METHODS OF MEASURING THE EGO IDENTITY

E.L. Soldatova, *South Ural State University, Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation, elena_soldatova@rambler.ru*
E.V. Benko, *South Ural State University, Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation*

This article is a review of some measurement instruments elaborated to measure the ego-identity development. It contains a brief description of the psychological methods used in the modern foreign studies of ego identity.

Keywords: ego identity, methods of measuring the identity status, identity styles, identity development, foreign studies.

The concept of ego identity was introduced by Erik Erikson, and it is central concept of his psychosocial development theory. Ego identity is a subjective sense of the integrity, continuity and stability of the self [14]. It is a complex dynamic structure that develops throughout a human life and goes through the various identity crises to progressive or regressive identity formation [13].

At the moment, there are many foreign scientific publications devoted to the study of ego identity, its formation and possible crises of identity, and there are a large number of methods used of measuring the identity development. We consider some of the methods used by modern researchers.

Research on Erikson's identity development theory are guided mainly by Marcia's identity status paradigm, which defines identity in terms of the basic dimensions of exploration and commitment. Exploration refers to the degree to which individuals engage in a personal search for goals and values and experiment with different social roles and ideologies. Commitment refers to the determined adherence to a set of convictions, goals, and values. Based on these two underlying dimensions, four identity statuses were identified: achievement (high exploration, high commitment), moratorium (high exploration, low commitment), foreclosure (low exploration, high commitment), and diffusion (low exploration, low commitment) [4].

Researchers have developed a number of measurement instruments to index personal identity development. Perhaps the most popular of these, as suggested by Schwartz (Schwartz, 2009), are the Extended Objective Measure of Ego Identity Status (EOM–EIS–II; Bennion&Adams, 1986) and the Ego Identity Process Questionnaire (EIPQ; Balistreri, Busch-Rossnagel, & Geisinger, 1995), both of which are grounded in Marcia's (1966) identity status model [12].

The EIPQ comprises 32 items that are answered on a six-point Likert-type scale (strongly agree = 6, strongly disagree = 1). The scores are added to obtain a total score for commitment and a total score for exploration [10].

The EOM–EIS–II comprises 64 items that are also answered on Likert-type scale. 32 items are designed to determine ideological identity in the areas of politics, religion, and philosophical life style. The remaining 32 items assess interpersonal identity in the areas of gender roles, friendship, recreation, and dating. Sample items include "There are a lot of different kinds of people. I am exploring many possibilities to find the right kind of friends for me" [11].

Marcia himself created the Identity Status Interview (ISI; Marcia, 1966), which contains semi-structured questions pertaining to three life domains (career, relationships, view of the world) [15].

France has its own method of measuring the identity status. "The multidimensional scale of identity processes" (l'Échelle multidimensionnelle des processus identitaires, EMPI) consists of 48 items that are answered on a five-point Likert-type scale. EMPI allows to evaluate the identity processes and identity status, based on the basic concepts of paradigm Marcia: details of the exploration process of identity (exploration in the past, in the present, in breadth and detailed (passée, présente, en largeur, et détaillée)) and the dimension of the identity processes and identity status in 4 spheres of life (leisure, future profession, friendship, family). The example of the exploration in the past: "In the past, I was interested in many professions which I could choose" [1].

Eriksonian measures have been much less widely used; perhaps the most commonly used is the Erikson Psychosocial Stage Inventory (EPSI; Rosenthal, Gurney, & Moore, 1981), that comprises 72 items that are also answered on Likert-type scale [12].

The Ego Identity Scale (EIS; Tan, Kendis, Fine, & Porac, 1977) is based on Erikson's and Marcia's characterization of ego identity achievement. The scale consists of 12 items in a forced-choice format consisting of two state-

ments. Respondents are asked to choose which of the two describe them better. In each pair, one statement relates to ego-integrity and the other to diffused identity (e.g., "Generally speaking, I can keep much better control of myself and of situations if I maintain an emotional distance from others" vs. "I needn't fear loss of control, of myself or of situations, simply because I become involved with another person") [6].

However, the identity status paradigm has been criticized for focusing primarily on individual differences in the outcome of the identity formation process, leading some authors to shift focus to the actual process rather than the outcome. According to some contemporary authors (B. Duriez, K. Luyckx, B. Soenens, M. Berzonsky, 2012) Berzonsky's model takes the most prominent place in recent research on the identity formation process. In this model, three identity styles are proposed, each of which captures stylistic differences in how individuals approach identity-relevant tasks and problems. First, an *informational style* is typical of adolescents who engage in a process of exploration by seeking out and evaluating identity-relevant information prior to making committed decisions. Adolescents with this identity style display high levels of cognitive complexity, engage in problem-focused coping, and are empathic, open to new information, critical toward their self-concepts, and willing to revise aspects of their identity when faced with discrepant information, which should result in a well-differentiated and integrated sense of personal identity (Berzonsky, 1990; Soenens, Duriez, & Goossens, 2005). Individuals with high informational scores tend to define themselves in terms of personal goals and values (Berzonsky, Macek, & Nurmi, 2003; Luwak, Ferrari, & Cheek, 1998). Second, a *normative style* is typical of adolescents who rely on the norms and expectations of significant others (e.g., parents and authority figures) when having to make identity-relevant decisions. Adolescents with this identity style tend to conform to traditional opinions and have high self-control, but a high need for closure as well. They have an inflexible value system that they try to preserve by shutting themselves off from information that might threaten their most crucial (often authoritarian) goals and values (Berzonsky, 1990, Soenens et al., 2005). Normative individuals tend to define themselves in terms of collective considerations such as religion, family, and nationality (Berzonsky et al., 2003; Luwak et al., 1998). Finally, a *diffuse-avoidant style* is typical of adolescents who avoid personal issues and procrastinate decisions until situational demands dictate their behavior. Adolescents with this identity style display low levels of active information processing and problem solving and high levels of self-handicapping and impulsivity. They accommodate their identity in reaction to social demands, resulting in a loosely integrated identity structure (Berzonsky & Ferrari, 2009). Diffuse-avoidant individuals tend to define themselves in terms of social attributes such as reputation and popularity (Berzonsky et al., 2003) [4].

According to his theory Berzonsky developed the Identity Style Inventory (ISI-3; Berzonsky, 1992). The ISI-3 contains an informational scale (INFO; 10 items, e.g., "I've spent a great deal of time thinking seriously about what I should do with my life"), a normative scale (NORM; 10 items, e.g., "I prefer to deal with situations where I can rely on social norms and standards"), and a diffuse-avoidant scale (DIFF; 10 items, e.g., "I'm not really thinking about my future now; it's still a long way off") [4].

The Identity Processing Styles Q-sort is also based on Berzonsky's theoretical conceptualization of identity styles (IPSQ: Pittman et al. 2009). The q-sort methodology requires that participants read descriptions of the different styles on cards and then place the cards into a forced distribution that ranges from most to least like the participant. In the IPSQ, the 60 descriptive sentences are written on separate cards, and each participant sorts them into a fixed 9-column distribution from ''most like me'' to ''least like me.'' An example item for the informational style is ''My future is something I think about a lot,'' and for the normative style is ''What my parents (parent-figures) think I should do is one of the MOST important influences on my life choices.'' [5].

The Identity Distress Survey (IDS; Berman et al. 2004) measures distress associated with unresolved identity issues. The survey was modeled on the DSM-III and III-R criteria for Identity Disorder, but can also be used to assess DSM IV criteria for Identity Problem. The survey asks participants to rate on a 5 point scale (Not at all, Mildly, Moderately, Severely, or Very Severely) the degree to which they have been recently upset, distressed, or worried over the following identity issues: long-term goals, career choice, friendships, sexual orientation and behavior, religion, values and beliefs, and group loyalties [3].

In the Netherlands the Groningen Identity Development Scale (Bosma 1985) was developed. The GIDS consists of a semi-structured identity interview. This interview is organized by domain and covers the domains: philosophy of life, parents, friends, studies, self, and intimate relationships [9].

Utrecht-Groningen Identity Development Scale (Meeus and Dekovic 1995) was originally developed for use with Dutch-speaking adolescents to assess identification with commitment and exploration in depth with 5 items each. All items were answered on a 5-pointLikert-type rating scale, ranging from 1 (‘completely untrue’) to 5 (‘completely true’). Sample items for identification with commitment are ‘‘My education gives me certainty in life’’ and ‘‘My education gives me self-confidence’’. Sample items for exploration in depth are ‘‘I try to figure out regularly what other people think about education’’ and ‘‘I often reflect on my education’’ [8].

The Utrecht-Management of Identity Commitments Scale (U-MICS), a selfreport measure designed by Meeus (Crocetti et al. 2008b) based on the U-GIDS (Meeus 1996). With this instrument, 5-point Likert-scale items, with a response format ranging from 1 (completely untrue) to 5 (completely true), are used to assess three identity dimensions: commitment (five items), in-depth exploration (five items), and reconsideration (three items). Sample items are: ‘‘My education/best friend gives me certainty in life’’ (ideological/interpersonal commitment), ‘‘I think a lot about my education/best friend’’ (ideological/interpersonal in-depth exploration), ‘‘I often think it would be better to try and find different education/a different best friend’’ (ideological/interpersonal reconsideration) [7].

The Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (DIDS) was developed in 2008 by Luyckx et al. The DIDS measures the five dimensions of identity formation: commitment making, identification with commitment, exploration in depth, exploration in breadth, and ruminative exploration. There are five items assessing each dimension, an example item for the dimension of exploration in-breadth is ‘‘I try to figure out regularly which lifestyle would suit me,’’ for the dimension of commitment-making ‘‘I know what I want to achieve in my life,’’ for the dimension of exploration in-depth ‘‘I work out for myself if the aims I put forward in life really suit me,’’ and for the dimension of identification with commitments ‘‘I value my plans for the future very much.’’ [5].

Narrative researchers and identity theorists have found that identity develops both consciously and unconsciously by creating and sharing stories with others (Hoare 1991, 2007; McAdams 1993; McAdams et al. 2006; McLean 2008). every individual carries within him or herself a macrostructure of his or her life story that is continually updated and revised. Through processes of autobiographical reasoning, individuals establish links of causality between various parts of a subjective past and present which provide an overall sense of coherence about who and why one ‘‘is’’. Identity memories are defined as narrative reminiscences that indicate a particular type of causal connection between a past episode or experience and the present experience of the self which either encourage or inhibit identity integration [2].

References

1. Barbot B. Structures Identitaires et Expression Créative à l'Adolescence. [Orientation Scolaire et Professionnelle], 2008, vol. 37 (4), pp. 483–507.

2. Bazuin-Yoder A. Positive and Negative Childhood and Adolescent Identity Memories Stemming from One’s Country and Culture-of-origin: A Comparative Narrative Analysis [Child & Youth Care Forum], 2011, vol. 40 (1), pp. 77–92.

3. Berman S.L., You Yu-Fang, Schwartz S., Teo G., Mochizuki K. Identity Exploration, Commitment, and Distress: A Cross National Investigation in China, Taiwan, Japan, and the United States [Child & Youth Care Forum], 2011, vol. 40 (1), pp. 65–75.

4. Duriez B., Luyckx K., Soenens B., Berzonsky M. A Process Content Approach to Adolescent Identity Formation: Examining Longitudinal Associations Between Identity Styles and Goal. *Journal of Personality*, 2012, vol. 80 (1), pp. 135 –161.

5. Eryigit S., Kerpelman J. L. Cross-cultural Investigation of the Link Between Identity Processing Styles and the Actual Work of Identity in the Career Domain [Child & Youth Care Forum], 2011, vol. 40 (1), pp. 43–64.

6. Finzi-Dottan R., Bilu R., Golubchik P. Aggression and Conduct Disorder in Former Soviet Union Immigrant Adolescents: The Role of Parenting Style and Ego *Children and Youth Services Review*, 2011, vol. 33 (6), pp. 918–926.

7. Klimstra T. A., Hale W.W. III, Raaijmakers Q.A.W., Branje S. J. T., Meeus W.H.J. Identity Formation in Adolescence: Change or Stability? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 2010, vol. 39 (2), pp. 150–162.

8. Klimstra T.A., Luyckx K., Germeijs V., Meeus W.H.J., Goossens L. Personality Traits and Educational Identity Formation in Late Adolescents: Longitudinal Associations and Academic Progress. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 2012, vol. 41 (3), pp. 346–361.

9. Kunnen E.S., Sappa V., van Geert P.L.C., Bonica L. The Shapes of Commitment

Development in Emerging Adulthood. *Journal of Adult Development*, 2008, vol. 15, pp. 113–131.

10. Marcotte J. Identity Development and Exploration and Their Psychosocial Correlates in Emerging Adulthood: A Portrait of Youths Attending Adult Education Centers in Quebec. *Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies*, 2009, vol. 4 (4), pp. 279–287.

11. Mullis R.L., Graf S.C., Mullis A.K. Parental Relationships, Autonomy, and Identity Processes of High School Students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology: Research and Theory on Human Development*, 2009, vol. 170 (4), pp. 326–338.

12. Schwartz S.J. Zamboanga B.L., Wang Wei, Olthuis J.V. Measuring Identity from an Ericksonian Perspective: Two sides of the same coin? *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 2009, vol. 91 (2), pp. 143–154.

13. Soldatova E. Structure and Dynamics of Normative Crisis in Transition to Adulthood [*Struktura i dinamika normativnogo krizisa v perehodnom vozraste*]. Chelyabinsk, South Ural State University, 2007.

14. Shapovalenko I.V. Developmental Psychology [*Psihologija razvitija*]. Moscow, Gardariki, 2005.

15. Syed M., Seiffge-Krenke I. Personality Development from Adolescence to Emerging Adulthood: Linking Trajectories of Ego Development to the Family Context and Identity Formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2013, vol. 104 (2), pp. 371–384.

УДК 159.923.2

МЕТОДИКИ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ ЭГО-ИДЕНТИЧНОСТИ

Е.Л. Солдатова, Е.В. Бенко

В данной статье представлен обзор психологических методов измерения эго-идентичности, которые используются в современных зарубежных исследованиях. В работе предоставлены полные названия методик, их официальные сокращения, год создания, авторы, разработавшие их, краткие характеристики методик, теоретическая база, форма предъявления, а также примеры стимульного материала. Теоретической базой большинства методик является теория статусов идентичности Дж. Марсиа, согласно которой идентичность определяется с помощью двух основных терминов – исследование и принятие (exploration and commitment). В последнее время разрабатываются методики на основе модели стилей идентичности М. Берзонского, в которой предложены 3 стиля идентичности, отражающие способы решения проблем и задач, возникающих при формировании эго-идентичности (информационный, нормативный, диффузно-избегающий). В статье также представлены методики исследования эго-идентичности на основе концепции Э. Эриксона, которые распространены гораздо меньше, и методика исследования дистресса идентичности на основе критериев расстройства идентичности из DSM-III. Стимульный материал методик чаще всего представлен в форме списка утверждений, который предлагается оценить по шкале Лайкерта, другие возможные формы методик исследования идентичности, такие как полуструктурированное интервью, методики в форме вопросов с принудительным выбором из 2 предложенных высказываний и в форме Q-сортировки, встречаются реже. В конце статьи дана краткая характеристика нарративной техники «Мемуары идентичности» (Identity memories), которая показывает особый тип каузальной связи между прошлым опытом и опытом, переживаемым в данный момент, которая либо способствует, либо препятствует интеграции идентичности.

Ключевые слова: эго-идентичность, методики исследования статуса идентичности, стили идентичности, развитие идентичности, зарубежные исследования.

Солдатова Елена Леонидовна, доктор психологических наук, профессор, декан факультета психологии, Южно-Уральский государственный университет, г. Челябинск, elena_soldatova@rambler.ru

Бенко Елизавета Вячеславовна, аспирант факультета психологии, Южно-Уральский государственный университет, г. Челябинск

Поступила в редакцию 23 августа 2013 г.