variable	p-value
Distinctiveness	.951
Continuity	.494
Self-esteem	.400
Belonging	.210
Efficacy	.740
Meaning	.940

Table 4.15 shows that all the p-values are greater than 0.05. This indicates that the variances are equal across the two genders. Thus, the assumption that the samples are obtained from populations of equal variances was not violated.

Table 4.16
Levene's Test for Equality of Variances Values for 'Ethnicity'
(n = 96)

Variable	p-value
Distinctiveness	.351
Continuity	.887
Self-esteem	.171
Belonging	.210
Efficacy	.606
Meaning	.051

Table 4.16 shows that all the p-values are greater than 0.05. This indicates that the variability of scores for each of the ethnic groups is similar. Thus, the assumption that the samples are obtained from populations of equal variances was not violated.

4.3.3 Hypothesis Testing: T-tests Results

The results of the t-tests rejected *H1*, *H2*, *H3*, *H4*, *H5* and *H6*.

There was no significant difference in scores for individuals with high religiosity scores (M=.54, SD=.58) and those with low religiosity scores [M=.43, SD=.42; t (94) =.97, p=.34] with respect to the belonging motive. There was also no significant difference in scores for individuals with high lay contextualism scores (M=.55, SD=.46) and those with low lay contextualism scores [M=.50, SD=.55; t (90) =.29, p=.77] with respect to the belonging motive.

Concerning the distinctiveness motive, no significant difference in scores was found for individuals with high religiosity scores (*M*=.45, *SD*=.54) and those with low religiosity scores [*M*=.38, *SD*=.50; *t* (94) =.61, *p*=.54]. Similarly, there was no significant difference in scores for individuals with high lay contextualism scores (*M*=.54, *SD*=.58) and those with low lay contextualism scores [*M*=.42, *SD*=.53; *t* (90) =.66, *p*=.51] concerning the distinctiveness motive.

Results regarding the continuity motive further indicate that there was no significant difference in scores for individuals with high religiosity scores (*M*=.60, *SD*=.57) and those with low religiosity scores [*M*=.54, *SD*=.51; *t* (94) =.55, *p* =.58]. Likewise, there was no significant difference in scores for individuals with high lay contextualism scores (*M*=.32, *SD*=.42) and those with low lay contextualism scores [*M*=.59, *SD*=.56; *t* (90) =-1.41, *p* =.16].

The t-test yielded similar results for the efficacy motive. No significant difference in scores was found for individuals with high religiosity scores (*M*=.66, *SD*=.56) as compared to those with low religiosity scores [*M*=.54, *SD*=.59; *t* (94) =1.02, *p* =.31]. There was equally no significant difference found in the scores for individuals with high lay contextualism scores (*M*=.39, *SD*=.38) and those with low lay contextualism scores [*M*=.64, *SD*=.60; *t* (90) =-1.23, *p* =.22].

Regarding to the self-esteem motive, a similar fashion was observed where there was no significance different in scores for individuals with high religiosity scores (*M*=.69, *SD*=.63) and those with low religiosity scores [*M*=.55, *SD*=.59; *t* (94) =1.01, *p* =.31]. Additionally, there was no significant difference in scores for individuals with high lay contextualism scores (*M*=.60, *SD*=.40) and those with low lay contextualism scores [*M*=.65, *SD*=.64; *t* (90) =-.22, *p* =.83].

With respect to the meaning motive, there was also no significant difference in scores for individuals with high religiosity scores (*M*=.66, *SD*=.64) and those with low religiosity scores [*M*=.56, *SD*=.59; *t* (94) =.77, *p* =.45]. Relatedly, no significant difference in scores for individuals with high lay contextualism scores (*M*=.46, *SD*=.42) and those with low lay contextualism scores [*M*=.63, *SD*=.65; *t* (90) =-.74, *p* =.46] was observed.

The t-tests provided varying outcomes for *H7*. A statistically significant difference was found between males (*M*=.42, *SD*=.52) and females [*M*=.74, *SD*=.57; *t* (95) =-2.79, *p* =.01] in relation to the motive of efficacy. According to Gravetter and Forzano (2006), the magnitude of the differences in the means was moderate (*d*= .6). The study also found a statistically significant difference between the participants who were below 18 years of age (*M*= .48, *SD*= .61) and those who were at least 18 years of age [*M*= .74, *SD*= .62; *t* (95) =-2.07, *p* =.4], when the two age groups were compared in relation to the meaning motive. However, the magnitude of the differences in the means was small (*d*= .04) (Gravetter and Forzano, 2006). This denotes that *H7* was only partially supported as no other statistically significant differences were found between the males and the females or between the two age groups for any of the other motives.

4.3.4 Hypothesis Testing: Analysis of Variance Results

The analysis of variance did not produce any statistically significant results, denoting that there was no significant difference among the mean scores on any of the identity motives for the ethnic groups. This further provides support for *H7* to be rejected.

To summarise, the results from the t-tests rejected most of the hypotheses of the study and only partially supported *H7*. The analysis of variance results did not support *H7*.

CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.0 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the methods used to carry out the study. The chapter further reflects on and discusses the findings of the study. The limitations of the study are then uncovered followed by recommendations for future research.

5.1 Summary of Results

The target population of this study was expected to provide socio-cultural variation. It was observed that this was more or less achieved as the genders as well as the two age groups were sufficiently represented. Although more females (61.5%) than males (38.5%) participated in the study, while Windhoek was reported to have a slightly larger population of males compared to females, the gender difference is not unusual as more males compared to their female counterparts are expected to have dropped out of school by the eleventh grade. The age group of individuals who were at least 18 years old only contained 7.6% more participants than that consisting of individuals younger than 18 years of age.

While a lot more participants were from the Owambo ethnic group (48.5%) compared to the other ethnic groups, this representation was relatively proportional to the characteristics of the Windhoek population. As earlier highlighted, the number of individuals from the Owambo ethnic group also surpasses the other groups found in Windhoek by far.

The group that scored high on lay contextualism (9.4%) greatly trailed behind that scoring low on the dimension (90.6%) in terms of number of participants,

making it difficult to compare the participants on this facet. On the other hand, the smaller gap between the number of participants scoring low on religiosity (35.9%) and those scoring high on religiosity (64.1%) facilitated better the comparison of the participants in terms of orientation towards individualism/ collectivism.

All in all, the cultural representations obtained aided the present study to specify cultural orientation beyond national profiles, a tendency of cross-cultural research that the present study attempted to evade.

Concerning the research instrument, the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* proved to be relatively reliable within the Namibian context. The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .73 and .75 for the *lay contextualism* and *religiosity* scales respectively generated by this study signify this. Although the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the present study was a bit low for *identity priority*, the value of .64 obtained closely corresponds with that found by Becker et al. (2010) and can still be regarded as acceptable. As earlier pointed out, Becker et al. reported an alpha coefficient of .68 for the identity priority scale.

Tests for the assumption of normality found all the study variables to be normally distributed. Explorations for homogeneity of variance also found the different groupings compared within each of the cultural facets to have variability of scores.

5.2 Hypotheses Testing

Independent-samples t-tests were carried out to test each of the research hypotheses. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was additionally conducted to test part of *hypothesis 7*.

5.2.1 H1: Individuals from a Collectivistic Culture are more likely to construct their Identities around the Motive of Belonging as Compared to Individuals from an Individualistic Culture.

The t-test results of this study with regards to *H1* showed no significant difference in scores for individuals with high religiosity ratings and those with low religiosity ratings and neither in the scores for individuals with high lay contextualism ratings compared to those with low lay contextualism scores.

The results of this study, thus, did not support the hypothesis that individuals from a collectivistic culture are more likely to construct their identities around the motive of belonging as compared to individuals from an individualistic culture. Consequently, it can be deduced that orientation towards individualism/ collectivism does not seem to influence the involvement of the belonging motive in identity construction. This suggests that individuals strive to uphold and increase a sense that they fit in with others or are accepted by others, irrespective of whether they place more importance on their personal rights than the rights of the groups they are affiliated with, or vice versa.

This finding seems to support the idea that the need for belonging is widespread to human beings as posited by Baumeister and Leary (1995): in Vignoles et al. (2006). At the same time, this finding brings into question the supposition by theorists that the motive of belonging operates in opposition in different cultures. According to Vignoles et al., many theorists (Brewer, 1991; Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980) have put forward that the belonging motive is more linked to collectivistic cultures than to individualistic cultures. However, the present

study could not affirm that the satisfaction of the belonging motive is reliant on whether an individual is geared towards cultural collectivism or individualism.

5.2.2 H2: Individuals from an Individualistic Culture are more likely to construct their Identities around the Motive of Distinctiveness as Compared to Individuals from a Collectivistic Culture.

Relating to *H2*, the t-test results of this study also showed that there was no significant difference in the scores of individuals with high religiosity ratings and those with low religiosity ratings. Similarly, there was no significant difference in scores for individuals with high lay contextualism ratings and those with low lay contextualism ratings as far as the same motive was concerned.

This indicates that the results of this study did not support the hypothesis that individuals from an individualistic culture are more likely to construct their identities around the motive of distinctiveness as compared to individuals from a collectivistic culture. Thus, orientation towards individualism/ collectivism does not seem to influence the role of the distinctiveness motive in identity construction.

This result reinforces the position that a level of distinctiveness is required to establish an identity that feels significant Codol (1981): in Vignoles et al. (2006), and simultaneously contradicts the theory that striving to achieve distinctiveness is a trait limited to persons from individualistic backgrounds (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980: in Vignoles et al., 2006). Thus, it seems the propensity to want to be different when developing one's identity is generalisable to individuals falling anywhere on the continuum of individualism/ collectivism orientation. This result, consequently, adds to the indication that deriving a sense of distinctiveness is at the core of identity

construction of individuals, regardless of the factors forming their cultural background.

5.2.3 H3: Individuals from a Collectivistic Culture are more likely to construct their Identities around the Motive of Continuity as Compared to Individuals from an Individualistic Culture.

The results related to *H3* showed no significant difference in scores for individuals with high religiosity levels and those with low religiosity levels. Likewise, there was no significant difference in scores for individuals with high lay contextualism levels and those with low lay contextualism levels.

As a result, this study also did not support the hypothesis that individuals from a collectivistic culture are more likely to construct their identities around the motive of continuity as compared to individuals from an individualistic culture. This follows that the attainment of an identity that is stable seems to transcend beyond orientation towards individualism/ collectivism.

This finding is consistent with previous research that suggests that the existence of a sense of continuity is primary to the construction of the identities of people in general.

5.2.4 H4: Individuals from an Individualistic Culture are more likely to construct their Identities around the Motive of Efficacy as Compared to Individuals from a Collectivistic Culture.

Concerning *H4*, the t-test results of this study once more did not yield significant differences between the scores for the individuals with high religiosity ratings as compared to those with low religiosity ratings, as well as between the scores of individuals with high lay contextualism ratings and those with low lay contextualism ratings.

This study also consequently rejected the hypothesis that individuals from an individualistic culture are more likely to construct their identities around the motive of efficacy as compared to individuals from a collectivistic culture. It can be derived from this finding that individuals in the main focus on cultivating a sense that they are competent. Hence, the philosophy that individuals need to believe that they are efficient (Deci & Ryan, 2000: in Vignoles et al., 2006) and the associated view that such a belief is crucial to identity (Codol, 1981: in Vignoles et al., 2006) are promoted by this finding.

5.2.5 H5: There will be no Significant Difference between Individuals from Individualistic and Collectivistic Cultures in Relation to their Focus on the Motive of Self-esteem when constructing their Identities.

Regarding *H5*, a similar fashion was observed where the t-test produced no significant different in scores for individuals with high religiosity scores and those with low religiosity scores. Similarly, no significant difference in scores for individuals with high lay contextualism ratings and those with low lay contextualism

ratings were observed. Thus, these results suggest that individuals that were more geared towards collectivism similarly seemed to focus on the self-esteem motive in the construction of their identities as those that were more oriented towards individualism.

This finding supports the hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between individuals from individualistic and collectivistic cultures in relation to their focus on the motive of self-esteem when constructing their identities. The finding is in line with existing research, which puts forward that everyone equally sets out to perceive themselves positively (Muramoto, 2003). As such, as maintained by past research, the self-esteem motive seems to be universal.

5.2.6 H6: There will be no Significant Difference between Individuals from Individualistic and Collectivistic Cultures in relation to their Search for Meaning when constructing their Identities.

The t-test did not show a significant difference in scores for individuals with high religiosity ratings and those with low religiosity ratings with respect to *H6*. Relatedly, no significant difference was found in the scores of individuals with high lay contextualism ratings and those with low lay contextualism ratings.

The results of the present study, hence, point towards the idea that orientation towards individualism/ collectivism did not seem to influence the search for meaning when the participants constructed their identities. Thus, the hypothesis that there will be no significant difference between individuals from individualistic and collectivistic cultures in relation to their search for meaning when constructing their identities was supported. This finding strengthens the conviction of various

researchers that deriving a sense of purpose is central to the effective functioning of individuals (Vignoles et al., 2006).

5.2.7 H7: There will be significant differences between individuals with different demographics in relation to the involvement of the motives of belonging, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, meaning and self-esteem in the construction of their identities.

While the analysis of variance results showed no significant difference among the mean scores on any of the identity motives for the ethnic groups, the results of the t-test showed that a statistically significant difference of moderate effect size existed between the scores of males and females in relation to the motive of efficacy. Although a significant difference was further observed between the scores of participants who were below 18 years of age and those who were at least 18 years of age when the two age groups were compared in relation to the meaning motive, the effect size was small, suggesting that the difference could have occurred by chance.

No other statistically significant differences were found between the genders or between the two age groups compared for any of the other identity motives. Thus, insufficient support exists for the endorsement of the hypothesis that there will be significant differences between individuals with different demographics in relation to the involvement of the motives of belonging, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, meaning and self-esteem in the construction of their identities. This follows that *H7* was rejected.

Nonetheless, the finding that the males and females differed relatively in terms of their efficacy levels, with the females averagely focusing more on

developing an identity that embraces a sense that they are competent, is consistent with previous research. Pajares (2002) relates that researchers have found females to convey higher levels of efficacy at various stages of their schooling in comparison to males. Yet, this result can still be surprising, as males are traditionally more socialised to be competitive, which results in them being expected to have higher regard for feelings of efficacy during identity construction in comparison to females.

Failure to find a sizeable effect size concerning the significant difference observed between the scores of the two age groups, which suggests that age does not influence the motives behind identity construction, both supports as well as opposes existing research. According to Frankl (1959, 1967): in Takkinen and Ruoppila (2001), the identity motive of meaning is perceived to be widespread to all human beings and transcends sex, age, cognitive ability, religious orientation as well as all other personal qualities. On the other hand, by putting forward that a sense of meaning particularly becomes significant to older individuals (Battista & Almond, 1973: in Takkinen & Ruoppila, 2001; Wong, 1989: in Takkinen & Ruoppila), previous research also seems to allude to the idea that age has a bearing on the need for meaning.

The present study's finding agrees with the former view by failing to substantiate that a relationship exists between age and the quest for meaning in identity construction. The notion that the quest for meaning increases with age resulting from individuals being propelled to assess the value of their lives as they grow older and become more conscious of death (Erikson, 1994: in Takkinen & Ruoppila) is, thus, discouraged by the results of this study.

5.3 Research Findings and Theoretical Assumptions

The observed difference between males and females with reference to the motive of efficacy fosters the idea that differences can exist between individuals from varying backgrounds in the weight placed on achieving a sense of efficacy in identity construction. This finding, therefore, raises questions about the universality of the motives of identity construction, particularly with regards to the efficacy motive, and seems to make the supposition of Vignoles et al. (2006), that cultural differences may exist in the manners that the different motives get satisfied, probable.

Indeed, failure of the present study to find salient differences between individuals from collectivistic and individualistic backgrounds with respect to any of the motives investigated supports the likelihood that the identity motives of concern could be generalise-able to wider cultural contexts and not just to individuals from predominantly individualistic backgrounds. Furthermore, the discovery of this study that the motives of belonging and distinctiveness, in particular, do not seem to be bound to individuals from specific cultural backgrounds as has been stressed by existing research also appears to support the universality of the identity motives.

Yet, the actuality that a difference existed in the significance placed on the motive of efficacy by males and females signifies that culture might have some bearing on the degree of influence that the identity motives have on identity construction. The results of this study seem to support the standing that as much as the same identity motives may generally guide the process of identity construction within different groups of individuals, a possibility exists that these motives are satisfied differently based on culture. Some theorists have postulated that while all

humans share the same motivational pool, the specific needs behind the motives as well as the demand intensities to attain these motives may vary from culture to culture (Strauss, 1992).

It is, consequently, the assumption of the present study that while individuals may in fact principally be guided by the motivations to develop and increase feelings of self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, belonging, efficacy, and meaning when constructing their identities, it is also expected that cultural factors may moderate the strengths of the identity motives in different individuals.

The position of the present study, thus, supports the Social Identity, Social Constructivist, Self-Development, Developmental, Systems, Ecological and Self-Representation theories, whose stance is essentially that behaviour occurs in context. Simultaneously, the findings of the present study support the theory of identity motives, which occupies a middle ground between the Universalist and Relativist views of identity construction.

5.4 Significance of the Study

This study replicated the findings of Vignoles et al., (2006), that motives for self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, meaning, belonging, and efficacy generally guide the processes by which individuals construct their identities. However, by signifying that cultural factors may influence the weight carried by the identity motives in the process of identity construction, this study has also provided an important step forward in conceptualising the relationship between culture and identity, moving the field of identity construction towards a more dynamic understanding of how identities are constructed in different cultural contexts.

As a result of its novelty, this research is of significance to the domain of cross-cultural psychology, particularly in the field of identity construction, as it fills a gap in academic research by extending the knowledge base that currently exists in the field in Namibia and in the African context in general. Furthermore, the ability of the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* to yield acceptable reliabilities within the Namibian context assists the present study to validate the suitability of the *Identity Motives Questionnaire* as a measure of motivated identity construction.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

A possible limitation of the present study is that the research participants were all students from schools around Windhoek. Although regarded as more culturally diverse than any other population, students may, by virtue of their privileges and education, have much in common and not be fully representative of their cultural backgrounds as a whole. Furthermore, the targeted age range of 16 to 20 provides a drawback in the sense that it creates difficulty with generalisation of the results to older individuals. As it is theorised that culture might impact on the level of prominence placed on certain identity motives, generalising the results of this study to much older or much younger individuals could be problematic.

Another possible limitation of this study is posed by its design. By making use of the convenience sampling technique to recruit the participants, only individuals who were easily accessible ended up contributing to the study. The result is that the participants did not adequately represent the wide assortment of ethnic groups and races obtainable in this country.

5.6 Recommendations for Future Research

Based on the limitations pointed out above, it is recommended that future research be extended to a much larger sample size consisting of older generations from more diverse ethnic groups to increase opportunities for generalise-ability. Including participants from the "White" ethnic groups, for example, could have created more cultural diversity within the sample of the present study. Investigation into broader cultural facets such as economic status, urbanisation, education and religion would also enhance prospects for expansive comparisons, allowing for a better account of the role of culture in motivated identity construction.

As a result of the present study's rather varying results with regards to the role of demographic factors in influencing the motives of identity construction, it is further recommended that more extensive research be carried out in the field of culture and motivated identity construction to increase understanding of how identities are constructed in different cultural contexts.

Understanding how the identity is constructed could offer useful insights into inter-group conflicts such as the Holocaust, Rwandan Genocide, the ethnic cleansing of Slobodan Milosevic and the apartheid systems in Namibia and South Africa. A further recommendation of this study is, therefore, for the link between identity construction and the development of ethnic clashes to be explored more to provide a new source of ideas on resolving identity related conflicts.

5.7 Conclusion

Apart from the self-esteem motive, it has been declared that the motives of continuity, efficacy, belonging, meaning and distinctiveness also underlie the processes related to identity construction. However, literature does not seem to support that sufficient research on these specific identity motives has ever been conducted in countries outside of Europe.

The present study confirmed that the findings of Vignoles et al. (2006), that individuals value those identity elements that provide a greater sense of self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, and meaning, may indeed be applicable in nations outside of Europe. On the other hand, the present study also found some variations in the emphasis placed on the motive of efficacy by the genders. Consequently, the present study concluded that while individuals may all generally be inclined to enhance feelings of self-esteem, continuity, distinctiveness, efficacy, belonging and meaning in their self-definitions, cultural factors may influence the degree of significance placed on each of these motives.

This study, thus, supports the literature that regards identity motives as occupying a middle ground between the two opposing views that identity motives are either common to all individuals or only distinctively exist in some individuals. Instead of classifying identity motives as strictly universal or as strictly culture specific, the present study recognises that the particular identity motives are likely shared by to all, but may vary in strength from person to person based on cultural orientation. It, therefore, follows that this study additionally fits in with the Social Constructionist, Social Identity, Identity, Self-Development, Systems, Ecological and

Self-Representation theories, as well as the Development Theory of Vygotsky that generally stress behaviour as a process influenced by social communications and practices.

The findings of this study encourage increased effort in investigating the role of culture in identity construction, particularly with regards to how cultural factors other than orientation towards individualism/ collectivism might impinge on the intensity of identity motives. The present study has, consequently, created awareness of the need to incorporate cultural diversity into studies of identity motives, which might help bring the field of identity construction towards a more comprehensive understanding of how identity is constructed.

REFERENCES

Abrams, D. (2009). Social Identity on a National Scale: Optimal Distinctiveness and Young People's Self-Expression through Musical Preference. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations 2009; 12;* 303. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://gpi.sagepub.com

Aharpour, S., & Brown, R. (2002). Functions of Group Identification: An Exploratory Analysis. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale, 15(3- 4),* 157-186.

Banerjee, R. & Dittmar, H. (2007). Individual Differences in Children's Materialism: The Role of Peer Relations. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*; 34; 17-30. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://psp.sagepub.com

Becker, M. , Vignoles, V. L., Owe, E. Brown, R., Smith, P. B. Easterbrook, M., ... Yamakoglu, N. (2010). *Culture and the Distinctiveness Motive: Constructing Identity in Individualistic and Collectivistic Contexts*. Manuscript in preparation, University of Sussex: UK.

Blaxter, L., Hughes, C. & Tight, M. (2001). *How to Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Breakwell, G. M. (1987). Identity. In H. Beloff & A. Coleman (Eds.), *Psychology Survey 6* (pp. 94-114). Leicester, United Kingdom: British Psychological Society.

Brewer, M. B. & Pickett, C. L. (1999). Distinctiveness Motives as a Source of the

Social Self. In T. R. Tyler, R. M. Kramer & O. P. John (Eds.), *The Psychology of the Social Self* (pp. 71-87). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Breidlid, A. & Baxen, J. (2010). *HIV/AIDS in Sub-Saharan Africa: Understanding the Implications of Culture & Context*. Retrieved May 31, 2011 from: http://unu.edu

Brown, J. D. & Kobayashi, C. (2002). Self-Enhancement in Japan and America. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *5*, 145-168.

Capozza, D., Brown, R., Aharpour, S. & Falvo, R. (2006). A Comparison of Motivational Theories of Identification. In R. Brown & D. Capozza (Eds.), *Social Identities: Motivational, Emotional and Cultural Influences* (pp.51-72). Hove: Psychology Press.

Christopher, J. C. & Bickhard, M. H. (2007). Culture, Self and Identity: Interactivist Contributions to a Metatheory for Cultural Psychology. *Culture Psychology* 2007; 13; 259. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://cap.sagepub.com

Chandler, M. J., Lalonde, C. E., Sokol, B., & Hallett, D. (2003). Personal Persistence, Identity Development and Suicide: A study of Native and Non-Native North American Adolescents. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 68*(2).

Chirkov, V.I., Ryan, R.M., & Willness, C. (2005). Cultural Context and Psychological Needs in Canada and Brazil: Testing a Self-determination Approach to the Internalization of Cultural Practices, Identity and Wellbeing. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, *36*, 423–443.

Constitution of Namibia, Art. 21, Sec.1, Cl. b.

Constitution of Namibia, Art. 21, Sec.1, Cl. g.

Cukur, C. S., De Guzman, M. R. T. & Carlo, G. (2004). Religiosity, Values, and Horizontal and Vertical Individualism–Collectivism: A Study of Turkey, The United States, and The Philippines. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144(6)*, 613–634

D'Andrade, R. (1992). Schemas and Motivation. In R. D'Andrade & C. Strauss (Eds.). *Human Motives and Cultural Models* (pp. 23-44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Dauenheimer, D. G., Stahlberg, D., Spreemann. S., & Sedikides, C. (2002). Self-Enhancement, Self-Verification, or Self-Assessment? The Intricate Role of Trait Modifiability in the Self-evaluation Process. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale, 15(3-4)*, 89-112

Desrochers, S. Andreassi, J. & Thompson, C. (2002). *Identity Theory*. Retrieved June 19, 2011 from: http://www.wfnetwork.bc.edu

Dobler, G. (2010). On the Border to Chaos: Identity Formation on the Angolan-Namibian Border, 1927-2008. *Journal of Borderlands Studies. Volume 25, 2* (p.22).

Edwards, D. (2005). Motivation and Emotion. In D. A. Louw & D. Edwards (Eds.). *Psychology: An Introduction for Students in Southern Africa* (pp. 421-448). Sandton: Heinemann Higher & Further Education (Pty) Ltd

Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2011). *Confucianism.* Retrieved May 04, 2011 from: http://www.britannica.com

Faircloth, B. S. (2009). Making the Most of Adolescence: Harnessing the Search for

Identity to Understand Classroom Belonging. *Journal of Adolescent Research 24; 321*. Retrieved September 25, 2009 from http://jar.sagepub.com

Fairweather, I. (2006). Heritage, Identity and Youth in Postcolonial Namibia. *Journal of Southern African Studies; Volume 32; Number 4*. Retrieved May 31, 2011 from: http://www.jstor.org

Foster, D. (2005). Social Psychology. In D. A. Louw & D. Edwards (Eds.). *Psychology: An Introduction for Students in Southern Africa* (pp. 717-776). Sandton: Heinemann Higher & Further Education (Pty) Ltd.

Foxcroft, C. & Roodt, G. (2009). *Introduction to Psychological Assessment in the South African Context*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd.

Glatthorn, A. A. & Joyner, R. L. (2005). *Writing the Winning Thesis or Dissertation: A Step-by-Step Guide*. Califrnia: Corwin Press.

Gravetter, F. J. & Forzano, L. B. (2006). *Research Methods for the Behavioural Sciences*. Australia: Thomson Wadsworth.

Griswold, W. (1994). *Cultures and Societies in a Changing World*. California: Thousand Oaks.

Hammack, P. L. (2008). Narrative and the Cultural Psychology of Identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*; 12; 222-247. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://psr.sagepub.com

Haugh, W. A. (2007). *Culture of Namibia*. Retrieved September, 04, 2009 from: www.everyculture.com

Hedegaard, M. (2005). Strategies for Dealing with Conflicts in Value Positions between Home and School: Influences on Ethnic Minority Students'

Development of Motives and Identity. *Culture Psychology*; *11*; 187-205. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://cap.sagepub.com

Heine, S.H., Lehman, D.R., Markus, H.R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is There a Universal Need for Positive Self-Regard? *Psychological Review*, *106*, 766–794.

Hermans, H. J. M. & Kempen, H. J. G. (1998). Moving Cultures: The Perilous Problems of Cultural Dichotomies in a Globalising Society. *American Psychologist, 53,* 1111-1120.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jameson, D. A. (2007). Reconceptualising Cultural Identity and its Role in Intercultural Business Communication. *Journal of Business Communication*; 44; 199-235. Retrieved October 25, 2009 from: http://job.sagepub.com

Kim, B. (2001). Social Constructivism. In M. Orey (Ed.), *Emerging Perspectives on Learning,Teaching, and Technology*. Retrieved August 29, 2011, from http://projects.coe.uga.edu

Lalljee, M. (1996). The Interpreting Self: An Experimentalist Perspective. In R. Stevens (Ed.).*Understanding the Self*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Lifschitz, S. & Oosthuizen, C. (2001). Discovering Agape: Forming and Reforming a Healing Community. In M. Seedat, N. Duncan & S. Lazarus (Eds.), *Community Psychology: Theory, Method and Practice* (pp. 107-132). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Klein, O., Spears, R. & Reicher, S. (2007). Social Identity Performance: Extending

the Strategic Side of SIDE. *Personality and Social Psychology Review; 11*; 28-45. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://psr.sagepub.com

Kurman, J. (2003). Why Is Self-Enhancement Low in Certain Collectivistic Cultures? An Investigation of Two Competing Explanations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *34*, 496-510.

Kurman, J. (2003). Why Is Self-Enhancement Low in Certain Collectivistic Cultures? An Investigation of Two Competing Explanations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *34*, 496-510.

Kuther, T (2001). *Freud's Theory of Personality: Development of the Psyche*. Retrieved August 29, 2011 from: http://www.suite101.com

Markus, H. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the Self. *Psychological Review*, *98*, 224-253.

Matsumoto, D. (2006). Culture and Cultural Worldviews: Do Verbal Descriptions about Culture Reflect Anything Other Than Verbal Descriptions of Culture? *Culture Psychology; 12*; 33-62. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://cap.sagepub.com

Muramoto, Y. (2003). An Indirect Self-Enhancement in Relationship among Japanese. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *34*, 552-566.

Namibia 2001 Population and Housing Census

Owe, E., Vignoles, V. L., Becker, M., Brown, R., Smith, P. B., Lee, S. W. S., … Yamakoglu, N. (2010). *Identifying the Belief Component of Individualism-Collectivism: Contextualism Beliefs across 19 Nations*. Manuscript in preparation, University of Sussex, UK.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking Individualism

and Collectism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta-Analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 3-72.

Pajares, F. (2002). *Gender and Perceived Self-Efficacy in Self-Regulated Learning*. Retrieved October 25, 2011 from: Interactive Business Network Resource Library: Http://Findarticles.Com

Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Ananlysis using SPSS*. Maidenhead: Open Univesity Press.

Roeser, R. W., Galloway, M., Casey-Cannon, S., Watson, C., Keller, L. & Tan, E. (2008). Identity Representations in Patterns of School Achievement and Well-Being among Early Adolescent Girls: Variable- and Person-Centred Approaches. *The Journal of Early Adolescence; 28*; 115-152. Retrieved September 24, 2009, from: http://jea.sagepub.com

Roshan Cultural Heritage Institute. (2001). *Defining Culture.* Retrieved April, 19, 2009, from http://www.roshan-institute.org

Santrock, J. W. (2008). *Life-Span Development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schachter, E. P. (2005). Context and Identity Formation: A Theoretical Analysis and a Case Study. *Journal of Adolescent Research; 20*; 375-395. Retrieved October 01, 2009 from: http://jar.sagepub.com

Schimmack, U., Oishi, S. & Diener, E. (2005). Individualism: A Valid and Important Dimension of Cultural Differences between Nations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, Vol. 9, No. 1*, 17–31.

Sedikides, C. Gaertner, L. & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural Self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality Social Psychology, 84*, 60-79.

Singelis, T. M., Triandis, H. C., Bhawuk, D., & Gelfand, M. J. (1995). Horizontal and Vertical Dimensions of Individualism and Collectivism: A Theoretical and Measurement Refinement. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science, 29*, 240-275.

Sixtensson, J. & Hamma, C. (2005), *"They say: divided we fall, united we stand" – A Study on National Identity and Nation-building in Postcolonial Namibia*. (A University Essay from the University of Malmö, Sweden). Retrieved 31 May 2011 from: http:// http://hdl.handle.net

Smurda, J. D., Wittig, M. A. & Gokalp, G. (2006). Effects of Threat to a Valued Social Identity on Implicit Self-Esteem and Discrimination. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations*; *9*; 181-197. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://gpi.sagepub.com

Snyman, G. (2005). Constructing and Deconstructing Identities in Postapartheid South Africa: A Case of Hybridity versus Untainted Africanicity. *Rhetoric of Identity: Conference Paper*. Retrieved May 31, 2011 from: http://www.ars-rhetorica.net

Stevens, R. D. (1996). Aspects of the Self. In R. D. Stevens (Ed.). *Understanding the Self. London*: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Strauss, C. (1992). Models and Motives. In R. D'Andrade & C. Strauss (Eds.). *Human Motives and Cultural Models* (pp. 1-20). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Takkinen, S. & Ruoppila, I. (2001). Meaning in Life in Three Samples of Elderly Persons with High Cognitive Functioning. *Int'l. J. Aging and Human*

Development, Vol. 53(1) 51-73. Retrieved October 25, 2011 from: http://www.gigusa.org

Tappan, M. B. (2005). Domination, Subordination and the Dialogical Self: Identity Development and the Politics of 'Ideological Becoming'. *Culture Psychology; 11; 47-75*. Retrieved September 24, 2009 from: http://cap.sagepub.com

Tapscott, C. (2001). Class Formation and Civil Society in Namibia. In I. Diener & O. Graefe (Eds.), *Contemporary Namibia; the First Landmarks of a Post-Apartheid Society* (pp. 307-325). Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers (Pty) Ltd.

Teague, R. (2000). *Social Constructivism & Social Studies*. Retrieved August 29, 2011 from: http://www.oup.com

Thomas, K. (1996). The Defensive Self: A Psychodynamic Perspective. In R. D. Stevens (Ed.). *Understanding the Self*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd

Traavik, J. V. (2010). *Identity Construction across Generations and Nationalities*. Retrieved July 28, 2011 from: University of Oslo Department of Educational Research Faculty of Educational Sciences: http://www.uio.no

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism & Collectivism*. Colorado: Westview Press, Inc.

Van Schalkwyk, G. J. (2010). The Crown Prince and the Frog-Prince: Characterisations in the Identity Construction of Firstborn Males. *South African Journal of Psychology, 40(3),* 282-291. Retrieved 31 May 2011 from: http://www.taosinstitute.net

Vignoles, V. L. & Moncaster, N. J. (2007). Identity Motives and In-Group

Favouritism: A New Approach to Individual Differences in Intergroup Discrimination. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46,* 91–113.

Vignoles, V. L., Regalia, C., Manzi, C., Golledge, J. & Scabini, E. (2006). Beyond Self-Esteem: Influence of Multiple Motives on Identity Construction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psycholoy, 90*, 398-333.

Welman, J. C. & Kruger, S. J. (2001). *Research Methodology*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Zhang, Y. & Huxham, C. (2009). Identity Construction and Trust Building in Developing International Collaborations. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science; 45*; 186-211. Retrieved September, 24, 2009 from: http://jab.sagepub.com

APPENDICES

Appendix: A Sample Consent Letter from Ministry Of Education

REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION: KHOMAS REGION

Tel: 061 – 2934221
Fax: 061 –211431

Private Bag 13236
Windhoek
13 March 2009

Enquiries: Ms. W. Bruwer

The Principal
Windhoek High School
Windhoek

Dear Mr Van Sittert

Permission to Ms. M. Martin to conduct research

The Khomas Regional Office hereby grants permission to Ms. Mariana Martin to conduct research at **Windhoek High School** for her research project on **Motivated Identity Construction Process.**

Ms. Martin is aware of the following conditions:

- She must liaise with the Principal of the school regarding her plan of action
- Her visits to the school must not disrupt the normal school programme
- That she must obtain parental permission in order to conduct research with learners

Thank you for your support.

Yours sincerely

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION
... WINDHOEK

Ms.C. U. Tjikuua
Director of Education

DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION
KHOMAS REGION

Appendix: B Parental Consent

for
Beliefs, Thoughts and Feelings Questionnaire

Dear sir/ madam

My name is Mariana Martin. I am currently studying towards a Master's degree in Clinical Psychology at the University of Namibia. As part of my studies, it is a requirement for me to undertake a dissertation. I, thus, invite your son/ daughter to participate in a research study.

The study, which is being conducted by myself aims to examine individuals' beliefs, thoughts and feelings about themselves as well as other people. Your child was selected as a possible participant, because of his or her age-group. The study targets individuals from the ages of 17-19. If your child is younger than 18 years, it is required that you provide your permission to include him/her in the study.

What will be involved if your child participates? If you decide to allow your child to participate in this research study, your child will be asked to complete a questionnaire, which will take less than one hour to complete.

Are there any risks or discomforts? There are no known risks associated with participating in this study. Your child's privacy will be protected. Apart from the child's name on the consent forms, there will be no identifying information on the questionnaire whatsoever that could make it traceable to your child. Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. Your child's participation is also completely voluntary. If you (or your child) change your mind about your child's participation, your child can be withdrawn from the study at any time.

Please note that there are not going to be any rewards or compensation for participating in the study. However, the research would make a significant contribution to the understanding of behaviour in general as information obtained through your child's participation may be published in a professional journal or presented at a professional meeting.

Your consent would, thus, be highly valuable.

Sincerely,

Mariana Martin

Appendix: B Parental Consent (Continued)

HAVING READ THE INFORMATION PROVIDED, YOU SHOULD INDICATE WHETHER OR NOT YOU WISH FOR YOUR CHILD TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY. YOUR SIGNATURE INDICATES YOUR WILLINGNESS TO ALLOW YOUR CHILD TO PARTICIPATE.

_____ _____

Parent/Guardian Signature Date

_____

Printed Name

Child's name _____

Appendix: C Participant Consent Form

BELIEFS, THOUGHTS AND FEELINGS QUESTIONNAIRE

We ask you to reply to a series of questions concerning your beliefs, thoughts and feelings about yourself and other people.

Please read and consider each question carefully, but do not agonise over your answers. There are no right or wrong answers, and first impressions are usually fine. Just think about what best reflects your own opinions or feelings.

All of the data collected will be treated in the strictest confidence and will be analysed only by the research team. Your participation is voluntary and you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason.

In a few months, we would like to contact you again to reply to another—shorter—questionnaire. Of course, you are free to decide not to participate. If you are willing to answer the second questionnaire, please write your full name here:

Note that your name will not be recorded in our data files nor will it be passed on to anyone outside the research team.

Before turning over, please sign the following declaration:

I have been asked to participate in this research project investigating beliefs, thoughts and feelings, and I give my free consent by signing this form. I understand the following procedures follow my consent:

- The research will be carried out as described by the researcher.
- If I decide not to participate, or decide to withdraw from participation, my decision will be accepted.
- My consent to participate is voluntary and I may withdraw from the study at any time. I do not have to give a reason for the withdrawal of consent.
- I have read and understood the information above, and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Signature_____Date_____

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR HELP WITH OUR RESEARCH.

Appendix: D Identity Motives Questionnaire

Please complete section 1 on the facing page before you turn over.

Remember that all your answers throughout this questionnaire will be entirely confidential.

Please do not change your answers to any part of the questionnaire after you have moved on to another section.

Section 1: Who are you?

Oove uŋ̊e? Wie is jy? Ham do sado?

Wer sind Sie? Ongoye lye? Oove lye? Nyone wolye?

In the numbered spaces below, please write down 10 things about yourself. You can write your answers as they occur to you without worrying about the order, but together they should summarise the image you have of who you are.

Please write down your answers in any language you want to; they do not have to be in English.

Your answers might include social groups or categories you belong to, personal relationships with others, as well as characteristics of yourself as an individual. Some may be things that other people know about, others may be your private thoughts about yourself. Some things you may see as relatively important, and others less so. Some may be things you are relatively happy about, and others less so.

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.

Section 2

Now please look back at the 10 answers you gave to the question "who are you?" in **section 1**.

The next few questions refer to these 10 answers you have given. Please answer each question 10 times, referring separately to each of your 10 previous answers.

2.1 **How important is each of these things in defining who you are?**

Not at all important...					... intermediate ...					... extremely important
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

2.2 **How happy or unhappy do you feel about each of these things?**

Extremely unhappy ...					... neutral ...					... extremely Happy
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

2.3 **How much do you show people that you are each of these things in your everyday actions?**

Don't show this at all ...				... show this to some extent ...						... very definitely show this
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Section 3

We want to know how to what extent you agree or disagree with some statements. Please read each statement carefully. Then indicate the extent to which you ***agree*** or ***disagree*** by circling a number for each statement. If you completely agree, circle the 7 next to that statement; if you completely disagree, circle the 1; if you are unsure or you think the question does not apply to you, circle 4.

		Completely Disagree							Completely Agree
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.1	I feel good when I cooperate with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.2	I prefer to be direct and forthright when discussing with people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.3	It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.4	I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.5	I like sharing little things with my neighbours.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.6	Without competition, it is not possible to have a good society.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.7	When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.8	I like my privacy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.9	I hate to disagree with others in my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.10	I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve of it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.11	What happens to me is my own doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.12	I enjoy being in situations involving competition with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

If you completely agree, circle the 7 next to that statement; if you completely disagree, circle the 1; if you are unsure or you think the question does not apply to you, circle 4.

		Completely Disagree							Completely Agree
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.13	One should live one's life independently of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.14	I often do "my own thing".	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.15	My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.16	Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.17	It is important that I do my school work better than others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.18	I am a unique individual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.19	It is important to maintain harmony within my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3.20	It is important to me that I respect decisions made by my groups.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Section 4

IF YOU ARE FEMALE, PLEASE ANSWER SECTION 4A.
IF YOU ARE MALE, PLEASE ANSWER SECTION 4B (see page 10).

4A (FEMALES ONLY) – Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and circle a number on each line that shows how much each person is or is not like you.

		Very much like me	Like me	Some-what like me	A little like me	Not like me	Not like me at all
		01	02	03	04	05	06
4.1	Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to her. She likes to do things in her own original way.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.2	It is important to her to be rich. She wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.3	She thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally. She believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.4	It's important to her to show her abilities. She wants people to admire what she does.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.5	It is important to her to live in secure surroundings. She avoids anything that might endanger her safety.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.6	She likes surprises and is always looking for new things to do. She thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.7	She believes that people should do what they're told. She thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.8	It is important to her to listen to people who are different from her. Even when she disagrees with them, she still wants to understand them.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.9	It is important to her to be humble and modest. She tries not to draw attention to herself.	01	02	03	04	05	06

(continued from previous page) **FEMALES ONLY**

Very much like me	Like me	Some-what like me	A little like me	Not like me	Not like me at all
01	02	03	04	05	06

4.10	Having a good time is important to her. She likes to "spoil" herself.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.11	It is important to her to make her own decisions about what she does. She likes to be free and not depend on others.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.12	It's very important to her to help the people around her. She wants to care for their well-being.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.13	Being very successful is important to her. She hopes people will recognise her achievements.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.14	It is important to her that the government ensures her safety against all threats. She wants the state to be strong so it can defend its citizens.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.15	She looks for adventures and likes to take risks. She wants to have an exciting life.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.16	It is important to her always to behave properly. She wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.17	It is important to her to get respect from others. She wants people to do what she says.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.18	It is important to her to be loyal to her friends. She wants to devote herself to people close to her.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.19	She strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to her.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.20	Tradition is important to her. She tries to follow the customs handed down by her religion or her family.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.21	She seeks every chance she can to have fun. It is important to her to do things that give her pleasure.	01	02	03	04	05	06

Now please see section 5 (see page 12).

4B (MALES ONLY)

Here we briefly describe some people. Please read each description and circle a number on each line that shows how much each person is or is not like you.

Very much like me	Like me	Some-what like me	A little like me	Not like me	Not like me at all
01	02	03	04	05	06

4.1	Thinking up new ideas and being creative is important to him. He likes to do things in his own original way.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.2	It is important to him to be rich. He wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.3	He thinks it is important that every person in the world should be treated equally. He believes everyone should have equal opportunities in life.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.4	It's important to him to show his abilities. He wants people to admire what he does.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.5	It is important to him to live in secure surroundings. He avoids anything that might endanger his safety.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.6	He likes surprises and is always looking for new things to do. He thinks it is important to do lots of different things in life.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.7	He believes that people should do what they're told. He thinks people should follow rules at all times, even when no-one is watching.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.8	It is important to him to listen to people who are different from him. Even when he disagrees with them, he still wants to understand them.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.9	It is important to him to be humble and modest. He tries not to draw attention to himself.	01	02	03	04	05	06

(continued from previous page) **MALES ONLY**

		Very much like me	Like me	Some-what like me	A little like me	Not like me	Not like me at all
		01	02	03	04	05	06
4.10	Having a good time is important to him. He likes to "spoil" himself.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.11	It is important to him to make his own decisions about what he does. He likes to be free and not depend on others.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.12	It's very important to him to help the people around him. He wants to care for their well-being.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.13	Being very successful is important to him. He hopes people will recognise his achievements.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.14	It is important to him that the government ensures his safety against all threats. He wants the state to be strong so it can defend its citizens.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.15	He looks for adventures and likes to take risks. He wants to have an exciting life.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.16	It is important to him always to behave properly. He wants to avoid doing anything people would say is wrong.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.17	It is important to him to get respect from others. He wants people to do what he says.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.18	It is important to him to be loyal to his friends. He wants to devote himself to people close to him.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.19	He strongly believes that people should care for nature. Looking after the environment is important to him.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.20	Tradition is important to him. He tries to follow the customs handed down by his religion or his family.	01	02	03	04	05	06
4.21	He seeks every chance he can to have fun. It is important to him to do things that give him pleasure.	01	02	03	04	05	06

Section 5

The next questions refer again to the 10 answers you gave to the question "who are you?" in **section 1**.

As before, please answer each question 10 times, referring separately to each of your 10 previous answers.

5.1 **How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you—in any sense—from other people?**

Not at all ...					... moderately ...					... extremely.
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5.2 **How much does each of these things give you a sense of continuity—between past, present and future—in your life?**

Not at all ...					... moderately ...					... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5.3 **How much does each of these things make you see yourself positively?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5.4 **How much does each of these things make you feel you "belong"—that you are included among or accepted by people who matter to you?**

Not at all ...					... moderately ...					... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5.5 **How much does each of these things make you feel competent and capable?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

5.6 **How much does each of these things give you the sense that your life is ‘meaningful’?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Section 6

Using the scale below, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling a number for each statement.

completely disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	completely agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

6.1	Who a person is, is mostly defined by his/her family relationships.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.2	Everyone, no matter who they are, can significantly change his/her basic characteristics.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.3	To understand a person well, it is essential to know about his/her role in society.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.4	To understand a person well, it is essential to know about the place he/she comes from.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.5	The kind of person you are is something very basic about you and it can't be changed very much.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.6	Who a person is, is mostly defined by his/her personality traits.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.7	One can understand a person well without knowing about where he/she lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.8	Who a person is, is mostly defined by his/her inner thoughts.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.9	No matter what kind of person you are, you can always change a lot.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.10	Who a person is, is mostly defined by his/her position in society.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.11	One can understand a person well without knowing about which social groups he/she is a member of.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.12	You can't really change your deepest attributes.	1	2	3	4	5	6

(continued from previous page)

completely disagree	moderately disagree	slightly disagree	slightly agree	moderately agree	completely agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

6.13	Who a person is, is mostly defined by his/her occupation.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.14	One can understand a person well without knowing about his/her family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.15	You can do things differently, but the important parts of who you are can't really be changed.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.16	Who a person is, is mostly defined by his/her abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.17	One can understand a person well without knowing about his/her social position.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.18	Who a person is, is mostly defined by where he/she lives.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.19	You are a certain kind of person, and there is not much that can be done to really change that.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.20	One can understand a person well without knowing about the place he/she comes from.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.21	Who a person is, is mostly defined by his/her personal tastes and interests.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.22	You can change even your most basic qualities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.23	Who a person is, is mostly defined by his/her educational achievements.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.24	To understand a person well, it is essential to know about which social groups he/she is a member of.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.25	To understand a person well, it is essential to know about his/her family.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6.26	You can always substantially change the kind of person you are.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Section 7

The next questions refer again to the 10 answers you gave to the question "who are you?" in **section 1**.

As before, please answer each question 10 times, referring separately to each of your 10 previous answers.

7.1 **How much does each of these things give you influence over other people?**

Not at all ...					... moderately ...					... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7.2 **How much does each of these things involve doing your duty towards others?**

Not at all ...					... moderately ...					... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7.3 **How much does each of these things make you think of your life as a story?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7.4 **How much does each of these things have a religious meaning for you?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7.5 **How much does each of these things help you to improve yourself?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7.6 **To what extent is each of these things stable and unchanging?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7.7 **How much does each of these things make you feel linked to your past?**

Not at all ...					... moderately ...					... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7.8 **How much does each of these things give you a sense of security?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

7.9 **How much does being each of these things give you a sense of personal achievement?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Section 8

8.1. Do you belong to a religion or religious denomination?
If yes, which one? (please tick)

No: do not belong to a denomination |__|
Yes: Christian |__|
Yes: Jew |__|
Yes: Muslim |__|
Yes: Baha'i |__|
Yes: Other |__| Please specify:.....

8.2. How important is religion to you?

Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Very	Extremely
|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|

8.3. How much does religion influence the way you act in everyday life?

Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	Very	Extremely
|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|

8.4. How often do you attend religious services and activities?

Never	Several times a year	About once a month	About once a week	Every day	Several times each day
|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|

8.5. How often do you pray or meditate?

Never	Several times a year	About once a month	About once a week	Every day	Several times each day
|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|	|__|

Section 9

The next questions refer again to the 10 answers you gave to the question "who are you?" in **section 1**.

As before, please answer each question 10 times, referring separately to each of your 10 previous answers.

9.1 **How much do you feel that other people benefit from you being each of these things?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9.2 **How much does each of these things make you a different kind of person from others?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9.3 **How much does each of these things give you a particular role or position in relation to others?**

Not at all ...					... moderately ...					... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9.4 **How much does each of these things make you feel that you are in control of your own life?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9.5 **How much does each of these things help you to see the world from a different perspective?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9.6 **How much does you being each of these things help to maintain harmony in your personal relationships?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9.7 **How much does each of these things create any sort of boundary between yourself and others?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

9.8 **How much does each of these things increase your social status?**

Not at all ...				... moderately ...						... extremely
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Section 10

Finally, please could you supply the following personal details:

10.1. Date of birth: day |__|__| month |__|__| year |__|__|__|__|

10.2. Gender: Male |__| Female |__|

10.3. Country of birth: .....

10.4. For how many years have you lived in Namibia? .....

10.5. What is your nationality? .....
(If dual or mixed, please describe as accurately as possible)

10.6. Compared to other people in Namibia, how would you describe your family's level of financial wealth? (please tick)

Very poor	|__|	Above average wealth	|__|
Moderately poor	|__|	Moderately rich	|__|
Below average wealth	|__|	Very rich	|__|
Average wealth	|__|		

10.7. What is your ethnic group? (please tick)

Owambo	|__|	Damara	|__|
Herero	|__|	Nama	|__|
Kavango	|__|	Caprivian	|__|
San/Bushmen	|__|	Tswana	|__|
Baster/Couloured	|__|	Afrikaaner	|__|
German	|__|	English	|__|

Other (please specify): .....

10.8. What language(s) do you usually speak… (please tick as many as you like)

- with your **family members**? .....

English	|__|	OtjiHerero	|__|
Oshiwambo	|__|	Afrikaans	|__|
Damara/Nama	|__|	German	|__|
Rukavango	|__|		

Other (please specify): .....

- with your **friends**? .....

English	|__|	OtjiHerero	|__|
Oshiwambo	|__|	Afrikaans	|__|
Damara/Nama	|__|	German	|__|
Rukavango	|__|		

Other (please specify): .....

10.9. How often do you use English in your everyday life outside school? (please tick)

Never	|__|	Every day	|__|
Very rarely	|__|	Always	|__|
Every week	|__|		

10.10. Which one of the following BEST describes the place where you live? (please tick)

Large city	|__|
Smaller/Average town	|__|
Village or rural	|__|

Other (please specify ……..