

## **DIALOGICALITY AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY**

Anna M. Batory  
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

**ABSTRACT.** Inspired by social-cognitive and dialogical theory of identity the research was focused on identity dynamics. It was assumed that there are two basic factors which influence identity organization: first, basic motives underlying identity formations which are: self-esteem, efficacy, continuity, distinctiveness, belonging and meaning (Vignoles et al, 2006); second, dialogical activity as an intrinsic property of the self (Hermans, 2003). The study explored the relation between identity structure and basic motives satisfaction as well as internal dialogical activity. It was hypothesized that the more identity element satisfies the motives and the higher its dialogical potential, the more it is privileged in the identity structure. Participants were 23 females and 19 males, aged 19-28. The research was conducted in the longitudinal design (2 stages in the space of two months). "Identity Ratings" questionnaire by Vignoles and collaborators (2006) was used to measure identity structure and motives satisfaction, and Questionnaire of Internal Dialogues Frequency by Puchalska-Wasyl (2006) as a measure of dialogicality. Because of the nested data structure (identity elements clustered within participants), multilevel regression was computed. The results confirmed that all abovementioned motives have to a certain extent important impact on identity (re)organization. Dialogicality proved to be good predictor of identity structure in its cognitive and behavioral dimension, that is perceived centrality of identity elements and their enactment. Identity structure is shaped by motivational influences as well as internal dialogical activity.

One intriguing self quality is the commonly experienced sense of unity despite heterogeneity - even ambiguity - of self-knowledge. Consciously we experience stability as well as changeability of the self and identity.

It is commonly agreed that identity is heterogenic and flexible, but there are many views of its complexity and dynamics. According to Markus & Wurf (1987) self-concept is simultaneously characterized by stability and changeability. According to the cognitive-experiential self-theory by Epstein, two modes of information processing, rational and experiential, explain this dual nature of identity (Epstein, 1994; Pacini, Epstein, 1999). The social-cognitive approach explains cross-situational coherence of behavior despite heterogenic social and self-knowledge (Cervone, 1996). Narrative psychology recognizes the ongoing life-story as an integrative process of constructing one's identity from the diversity of life experience (McAdams, 2001).

**AUTHORS' NOTE.** This research was supported by a grant from the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education No. NN106 064335. Please address correspondence regarding this article to Anna Batory, e-mail: batory@kul.lublin.pl

Unity-multiplicity paradoxes become clearer, especially when we acknowledge dialogical nature of self-construction (Hermans, 2003). In this paper I present dialogical and social-cognitive interpretations of identity dynamics, supported by research on how these two approaches may complement each other in the analysis of identity construction.

### **Heterogenic Identity From Dialogical And Socio-Cognitive Point Of View**

Identity is conceptualized as a multidimensional entity, consisting of multiple components, called I-positions (Hermans, Kempen, and van Loon, 1992) or identity elements (Vignoles, Regalia, Manzi, Golledge, Scabini, 2006; Vignoles, Manzi, Regalia, Jemmolo, Scabini, 2008). It has a dialogical nature and is constantly reorganized, because of its internal dynamics and context-dependency (Markus, Wurf, 1987; Andersen, Chen, 2002; Hermans, 2003; Kashima et al., 2004; van Halen, Janssen, 2004; Oleś, 2008a).

According to dialogical self theory (DS theory) the self is defined as a dynamic multiplicity of relatively independent I-positions, representing an extensive range of various perspectives (Hermans, 1996, 2001a, 2002, 2003). Depending on the changes in time and space the self fluctuates among a variety of positions, endowing each one with a voice. The dialogical self is inhabited by individual and collective voices (representing social groups, communal worldviews and other shared perspectives), which can be related to the individual and social identity. Internal dialogue is a phenomenon of mutual interchange between I-positions. Dialogical relations are established, because positions turn to each other exchanging their peculiar points of view. As a result of such an exchange the self system may change. There are several possibilities of such a modification: a new position may emerge, coalition between positions may be established, some may become salient, whereas others may become quiet and remain on the side-lines. Then, it is hard to establish any firm distinctions and lines of demarcation, because its internal structure and borders are flexible. The concept of dialogical self joins both unity and multiplicity, continuity and discontinuity of experience (Hermans, 2003). Each I-position is a possible center of narration (McAdams, 2001), therefore it is also a potential source of dialogue. Dialogical activity of certain I-position is at least partly accessible to conscious experience and may be assessed by self-report methods.

The terms “self” and “identity” are used interchangeably in the DS literature, not as a result of the lack of theoretical accuracy, but rather as a result of a peculiar conceptualization. The notion of dialogical self relates to James’s classical distinction between the I and the Me, in other words between “I as a subject” and “I as an object”. It joins these two aspects of the self. The sense of personal identity stems from the activity of I-as-a-subject, which integrates the variety of experience represented in the multiplicity of empirical elements (I-as-an-object). The term “I-position” expresses the

I-Me relationship: the self shifts from one spatial position to another, depending on the changes in situation and time. As far as the self is decentralized and there is no core, also the identity is not ascribed to particular I-position, but emerges from the interaction among numerous self components. The interplay between the I and the Me is a basis of identity construction.

Identity is heterogenic and context dependent (Talamo, Ligorio, 2000; Hermans, 2004; van Halen, Janssen, 2004; Hermans, Dimaggio, 2007). It is influenced by certain pressures, which results in its internal re-organization. Context dependency relates to identity's sensitivity to external influences, as well as to the changes of power and dominance among I-positions/identity elements (Hermans, 2001a). The question may be posed about reasons of this everlasting changeability. Even in the absence of evident external pressures identity architecture fluctuates. The key to identity dynamics is hidden in the motivational basis of identity creation.

It has been argued recently that identity construction is governed by particular motivational principles, called identity motives. Research has proved that these are: 1. self-esteem, 2. efficacy, 3. continuity, 4. distinctiveness, 5. belonging, and 6. meaning (Vignoles et al., 2006, 2008; Vignoles, Chryssochoou, Breakwell, 2002; Breakwell, 1986). Identity motives are defined as "pressures toward certain identity states and away from others, which guide the processes of identity construction" (Vignoles et al., 2006, p. 309). Identity elements occupy certain positions in the three dimensions of identity structure: 1. cognitive - *perceived centrality* of a certain element within identity, 2. affective - *positive affect* connected with it; and 3. behavioral - which refers to what Reicher (in: Vignoles et al., 2006) called *identity enactment*, defined as "the extent to which individuals strive to communicate each of their identity elements to others in everyday life" (p. 320). In other words it is a behavior harmonious with the self-knowledge. The elements that best satisfy the 6 motives are privileged in the identity structure. The more particular aspect of identity is a source of self-esteem, efficacy, continuity etc., the more it is perceived as central within identity (cognitive domain), the more happy one is with it (affective domain) and the more it is demonstrated in everyday life (behavioral domain). In other words, the extent to which a particular element satisfies the motives determines its position in the identity structure. The level of motives satisfaction is not stable, therefore identity structure changes. Three dimensions of identity structure express three essential manifestations of the "selfhood": "thoughts, feelings and behaviors that arise from the awareness of self as an object and agent" (Hoyle et al. in: Mishel, Shoda, Smith, 2004, p. 430).

In this project, the following conceptualizations of the abovementioned motives were assumed (by Vignoles et al., 2006). Self-esteem is conceived as a motivation to preserve and strengthen a positive perception of one's self. Efficacy refers to the searching for feelings of competence and control. Continuity relates to the need to preserve subjective sense of continuity across time and situation (however this

continuity does not exclude change). Distinctiveness refers to searching for a sense of differentiation from others, on the individual and social level. Belonging concerns the motivation to maintain and enhance feelings of closeness or acceptance by other people. Meaning is responsible for striving for the purpose in one's life. The basis of identity is not located in a homogenous structure, but is based on multiple heterogenic components (identity elements/I-positions) that satisfy the motives to certain extent. In terms of DS theory, the sense of identity is derived from the heterogenic system of various voices of the self, which cooperate, compete, contrast or complement each other. The voices come from I-positions, which are activated in certain contexts, in accordance with changes in time and space (e.g. during Christmas I may have temporarily activated my I-as-family-member, and derive pleasure and sense of identity from interaction with my family).

The sense of identity doesn't come from a single "Me", but is embedded in a complex set of elements, and emerges from multiple experience. From the perspective of self-complexity theories, apart from a "global" we have a "partial" sense of self-esteem, efficacy etc., which can be distinguished theoretically and grasped empirically (Swann, Chang-Schneider, McClarty, 2007). Hence, following socio-cognitive research we should take into account specific self-views, not global.

As argued above, identity motives constantly stimulate identity creation. Along with dialogical properties of the self they guide identity dynamics. The ongoing process of identity construction may be interpreted as continuous striving for such an organization of contents which best satisfies the motives. Furthermore, we may assume that optimal organization of identity elements can be established in dialogue. Dialogical activity re-organizes the system so that certain I-positions became dominant (Hermans, 2001a). Linking these two approaches, we may predict that the primacy of identity elements in the system is determined by two factors. Firstly, it is motives satisfaction that provides dominance in the identity structure (in its three dimensions). Secondly, dialogical activity of elements should promote their privileged location in the system.

### **Dialogue As A Source Of Identity Dynamics**

Dialogue is an essential property of the self, which plays an important role in identity construction (Hermans, 1996, 2001a, 2003; van Halen, Janssen, 2004). It helps to describe and explain the ongoing process of identity formation, contents heterogeneity, structural complexity and continuous malleability. Dialoguing as an intrinsic feature of the self is not restricted to internal mental activity, however this paper presents the project focused on its internal manifestation.

Cognitive psychology extensively elaborates on dynamic aspects of the self system; however it does not indicate a particular mechanism of interchange between its subsystems. This mechanism may be a dialogue. The phenomenon of internal (imaginative) dialoguing is called *internal dialogical activity* and it is defined as mental

engagement into the dialogues with imagined figures, simulation of social verbal relationships, changing points of view and mutual confrontation of different I-positions relevant for personal or social identity” (Oleś, 2006). Following this conceptualization dialogicality is treated as a trait and measured by Internal Dialogical Activity Scale (IDAS by Oleś). However for the purpose of a study of identity complexity, we should rather use a method that estimates the dialogical potential of each particular identity aspect. For this purpose we may use the Questionnaire of Internal Dialogues Frequency worked out by Puchalska-Wasył (2006). It is a modified version of Personal Position Repertoire (PPR) by Hermans (2001b), which was elaborated as a method for the study of (re)organization of the individual’s repertoire of I-positions. The version allows one to indicate the extent to which certain aspects of identity are engaged in dialogues with each other. The method is presented below.

Dialogue (internal or external) is a highly innovative activity, and as such may facilitate identity creation. It is an open process, which may be highly important for self-regulation (Fernyhough, 1996). The idea that dialogue is highly relevant for identity construction becomes clear especially when the sense of identity breaks up. Lysaker & Lysaker (2002) are convincing in maintaining that the disturbances in the sense of unity and internal consistency observed in schizophrenia may be caused by the collapse of internal dialogues. Indirectly, this observation supports the DS theory, suggesting that dialogue integrates a variety of experience and turns fragmentation into constructive heterogeneity (Hermans, 2001a).

Identity changeability should not necessarily be considered as constructing identity *ad hoc*, what would postmodern perspectives would imply. The contents may stay the same, while the structure of identity alters. The authority in dialogical space is shared by many positions. Those which gain dominance become salient. According to DS theory it is dialogue that is the source of that dominance. The identity elements currently activated in dialogue have potentially greater impact on self-regulation (Hermans, 1996).

When analyzing dynamic identity we should take into account dialogical functions of the self. Dialogical activity can be a mechanism of change, as well as the process leading to integration, which preserves existing structure (Hermans, 2001a; see also: Oleś, Brygola, & Sibińska, this issue). Does internal dialogical activity consolidate identity structure or does it rather stimulate its changes? The experimental study presented below aims to answer this question.

The implicit basis of this research rejects the idea of unrestricted changeability of identity. Its flexibility refers basically to the structural malleability rather than its contents. It is assumed that identity is dynamic, but not necessarily fluid, amorphous and relatively unlimited in its changeability (as many contemporary sociological

theories suggest, see Giddens, 1991). We can define its structure, contents, and specify the motives which guide its construction.

### **Study**

#### **Goal of the research**

The project was based on the cognitive and dialogical self theories. The social-cognitive point of view was enriched by the concept of dialogue. Both approaches emphasize constructivist and dynamic nature of identity creation. Motivational basis underlying identity formation may contribute to the understanding of dialogical self. The aim of the research was to capture identity dynamics. That is, its structural changes in the three dimensions: cognitive, affective and behavioral. In this study, it was assumed that there are two basic variables responsible for its changeability. The first of these, which regulates identity re-construction, is identity motives influence (6-motive model by Vignoles et al., 2006, 2008). Second, it is the internal dialogical activity as an essential property of the self (DS theory by Hermans, 2003).

The following question was posed: What is the relationship between identity structure and: a) basic motives satisfaction; as well as b) internal dialogical activity? It was hypothesized that: privileged location of identity elements in the structure is predicted by: a) identity motives satisfaction, and b) dialogical activity. That is, the more the identity element satisfies the motives and has high dialogical potential, the more it becomes dominant in the identity structure (in its three dimensions: cognitive, affective and behavioral).

The results will let us describe the conditions of the structural changes of identity, in reference to the six motives guiding identity construction and internal dialogical activity, and will reveal the motives which clearly stimulate identity construction. Moreover, theoretically the justified role of dialogicality in identity creation will be verified.

#### **Method**

The longitudinal study was conducted to observe structural changes of identity. In accord with Vignoles et al. (2006) it was assumed that longitudinal design would bring us closer to identity processes in action. The procedure consisted of two stages conducted in the space of two months. The research was presented as a study of identity. Questionnaires were distributed mainly among students. Participants responded to the questionnaires, working individually or in small groups (up to 6 people), in the presence of the researcher. Participants were contacted after two months and invited to the second stage of the research. The final sample consisted of 42 individuals (23 F and 19 M), aged 19-28.

*Time 1 questionnaire:* Participants first were instructed to generate freely a list of 12 identity elements. The instruction was constructed on the basis of the study by McQuillen, Licht & Licht (2001) and Vignoles et al. (2006) (Appendix A). Participants used the “Identity Ratings” questionnaire by Vignoles et al. (2006) to rate each identity element for perceived centrality, positive affect, identity enactment (2 items each; average was treated as a final score), and for its association with feelings of self-esteem, efficacy, continuity, distinctiveness, belonging and meaning of life (1 item each). Thus the questionnaire included 9 parts, related to the 3 dimensions of identity structure and to the 6 motives (Appendix B). The questions were followed by 7-point response scales. The “Identity Ratings” questionnaire was followed by the Questionnaire of Internal Dialogues Frequency by Puchalska-Wasyl (2006). This modified version of the Personal Position Repertoire by Hermans (2001a) measured dialogical activity of each identity element. In this adaptation participants had to estimate the frequency of internal dialogues between identity elements (I-positions) instead of the power of relationship between them. Secondly, whereas, in standard PPR, the participant juxtaposes two sets of positions, external (rows) and internal (columns), here comparisons are within the same set of positions or elements. The rows and columns contain the same list; each element is listed twice (once in the row, once in the column). Participants juxtaposed in the matrix each element with all other elements from the list and estimated the extent to which these two communicate in internal dialogue. The following 6-point response scale was used: 0 – not at all, 1 – very seldom, 2 – seldom, 3 – sometimes, 4 – often, 5 – very often. So as not to confuse the participants, half of matrix was crossed out (like in the multiplication table), in order not to juxtapose twice the same pair of positions. Adding the numbers in each column we obtained the score indicating the engagement of certain identity element in the dialogues. The score reached by a particular element was treated as its “dialogical potential”, the tendency to run internal dialogues.

*Time 2 questionnaire:* After a 2 months break (8-9 weeks), identity element lists were photocopied and presented to the participants. They were asked to reformulate those elements that needed revision. As a result, 18 (3.57%) out of 504 identity elements were revised. All revised responses were included in the analyses. Participants completed “Identity Ratings” tasks as they did initially (time 1). The same questions were used to estimate perceived centrality, positive affect, identity enactment as well as 6 identity motives.

## Results and Discussion

According to Vignoles et al. (2006) multilevel regression was computed, using the R Program. Time 2 measures of perceived centrality, positive affect and identity enactment were treated as dependent variables. In the final model its value at time 1 was controlled, so as to estimate autoregressive effects. Time 1 measures of identity motives satisfaction and dialogical activity were introduced as predictors (independent variables). In the multilevel regression model, identity elements were primary units of

analysis, rather than individual participants. This approach was determined by nested data structure: identity elements (level 1) were clustered within participants (level 2). The variance within participants was computed. Previously, the predictors (6 motives and dialogical activity) were centered around participant means (following Vignoles et al., 2002a, 2006). Table 1 (Appendix C) shows zero-order correlations between dependent and independent variables, for raw and participant-mean centered ratings.

Three separate regressions were computed for the three dependent variables: time 2 perceived centrality, positive affect and identity enactment. As a baseline for comparisons, in the first step null models were computed to predict centrality, affect and enactment by using a random intercept only. Next, six motive model was computed, adding fixed parameters for self-esteem, efficacy, continuity, distinctiveness, belonging and meaning. Estimates of fixed parameters from the null model and the 6-motive model, predicting time 2 outcome ratings of cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions of identity as a function of time 1 ratings of motive satisfaction are shown in Table 2 (Appendix C).

Next, the third model was computed, which included 6-motives and dialogical activity (Table 3 in the Appendix C). The 6-motive model was enhanced by adding dialogical variable, however some motives lost their significance (compare Tables 2 and 3).

The extended model (Table 3) was characterized by a significant reduction in deviance compared with the null model, and compared with the 6-motive model. For perceived centrality it was  $\chi^2(7) = 163.593, p < .000$  compared with the null model and  $\chi^2(1) = 21.060, p < .000$  compared with the 6-motive model. For positive affect it showed  $\chi^2(7) = 332.815, p < .000$  compared with the null model, however there was no reduction in deviance compared with the 6-motive model  $\chi^2(1) = -7.848, p = 1.000$ . Then, for identity enactment it was a significant reduction in deviance compared with the null model:  $\chi^2(7) = 103.775, p < .000$ , as well as compared with 6-motive model:  $\chi^2(1) = 8.910, p = .003$ . The extended model (which comprised 6 motives and dialogicality) showed significant connection to the identity structure, however the relationships differed among the three domains. The results were as follows. Perceived centrality at time 2 was predicted uniquely by time 1 ratings of continuity ( $\beta = .3, p < .000$ ) and dialogicality ( $\beta = .22, p < .000$ ). This result for cognitive level shows that identity definition process is guided basically by the continuity motive, which is acknowledged as the most fundamental feature of properly functioning identity (Maslow, 1970; Goldstein, 1990; Dunkel, 2005). Next, the positive affect at time 2 was predicted by time 1 ratings of self-esteem ( $\beta = .38, p < .000$ ) and efficacy ( $\beta = .14, p = .021$ ), which is in line with the identity process theory by Breakwell (1986), as well as by meaning ( $B = .186, p < .000$ ) which is widely acknowledged as fundamental human need (Frankl, 1984; Baumeister, 1991). And finally, identity enactment at time 2 was predicted uniquely by time 1 ratings of efficacy ( $\beta = .19, p = .008$ ), continuity ( $\beta = 0.15$ ,



$p = .023$ ), distinctiveness ( $\beta = .18, p = .001$ ) and dialogicality ( $\beta = .18, p = .003$ ); while belonging was approaching significance ( $p = .081$ ). The results for identity enactment partially relate to the self-determination theory (Ryan, Deci, 2000, 2008), which indicates that people tend towards satisfaction the needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness in their actions.

The findings for the extended model (Table 3) indicated that dialogicality was a significant predictor of perceived centrality and identity enactment. However there was no connection with positive affect, which may be explained by its emotionally diversified nature. Dialogicality assumes different types, emotionally positive and negative. Internal dialogical activity correlates with neuroticism; some of the dialogues take the form of rumination, e.g. persistent rethinking one's misfortunes (see Oleś, 2008b; Puchalska-Wasył, Chmielnicka-Kuter, & Oleś, 2008).

The results confirmed the influence of dialogicality on identity construction. The more dialogical a certain identity element, the more central it becomes in one's perception and the more it is manifested in behavior. In time, people give privileged location to those identity aspects which are active in their internal dialogues. To understand this we should focus on the nature of dialogicality and its role in personality. Internal dialogues serve a number of distinctive functions. Seven meta-functions of internal dialogues were discovered in empirical research by Puchalska-Wasył (2007): 1. support, 2. substitution, 3. exploration, 4. bond, 5. self-improvement; 6. insight; 7. self-guidance. The extent to which a particular dialogue may fulfill these functions depends on the type of dialogue. The abovementioned functions show that dialogues may play an important role in self-regulation and potentially improve subjective well-being. It may explain why dialogical aspects of identity are privileged in the system. Another interpretation is that internal dialogues draw attention to certain aspects of identity. Certain aspects become more cognitively accessible as a consequence of dialogue [analogous to the *working self-concept* by Markus & Kunda (1986) and Markus & Wurf (1987)].

In conclusion, the final model was computed. It included six motives and dialogical activity, but additionally dependent variables at time 1 were controlled so as to estimate autoregressive effects (Table 4 in the Appendix C).

This ultimate model was characterized by a significant reduction in deviance compared with the null model, 6-motive model, as well as with the extended model (6-motives *plus* dialogical activity) but without autoregressive impact. For perceived centrality it was  $\chi^2(10) = 217.776, p < .000$  compared with the null model;  $\chi^2(4) = 75.245, p < .000$  compared with the 6-motive model, and  $\chi^2(3) = 54.184, p < .000$  compared with the extended model without autoregressive effects included. For positive affect it was  $\chi^2(10) = 419.270, p < 0.000$  compared with the null model,  $\chi^2(4) = 78.608, p < .000$  compared with 6-motive model, and  $\chi^2(3) = 86.456, p < .000$

compared with the extended model. For identity enactment it was a significant reduction in deviance compared with the null model:  $\chi^2(10) = 254.480, p < .000$ , as well as compared with 6-motive model:  $\chi^2(4) = 159.616, p < .000$  and extended model  $\chi^2(3) = 150.706, p < .000$ .

Controlling for autoregressive effects it turned out that just a few predictors appeared significant. Perceived centrality at time 2 was predicted uniquely by time 1 ratings of continuity ( $\beta = .21, p < .000$ ) and dialogical activity ( $\beta = .14, p = .049$ ). Positive affect was predicted uniquely only by time 1 ratings of self-esteem ( $\beta = .18, p = .014$ ). Whereas, for identity enactment we found no significant predictors, when controlling for centrality, affect and enactment at time 2. Enactment showed the strongest autoregressive effect of time 1 measure on time 2 measure. Additionally, identity enactment at time 1 appeared to be a predictor of perceived centrality at time 2 ( $\beta = .13, p = .039$ ). This result was obtained also in the study by Vignoles et al (2006) and interpreted as a proof of the interplay between action and cognition in identity processes. However, unlike that research, in our study there was no reciprocal relationship (time 1 centrality didn't contribute to predictions of time 2 enactment).

This final, statistically restrictive design, showed that dialogicality predicts only perceived centrality of identity elements (Table 4). This outcome confirms Vignoles's predictions, that predicted that dialogicality might be a type of centrality "indicator" (2009, private conversation). Furthermore, zero-order correlations (Table 1) provide some more insight into the peculiarity of dialogicality. Internal dialogical activity of identity elements correlates with all the three dimensions of identity structure ( $r = 0.32, p < .001$  with centrality and enactment; and  $r = .22, p < .001$  with positive affect; scores based on participant-mean centered ratings). From among identity motives, the strongest correlation appears between dialogicality and meaning ( $r = .33, p < .001$  for participant-centered scores). This result may indicate a "meaning making" role of dialogical activity. Probably dialogical as well as narrative identity construction (McAdams, 2001; Oleś, 2008a) are two modes of thinking beneficial for the meaningful sense of identity.

### Conclusions

The 6-motive model extended by dialogicality delivered multidimensional description of identity dynamics. The motives accompanied by dialogical activity turned out to be important predictors of identity structure shape. Finally, only self-esteem and continuity appeared significant in the prediction of identity structure change. In time, participants rated as significant more central in their self-definition those identity elements which they earlier associated with a greater level of continuity and dialogicality. Furthermore, elements connected with greater self-esteem, were in time associated with a higher positive affect. The longitudinal character of the research led to conclusions about the impact of dialogical activity on the structural changes of identity.

However, more precise investigation is needed to sketch a causative model. Moreover, the analyses were done on a very small sample, further study is required. Despite the limits of this study, it seems to validate the view that dialogical activity indeed does play an important role in identity construction.

The results concerning internal dialogical activity may have practical consequence in counseling, where the aim is to stimulate identity change in a preferred direction (called “identity interventions” after Schwartz, 2001). Increasing the importance of some aspects in self-definition (perceived centrality) may be influenced by activating them in the internal dialogues. However, how long this increase of cognitive accessibility will last remains to be determined.

## References

- Andersen, S. M., & Chen, S. (2002). The relational self: An interpersonal social-cognitive theory. *Psychological Review*, 109(4), 619-645.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1991). *Meanings of life*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Breakwell, G. (1986). *Coping with threatened identities*. London: Breakwell.
- Cervone, D. (1996). Social-cognitive mechanisms and personality coherence: Self-knowledge, situational beliefs, and cross-situational coherence in perceived self efficacy. *Psychological Science*, 8(1), 43-50.
- Dunkel, C. S. (2005). The Relation Between Self-Continuity and Measures of Identity. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 5(1), 21-34.
- Epstein, S. (1994). Integration of the cognitive and the psychodynamic unconscious. *American Psychologist*, 49(8), 709-724.
- Fernyhough, C. (1996). The dialogic mind: A dialogic approach to the higher mental functions. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 14(1), 47-62.
- Frankl, E. V. (1984). *Homo patiens*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy PAX.
- Giddens, (1991). *Modernity and self-identity. Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goldstein, E. G. (1990). *Borderline Disorders. Clinical Models and Techniques*. New York: Guilford Press.

- Hermans, H. J. M. (1996). Voicing the self: From information processing to dialogical interchange. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119, 31-50.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2001a). Conceptions of self and identity: Toward a dialogical view. *International Journal of Education and Religion*, 1, 43-62.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2001b). The construction of a Personal Position Repertoire: Method and practice. *Culture & Psychology*, 7(3), 323-365.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2002). The dialogical self: Towards a theory of personal and cultural positioning. *Culture & Psychology*, 7(3), 243-281.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2003). The construction and reconstruction of a dialogical self. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 16, 89-130.
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2004). Introduction: The dialogical self in a global and digital age. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 4(4), 297-320.
- Hermans, H. J. M., & Dimaggio, G. (2007). Self, identity, and globalization in times of uncertainty: A dialogical Analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 11, 31-61.
- Kashima, Y., Kashima, E., Farsides, T., Kim, U., Strack, F., Werth, L., & Yuki, M. (2004). Culture and context-sensitive self: The amount and meaning of context-sensitivity of phenomenal self differ across cultures. *Self and Identity*, 3, 125-141.
- Lysaker, P. H., & Lysaker, J. T. (2002). Narrative structure in psychosis. Schizophrenia and disruptions in the dialogical self. *Theory & Psychology*, 12(2), 207-220.
- Markus, H., & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and malleability of the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 858-866.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 299-337.
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McAdams, D. P. (2001). The psychology of life stories. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(2), 100-122.
- McQuillen, A. D., Licht, M. H., & Licht, B. G. (2001). Identity structure and life satisfaction in later life. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 23(1), 65-72.
- Mischel, W., Shoda, Y., & Smith, R. E. (2004). *Introduction to personality: Toward an integration*. New York: Wiley & Sons.

- Oleś, P. K. (2008a). O różnych rodzajach tożsamości oraz ich stałości i zmianie [About different types of identity, their stability and changeability]. In P. K. Oleś & A. Batory (Eds.), *Tożsamość i jej przemiany a kultura* [Identity, its changes and culture] (pp. 41-84). Lublin – Warszawa: PWN – Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Oleś, P. (2008b). *The dialogical self: Between exchange and dominance*. Paper presented at The XXIX Congress of Psychology, Berlin, 20-25 July, 2008.
- Oleś, P. K., Oleś, M. (2006, June). *How to measure internal dialogical activity: Proposition of a new scale*. Poster presented on the Fourth International Conference on the Dialogical Self, Braga, Portugal, June 1-3, 2006.
- Pacini, R., Epstein, S. (1999). The relation of rational and experiential information processing styles to personality, basic beliefs, and the ratio-bias phenomenon. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(6), 972-987.
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. (2006). *Nasze wewnętrzne dialogi. O dialogowości jako sposobie funkcjonowania człowieka* [Our inner dialogues. About dialogicality as a way of human functioning]. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. (2007). Types and functions of inner dialogues. *Psychology of Language and Communication*, 11, 43-62.
- Puchalska-Wasył, M., Chmielnicka-Kuter, E., & Oleś, P. K. (2008). From internal interlocutors to psychological functions of dialogical activity. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 21, 239-269.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3), 182–185.
- Schwartz, S. J. (2001). The evolution of Eriksonian and Neo-Eriksonian identity theory and research: A review and integration. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 1(1), 7-58.
- Swann, W. B. Jr., Chang-Schneider, C., & McClarty, K. (2007). Do peoples' self views matter? Self concept and self esteem in everyday life. *American Psychologist*, 62(2), 84-94.
- Vignoles, V. L., Chryssochoou, X., & Breakwell, G. M. (2002a). Evaluating models of identity motivation: Self-esteem is not the whole story. *Self and Identity*, 1, 201-218.

- Vignoles, V. L., Chryssochoou, X., & Breakwell, G. M. (2002b). Sources of distinctiveness: position, difference and separateness in the identities of Anglican parish priests. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 761-780.
- 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 Psychology*, 90(2), 308-333.
- Vignoles, V., Manzi, C., Regalia, C., Jemmolo, S., & Scabini, E. (2008). Identity motives underlying desired and feared possible future selves. *Journal of Personality*, 76(5), 1165-1200.

## DIALOGICALITY AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY

### Appendix A

Instruction used for eliciting identity elements.

Think for a moment about the answer to the question *Who am I?*

In everyday life people present various “faces”, which mirror who they are. Think about your relationships (eg. I as a daughter, I as a friend of Magda); your main activities or interests/hobbies (eg. I as a member of a sport team, card player, traveler, jazz fan, rally organizer); the roles which you fulfill (I as a choir member, student, employee) and other characteristics, abilities, preferences and goals, which are important to you (eg. I - religious, I as a winner of a prize in a recitation contest, I - chronically sick, I as a future mother, I as a lawyer in 20 years, loser, person seeking for a risk, art lover).

Thinking about different aspects of your identity, don't limit yourself only to those which you consider as appropriate, nice and desired. If there are any which describe you well, but are less appropriate or even unwanted, also put them on a list with your answers.

## Appendix B

Questions from the Identity Ratings task were taken from the study by Vignoles et al. (2006, p. 333) and translated to Polish

CONSTRUCT	QUESTION
Perceived centrality (2 questions)	How much do you see each of the answers you have written as central or marginal to your identity? <sup>a</sup>
	How important is each of your answers in defining who you are?
Positive affect (2 questions)	How happy or unhappy do you feel about being each of these things? <sup>b</sup>
	How fulfilled do you feel by being each of these things? <sup>c</sup>
Identity Enactment (2 questions)	To what extent do you feel that being each of these things influences your actions toward other people in everyday life? <sup>d</sup>
	To what extent do you try to show people that you are each of these things in your everyday life? <sup>e</sup>
Self-esteem	How much does each of your answers give you a sense of self-esteem?
Efficacy	How much does each of your answers make you feel effective in doing the things you do?
Continuity	How much does each of your answers give you a sense of continuity in your life?
Distinctiveness	How much do you feel that each of your answers distinguishes you from other people?
Belonging	How much does each of your answers make you feel close to other people?
Meaning	How much do you feel that each of your answers gives a “meaning” to your life?



## DIALOGICALITY AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF IDENTITY

Each question was followed by a table with all identity elements.

The answers were given on a 7-point scales.

In most questions, scale anchors were as follows: 1 – not at all; 7 – extremely; however there were some exceptions, indicated below.

<sup>a</sup> scale anchors were: 1 – very much marginal; 7 – very much central.

<sup>b</sup> scale anchors were: 1 – very unhappy; 7 – very happy.

<sup>c</sup> scale anchors were: 1 – not at all fulfilled; 7 – extremely fulfilled.

<sup>d</sup> scale anchors were: 1 - no influence at all; 7 - extremely strong influence.

<sup>e</sup> scale anchors were: 1 - don't try to show it at all; 7 – very definitely try to show it.

## Appendix C

Table 1. Zero-order correlations between all ratings of independent variables at time 1 and dependent variables at time 2, for identity elements (n = 504). Values below diagonal use raw ratings, above use participant-mean centered ratings.

Variable	Time 1										Time 2		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
Time 1													
1. Centrality	-	.47	.46	.45	.36	.42	.12	.27	.41	.32	.5	.36	.31
2. Affect	.48	-	.45	.78	.63	.44	.17	.48	.73	.22	.34	.71	.26
3. Enactment	.43	.43	-	.5	.47	.4	.27	.37	.43	.32	.41	.34	.58
4. Self-esteem	.46	.78	.49	-	.65	.46	.22	.48	.77	.25	.4	.65	.31
5. Efficacy	.39	.62	.46	.65	-	.37	.17	.35	.57	.27	.34	.52	.32
6. Continuity	.47	.42	.38	.46	.38	-	.12	.4	.47	.16	.42	.35	.28
7. Distinctiveness	.2	.17	.25	.22	.18	.17	-	-.15	.12	.06	.12	.13	.19
8. Belonging	.31	.47	.38	.46	.34	.36	-.14	-	.52	.22	.27	.42	.24
9. Meaning	.5	.72	.45	.77	.55	.47	.13	.53	-	.33	.41	.61	.28
10. Dialogicality	.32	.26	.33	.31	.29	.2	.08	.24	.39	-	.32	.23	.25
Time 2													
11. Centrality	.57	.38	.43	.44	.38	.48	.22	.27	.46	.3	-	.52	.44
12. Affect	.39	.76	.35	.69	.56	.36	.18	.44	.64	.28	.39	-	.4
13. Enactment	0.3	.29	.64	.34	.35	.25	.18	.32	.34	.34	.3	.29	-

Table 2. Estimates of fixed parameters from null models and 6-motive models predicting time 2 outcome ratings of centrality, affect and enactment as a function of time 1 ratings of motive satisfaction; identity elements (level 1, n=504), nested within participants (level 2, n=42).

[illegible]

**Note:** Deviance was calculated as  $-2 \log$  likelihood. Values of  $\beta$  were derived from  $B$  weights by using within-participant standard deviations. Values of  $\Delta\chi^2$  and  $\Delta R^2$  for each parameter were derived from comparisons with alternative model without that parameter.

	Outcome rating (time 2)																	
	Centrality					Affect					Enactment							
Predictors (time 1)	B	SE	$\beta$	$\Delta\chi^2$	p	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	B	SE	$\beta$	$\Delta\chi^2$	p	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	B	SE	$\beta$	$\Delta\chi^2$	p	$\Delta R^2$ (%)
Intercept	5.06	.10					4.90	.10					4.24	.13				
Self-esteem	.08	.05	.12	-1.33	1.000	.3	.31	.05	.38	<b>39.62</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>4.5</b>	.05	.06	-3.52	1.000	-0.1	.05
Efficacy	.04	.04	.06	-3.45	1.000	.0	.11	.04	.14	<b>5.35</b>	<b>.021</b>	<b>.9</b>	.04	.19	<b>6.99</b>	<b>.008</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>.04</b>
Continuity	.27	.04	.30	<b>38.09</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>6.3</b>	.00	.04	.00	-4.73	1.000	-1	.04	.15	<b>5.21</b>	<b>.023</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>.04</b>
Distinctiveness	.03	.03	.04	-4.01	1.000	.0	.02	.03	.03	-4.61	1.000	.0	.04	.18	<b>11.19</b>	<b>.001</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>.04</b>
Belonging	.01	.04	.01	-4.86	1.000	-1	.09	.03	.11	2.02	.155	.6	.04	.14	3.04	0.081	1.1	.04
Meaning	.08	.05	.12	-.88	1.000	.4	.19	.04	.23	<b>14.35</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>1.8</b>	.05	.04	-3.93	1.000	-1	.05
Dialogical Activity	.04	.01	.22	<b>21.06</b>	<b>.000</b>	<b>4.2</b>	.00	.01	.01	-7.85	1.000	-1	.01	.18	<b>8.91</b>	<b>0.003</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>.01</b>
Residual variance																		
Level 2 ( $\tau^2$ )	.318						.297						.560					
Level 1 ( $\sigma^2$ )	1.150						1.008						1.305					
Deviance			1593.911						1530.573						1671.226			
Model comparison																		
		vs null model		<b>163.59</b>	(df=7)	<b>.000</b>		vs null model		<b>332.815</b>	(df=7)	<b>.000</b>		vs null model		<b>103.775</b>	(df=7)	<b>.000</b>
		vs 6-motive model		<b>21.06</b>	(df=1)	<b>.000</b>		vs 6-motive model		-7.848	(df=1)	1.000		vs 6-motive model		<b>8.910</b>	(df=1)	<b>.003</b>

**Note:** Deviance was calculated as  $-2 \times \log$  likelihood. Values of  $\beta$  were derived from  $B$  weights by using within-participant standard deviations. Values of  $\Delta\chi^2$  and  $\Delta R^2$  for each parameter were derived from comparisons with alternative model without that parameter.

Table 4. Estimates of fixed parameters from full models predicting time 2 outcome ratings of centrality, affect and enactment as a function of time 1 ratings of motive satisfaction and dialogical activity; identity elements (level 1, n=504), nested within participants (level 2, n=42). Centrality, affect and enactment at time 1 were controlled; autoregressive effects are italicized.

Outcome ratings (time 2)																			
Predictors (time 1)	Centrality						Affect						Enactment						
	B	SE	$\beta$	$\Delta\chi^2$	p	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	B	SE	$\beta$	$\Delta\chi^2$	p	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	B	SE	$\beta$	$\Delta\chi^2$	p	$\Delta R^2$ (%)	
Intercept	5.06	.10					4.897	.10					4.24	.13					
<b>Outcome ratings</b>																			
Centrality	.32	.04	.32	45.13	.000	6.5	-.03	.04	-.03	4.11	1.000	.0	.04	.04	.04	-3.56	1.000	.0	
Affect	-.09	.05	-.11	-.91	1.000	.3	.47	.05	.52	93.30	.000	8.7	-.08	.05	-.10	-1.73	1.000	.2	
Enactment	.13	.05	.13	4.26	.039	1.0	-.06	.04	-.05	-2.36	1.000	.1	.59	.05	.59	148.95	.000	21.1	
<b>Motive Ratings</b>																			
Self-esteem	.08	.05	.19	-1.19	1.000	.3	.14	.04	.18	5.95	.014	.8	.00	.05	-.00	-4.30	1.000	-.1	
Efficacy	.03	.04	.05	-3.94	1.000	.0	.05	.03	.06	-3.00	1.000	.1	.06	.04	.08	-1.70	1.000	.3	
Continuity	.19	.04	.21	19.41	.000	3.0	.00	.04	.00	-4.88	1.000	-.1	.04	.04	0.05	-3.36	1.000	.1	
Distinctiveness	-.01	.03	-.02	-4.91	1.000	-.1	.02	.03	.02	-4.84	1.000	.0	.04	.03	.06	-3.07	1.000	.1	
Belonging	-.03	.03	-.04	-4.30	1.000	.0	.06	.03	.07	-1.49	1.000	.2	.03	.03	.05	-3.999	1.000	.0	
Meaning	.06	.04	.09	-2.51	1.000	.1	.08	.04	.10	-.88	1.000	.2	.01	.04	.01	-4.48	1.000	.1	
<b>Dialogical Activity</b>	.03	.01	.14	3.89	.049	1.4	.01	.01	.05	-5.7	1.000	.1	.01	.01	.07	-4.52	1.000	.3	

Table 4 cont'd

Residual variance									
Level 2 ( $\tau^2$ )	.330		.313				.539		
Level 1 ( $\sigma^2$ )	.998		.814				.916		
Deviance		1539.728		1444.117				1520.520	
Model comparison									
	vs null model		$\Delta\chi^2$	$p$					
		<b>217.776</b>	(df=10)	<b>.00</b>		vs null model	<b>419.270</b>	(df=10)	<b>.00</b>
				<b>0</b>					
vs 6-motive model		<b>75.245</b>	(df=4)	<b>.000</b>		vs 6-motive model	<b>78.608</b>	(df=4)	<b>.000</b>
vs 6-m & dialogicality		<b>54.184</b>	(df=3)	<b>.000</b>		vs 6-m & dialogicality	<b>86.456</b>	(df=3)	<b>.000</b>
						vs null model	<b>254.480</b>	(df=10)	<b>.000</b>
						vs 6-motive model	<b>159.616</b>	(df=4)	<b>.000</b>
						vs 6-m & dialogicality	<b>150.706</b>	(df=3)	<b>.000</b>

*Note:* Deviance was calculated as  $-2 \times \log \text{likelihood}$ . Values of  $\beta$  were derived from  $B$  weights by using within-participant standard deviations. Values of  $\Delta\chi^2$  and  $\Delta R^2$  for each parameter were derived from comparisons with alternative model without that parameter.