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Summary

According to identity process theory (IPT) (Breakwell, 1993), the processes shaping identity are motivated by principles of maintaining distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy and self-esteem. This thesis develops IPT, using insights from cross-cultural/indigenous psychologies, optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991) and assumptions about representation. Three functionally separable sources of distinctiveness are distinguished, position, difference and separateness, which may be emphasised in identity construction according to culture and context.

Empirical research, conducted among members of the Anglican clergy, includes a new test of the motivational claims of IPT and several tests of the 'sources of distinctiveness' account using multivariate statistical analyses of questionnaire data, including multilevel modelling (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992). Additionally, theoretical issues are contextualised within participants' accounts of their own experience using interpretative phenomenological analyses (J. A. Smith, 1996a) of interview transcripts.

Results suggest (a) that distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy should be given equal theoretical consideration to self-esteem as motives guiding identity processes, (b) that distinctiveness may be constructed using position, difference and/or separateness and (c) that constructions of distinctiveness within this population were generally consistent with their beliefs about personhood, but also varied with contexts and purposes.
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This thesis is about identity. The term 'identity' has been used by philosophers, literary critics, social theorists, politicians, psychoanalysts, sociologists, anthropologists, journalists and others with more than as many different meanings. The concept of identity addressed here is a specifically social psychological one, which has its roots in the work of Henri Tajfel and colleagues (Tajfel, 1981, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Identity has been treated by some theorists as a construct explaining behaviour (e.g., Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), while others have placed an equal emphasis on explaining identity itself (e.g., Breakwell, 1993; Brewer, 1991; Deaux, 1993). This thesis is focused on the latter issue, and is concerned especially with the investigation of motivational principles which are understood to guide the processes shaping identity.

In this chapter, identity is defined as a form of representation. It is therefore considered useful to clarify assumptions about representation before theorising about identity. It is argued that representational meaning does not reside within individual 'meaningful elements', but is inherently about relationships between meanings. This leads to an understanding of representational structure and process which underlies both the theoretical and the methodological developments of this thesis.
Defining Identity

In order to theorise about identity, it is important to start from a clear definition of the term. Identity is defined here in phenomenological terms as the subjective concept of oneself as a person (adapted from Reber, 1985).

This definition avoids distinguishing between identity and self-concept, as these terms are understood to reflect differences in emphasis between theoretical traditions rather than objective differences in the structures and processes to which they refer (Breakwell, 1987; Deaux, 1992).

Both 'personal' and 'social' identity are included. The distinction between these components may be useful as a theoretical tool in some circumstances (Tajfel, 1981; J. C. Turner, 1987) and appears to have some phenomenological reality (Breakwell, 1983; Trafimow, Triandis & Goto, 1991), but focusing on one side at the expense of the other may lead researchers to miss both the similarities and the interconnections between personal and social identities (Breakwell, 1983; Deaux, 1992; Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1995; Reid & Deaux, 1996; B. Simon, 1997; J. C. Turner, 1999).

An important implication of this definition is that identity is a form of representation. Identity is subjectively meaningful information encoded in memory, continually formed and transformed, the dynamic product of interacting processes of perception, cognition and communication. This thesis starts from the assumption that representation has a different ontological status from material reality. Subjective meaning is understood to be supervenient on physical properties (after J. Kim, 1993), at least in the sense that representational events will necessarily be associated with physical events, but this does not entail either that representational structures are directly reducible to physical structures or that physical laws can necessarily be transferred to representational phenomena.
Clarifying the 'Rules' of Representation

The aim of this chapter is to ground the approach to identity used here within a clear set of assumptions about the nature of representation. This section forms a meta-theoretical account of the constraints and the possibilities of a specifically representational level of explanation.

Meaningful elements and representational systems

A representational level of explanation is, by definition, concerned with the analysis of meaning. It will therefore be useful to start with a brief discussion of the nature of 'meaningfulness'.

When analysing physical structures, it is usual to describe an entity in terms of constituent parts or 'building blocks': organisms in terms of chemical structure, chemicals in terms of atomic structure, and so on. In a similar vein, attempts have been made to theorise building blocks of meaning. For example, Dawkins (1982) describes the concept of a 'meme' as "a unit of information residing in a brain", which may be stored as "a pattern of synaptic connections" or "in 'distributed' form" (p. 109).

But attempts to isolate building blocks of meaning fail to problematise the nature of the meaningfulness of a meme or representational element. Meaning is taken to be self-explanatory in order to support a reductionist account, and yet it is not clear how a 'unit of information' can be said to be meaningful except by virtue of its relationship with other 'units'. This is illustrated by Saussure (as cited by Culler, 1976):

Concepts ... are not autonomous entities, each of which is defined by some kind of essence. They are members of a system and are defined by their relations to the other
members of that system. If I am to explain to someone the meaning of *stream* I must tell him about the difference between a stream and a river, a stream and a rivulet, etc. And similarly, I cannot explain the French concept of a 'rivière' without describing the distinction between 'rivière' and 'fleuve' on the one hand and 'rivière' and 'ruisseau' on the other. (Culler, 1976, p. 24)

The central point here is that, unlike the physical level in which structures and processes can in theory be reduced to their constituent parts, the representational level is structured in terms of relationships between elements which are only meaningful in terms of these relationships. It may then be useful to view systems of meaning in terms of a network of relationships between elements. The meaning of any part of a network is jointly constituted by its internal structure and by its relationship with other parts of the wider network.

A relational understanding of meaningfulness is reflected in writings on social representations. Moscovici (1988) defines representation as "a network of interacting concepts and images whose contents evolve continuously over time and space" (p. 220). Meanwhile, Breakwell (1993) notes that "representations are embedded in complex representational networks and that they are liable to change, whether subtle or global, as a result of their relationships to each other" (p. 198).

A similar understanding is apparent within cognitive perspectives on mental representation. E. R. Smith (1998, pp. 391-392), reviewing work in this area, describes a shift from viewing representations as *things* to a metaphor of representations as *states*, listing the following benefits:
1. If representations are things, then we must search for one to use, as when we look in the pantry for a can of beans to include in the soup. A representation that is not selected in the search makes no contribution to the dish being prepared. On the other hand, all representations are part of the person's overall state, so no representations remain unused or inert (Gilbert, 1993); any representation might influence current processing.

2. A thing can be stored away and later retrieved unchanged. The can of beans that was put on the shelf last week should still be there in exactly the same form today. In contrast, a state is intrinsically dynamic, influenced by the immediate context and whatever else is going on as well as by the content of a particular representation.

3. What can be done with a thing, like putting a can of beans on the shelf, can be undone. Once the can is taken down and used, it is no longer in the pantry. In contrast, if acquiring a belief changes the person's state it may not be possible to exactly reverse that change - to "unbelieve" what was once believed and return to the status quo ante. A theme within all three benefits is that the state metaphor portrays consequences of the relational nature of meaningfulness within mental representation more effectively than the thing metaphor.

This understanding of representation has important implications for the study of meanings. Firstly, meanings should be analysed in terms of the hermeneutic rule that "we must understand the whole in terms of the detail and the detail in terms of the whole" (Gadamer, 1960/1989, p291).
Secondly, it is neither possible nor is it necessarily appropriate to try to establish empirically the boundaries of a given representation: any representation should be understood as a section of a wider network, its boundaries being defined by the questions asked in a particular study.

**Change processes within representational systems**

If representation is structured according to relational principles, then this has substantial implications for how meanings can change.

Firstly, new elements can only become meaningful within the context of existing meanings. This is the essence of Piaget's (1936/1955) concept of *assimilation* and Moscovici's (1961, 1984) concept of *anchoring*.

Assimilation is "the modification of an incoming stimulus, or input information, by the activity of a pre-existent structure" (Boden, 1994, p. 6), while anchoring is a process which "draws something foreign and disturbing that intrigues us into our particular system of categories and compares it to the paradigm of a category" (Moscovici, 1984, p. 29). Although assimilation and anchoring are grounded in different epistemological perspectives and different levels of analysis, the similarity between the two concepts is obvious, and can be understood as necessary, given the logical constraints of a relational understanding of meaning.

---

1 Billig (1988) contrasts anchoring with an opposing process of particularisation, whereby new information is treated "as a special case, thereby negating, or criticizing, a strategy of categorization" (p. 13). This might be a means of avoiding change where a piece of information poses a potential threat to continuity of meaning within the system. Particularisation may itself be understood as a special case of anchoring, but it is useful to note that information may be anchored in several places within a conceptual system, and that the 'choice' of where to anchor may serve a motivational or practical purpose.
Secondly, it is important to note that change in one detail will have repercussions for the whole, which will then have repercussions for every detail, and so on. This is consistent with Piaget's (1936/1955) concept of accommodation which describes "the active modification of the structure itself, so as to adapt to the input" (Boden, 1994, p. 6).

Hence an important consequence of understanding representation in relational terms is that change will necessarily be a dynamic and iterative process, modifying both the incoming detail and the existing structure. This leads to a dynamic conceptualisation of the relationship between representational structure and process: structure forms the context within which processes occur, but processes have the capacity to create, maintain or change the structures in which they are embedded.

**Representing physical and social environments**

The account provided so far describes the operation of a representational system in its own terms without reference either to what is being represented or to who is representing it.

If we start from the assumption that the representer is a single sentient being, equated with a single representational system, then there are two possible sources of incoming information: source material may either come from the physical environment in the simple form of perception or from other beings or representational systems in the form of communication.

In the case of perception, information comes from the physical environment in the form of sense data, which are anchored into existing representational structures, which in turn modifies the existing structures, entailing a combined process of assimilation-accommodation.
Chapter 1: Definitions and Assumptions

Communication is a more complex process. Source material comes from other representational systems in the form of symbolic expressions, which must be perceived and interpreted within the representer's own system. Of course, communication tends to be a two-way process in which meaning is negotiated in the transaction between beings engaged simultaneously in perception and interpretation of each other's symbolic expressions.

Within this process, it is possible to understand meaning as located separately within each of the communicating representational systems, and also as embedded within the transaction itself (Rommetveit, 1990). There is no reason to suppose that meanings located at different stages of the communication process will necessarily be identical. In fact, if we accept the assumption that all meanings exist only in relation to other meanings, perfect communication - in the sense of an identical understanding across two systems - would be logically impossible unless the systems themselves were identical in every respect.

However it is assumed here that it is possible for meanings to be 'equivalent' across several representational systems, in the sense that there is sufficient similarity across the systems for communication to be pragmatically useful. Some degree of equivalence can be expected to arise wherever there is interaction between representational systems.²

The view that communication is both enabled by and produces shared meanings across representational systems has been understood as a fundamental assumption of social representation theory (Purkhardt, 1993,

² This is not to deny that, in cases such as certain uneven power relations, some dissimilarity between representational systems may also be 'pragmatically useful' in the functional sense that different understandings of a relationship may serve to justify and perpetuate the nature of the relationship.
p. 10). This is also a necessary precondition if my thesis is to have any useful meaning beyond the internal representational system of the writer. Given the necessity of making this assumption about the thesis, it seems reasonable to make the same assumption within the thesis.

Given an understanding of meaningfulness as a relational property, it should be noted that it is not appropriate to view any single concept as originating exclusively in either perception or communication. A concept is only meaningful within the context of a representational system which is jointly created by both perception and communication in interaction with cognitive processes of assimilation and accommodation.

In a similar vein, it is important to note that neither perception nor communication occurs independently of assimilation-accommodation. The existing representational system will affect both where in the physical environment the 'representer' is directing his or her attention and with which other representational systems communication occurs.

Assumptions about representation

The account above entails the following conclusions:

1. An element of meaning should be understood within the context of other meanings in which it is embedded, rather than in isolation.

2. Representational change is a dynamic process which iteratively modifies the parts and the whole of a representational structure. Thus, structure should not be understood as a fixed entity, but as a state (E. R. Smith, 1998), within which processes are embedded, but which is reproduced or transformed continuously by these processes.
3. Representational structures are shaped not only by internal processes of assimilation and accommodation, but also by perception and communication which provide incoming information, linking the system to its physical and social environment.

4. Communication is inevitably and fundamentally imperfect, in the sense that it will not result in identity of meaning between representational systems. But this does not imply that all communication is futile. Rather, communication should be understood as being necessarily an active process of interpretation or negotiation, which should therefore be evaluated using pragmatic rather than truth criteria.

**Implications for the Study of Identity**

It is important to note that psychology, like identity, can be understood as representation. Hence, the assumptions above are applicable not only to the phenomenon being studied but also reflexively to the study itself. Care has been taken that the theories addressed within this thesis should be consistent with assumptions about representation. These assumptions have also been applied reflexively to the research process in order to direct the choice of appropriate methods and inform interpretations.

**Theoretical implications**

The definition of identity which started this chapter incorporates several aspects of the account of representation. It is clearly a strength of this definition that it does not impose a separation of identity from self-concept or personal from social identity. If meanings are to be understood in terms of their contexts, then it would be disadvantageous to attempt to interpret aspects of identity within an artificially narrow frame of reference.
It is also stressed that identity is the dynamic product of interacting processes of perception, cognition and communication. In keeping with a metaphor of representations as states rather than things (E. R. Smith, 1998), identity structure is not assumed to be a stable entity, but is understood as the outcome of these processes at a single moment in time.

The 'relational' understanding of meaningfulness is also reflected strongly in the theoretical account of 'distinctiveness' within this thesis. Stemming directly from the assumptions introduced here, distinctiveness is theorised as a necessary aspect of meaning within identity (chap. 3). Additionally, in view of the importance of understanding meanings in terms of their wider contexts, attention is paid to the significance of cultural representations of person and self (chap. 3, chap. 7), which are seen as an important aspect of the meaningful background within which identities are embedded.

However, in one important respect, the treatment of identity within this thesis goes beyond a purely representational level of explanation. The representational level applies to the phenomenology of identity itself. But a central proposition of this thesis is that the processes shaping identity are guided by particular motivational principles (Breakwell, 1993).

It is not assumed that these principles are present within the representational structure of identity or that they necessarily operate on a conscious level. Rather they are understood metaphorically as 'forces' or 'vectors', which may or may not be accessible to consciousness, but which can be detected by their effects on identity processes and resulting states.

It would not be appropriate to develop the concept of a motivational principle further at this point. The thesis does not require any further assumptions on this issue, nor can any such assumptions be easily justified on a priori grounds. However, several possible routes to
motivation are suggested in the course of the thesis, and these are summarised and discussed in detail within the final chapter.

**Methodological implications**

Applying the assumptions reflexively to the thesis, it is apparent that the research reported here must be understood as a process of communication, which necessarily involves interpretation at every stage. This is true of quantitative as well as qualitative methodologies (Reicher, 1994).

A central methodological decision within the research has been to integrate qualitative and quantitative methods, with the intention of gaining a fuller picture of the theoretical issues addressed than would be possible using either of these approaches alone. A number of theorists writing from very different perspectives have advocated the integration of multiple methods to address social psychological issues (e.g., Breakwell, 1993; Denzin, 1978; Flick, 1992; Hammersley, 1996; Reicher, 1994; Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990). However, it is important to specify in what sense strategies of data collection and analysis drawn from different epistemological backgrounds are to be integrated (Bryman, 1988).

An important issue here is not to equate research methods uncritically with their epistemological origins. The assumptions introduced in this chapter do not directly entail that any one method is intrinsically superior to others for studying representational phenomena. It may be more productive to understand the different methods as tools used within the research, with different strengths and weaknesses, as well as different emphases. In these terms, the value of clarifying assumptions about representation lies in informing the strategies of data collection and interpretation used within each methodological approach, as well as enhancing the possibility of locating conclusions in a wider theoretical
perspective through careful consideration of the relationship between theory and method. It has been intended that both qualitative and quantitative parts of the research described in this thesis should be consistent with assumptions about the nature of identity. These assumptions provide a framework for integrating the conclusions drawn within the final chapter.

If the research process is theorised as an interaction between researcher's and researched systems of meaning, then it is additionally important to be explicit about features of the researcher's interpretative framework which may have shaped the interactions which took place during data collection as well as subsequent interpretations of the data. Accounts of my own and my supervisors' speaking positions with respect to the population studied are provided in chapter four, and their possible effects on various stages of the research process are discussed in the final chapter.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have defined identity as a form of representation and outlined assumptions about representation which have substantial implications for the theoretical and methodological content of this thesis. In the next two chapters, I examine a particular theory of the operation of identity dynamics, identity process theory (Breakwell, 1993), then focus on an important construct within this theory, the distinctiveness principle (Breakwell, 1986a; Brewer, 1991), which is discussed especially in relation to issues of culture and context. In the following eight chapters, I describe a programme of research which addressed these issues within the context of studying identity among members of the Anglican clergy. In the final chapter, findings are evaluated and integrated in terms of the assumptions outlined here, and their wider relevance is discussed.
Chapter 2
IDENTITY PROCESS THEORY

Are you not the future of all the memories stored within you? The future of a past?
VALÉRY - Mauvaises Pensées et Autres

The treatment of identity within this thesis is grounded in identity process theory (Breakwell, 1986a, 1987, 1988, 1992, 1993). This theory provides a model of cognitive processes and motivational principles which are understood to shape identity and to guide identity-related action.

Identity process theory was developed partly in order to address some of the deficits of social identity theory (Tajfel, 1981, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), which uses the concept of social identity to explain the occurrence of inter-group behaviour. Social identity theory assumes that identity-related behaviour is at least partially motivated by a need for self-esteem (Tajfel & Turner, 1986, p. 16; see also Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Hogg & Abrams, 1990), but the dynamics of this motivation are not addressed within the theory, nor is theoretical attention given more generally to the processes and principles underlying identity (Breakwell, 1992).

Identity Structure

According to Breakwell (1986a, chap. 2), identity structure is not a fixed entity, it is the dynamic product of an interaction between intra-psychic and social influence processes over subjective and historical time. Identity is organised in terms of content and value dimensions, although these are not independent of each other, and it includes both personal and social elements which are understood to be interrelated. This definition is consistent with the assumptions outlined in the previous chapter.
Identity Processes

According to the theory, there are two types of cognitive process involved in identity dynamics. These are assimilation-accommodation and evaluation, processes which shape respectively the content and value dimensions of identity. Assimilation and accommodation, treated as aspects of a single process, are respectively defined as the absorption of new components into the identity structure and the adjustment which occurs in the existing structure in order to anchor the new elements. Evaluation is the allocation of value to existing elements within identity. Both processes are understood to operate continuously, interacting dynamically with each other and with the processes of perception and communication linking a person to his or her environment.

Identity Principles

The operation of these processes is understood to be guided by identity principles, which are the motivational basis of identity. Identity principles are pressures towards particular identity states. Identity process theory includes a self-esteem principle as assumed within social identity theory, but does not suggest that identity processes are motivated solely to achieve self-esteem, which has been questioned elsewhere (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Brewer, 1991; Deaux, 1993; Hogg & Abrams, 1990).

It is a core proposition of identity process theory that the processes which shape identity are motivated by more than one principle. In her original formulation of the theory, Breakwell (1986a, 1987, 1988) lists three principles, self-esteem, distinctiveness and continuity; in subsequent accounts (Breakwell, 1992, 1993), an efficacy principle has been added. A brief review of evidence for each of these principles is given below.
Self-esteem

The self-esteem principle refers to "the motivation to maintain and enhance a positive conception of oneself" (Gecas, 1982, p. 20). This motive is widely viewed as universal and has been implicated in an enormous range of social psychological theories and findings to which full justice cannot be done here (see Burns, 1979; Gecas, 1982; Rosenberg, 1986).

Research suggests that people pay more attention to and show more confidence in information which supports a positive self-evaluation (Greenwald, 1980; D. T. Miller & Ross, 1975; J. M. Schwartz & Smith, 1976); people compare themselves selectively with those with whom comparisons will be more favourable (Gruder, 1977; Rosenberg & Simmons, 1972; Wills, 1991) and choose favourable dimensions on which to compare themselves (Lemaine, 1974; Lemaine, Kastersztein & Personnaz, 1978); people perceive as most central within their identities elements which provide self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1986); people identify more with higher status groups (Ellemers, van Knippenberg, De Vries & Wilke, 1988); and the majority of people see themselves and members of their groups as 'better than average' on a wide range of evaluative dimensions (Alicke, Klotz, Breitenbecher, Yurak & Vredenburg, 1995; Klar & Giladi, 1997).

Furthermore, low self-esteem has been associated with negative affect and depression (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991; Rosenberg, 1986) and various forms of 'self-discrepancy' have been associated with different negative affective states (Higgins, 1987). Threats to the positive evaluation of self have been shown to result in various coping reactions, including compensatory adjustments in self-evaluations (Greenberg & Pyszczynski, 1985) and in behaviour (Steele, 1988), as well as aggressive responses towards the source of the threat (Baumeister, Smart & Boden, 1996).
The self-esteem principle arguably has a central role within social identity theory. An explicit assumption is that "individuals strive to maintain or enhance their self-esteem" (Tajfel & Turner, 1986, p. 16). The theory has been understood to contain an implicit 'self-esteem hypothesis' (SEH: Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Hogg & Abrams, 1990), that intergroup discrimination elevates self-esteem through the achievement of a positive social identity (corollary 1) and will therefore occur especially as a response to low self-esteem (corollary 2). Research has on the whole supported corollary 1, but refuted corollary 2: it appears to be individuals higher in self-esteem who engage more in intergroup discrimination (Rubin & Hewstone, 1998; see also Baumeister et al., 1996).

The lack of unqualified support for SEH may be due to a failure to measure self-esteem at the appropriate level of specificity (Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). Self-esteem is not a unitary construct. Distinctions have been made between global and domain-specific self-esteem (Robinson, 1990), personal and collective self-esteem (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990) and trait and state self-esteem (Heatherton & Polivy, 1991). Additionally, what constitutes a positive self-conception appears to vary considerably across cultures (Heine, Lehman, Markus & Kitayama, 1999).

It may also be argued that low self-esteem is wrongly equated with threat within corollary 2. Baumeister et al. (1996) suggest that the greatest threat to self-esteem will occur where self-esteem is high, unstable and is challenged. They review evidence linking these conditions to a wide range of aggressive outcomes from self-reported feelings of hostility to murder, rape, domestic violence, gang crime, political terror and genocide.

Without prejudice to the above arguments, it is also likely that motives other than self-esteem are equally important in guiding identity processes (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Breakwell, 1986a; Brewer, 1991; Deaux, 1993).
**Distinctiveness**

The *distinctiveness* principle refers to the motivation to see oneself as distinctive or unique (Breakwell, 1986a). It has been argued by some theorists that a sense of distinctiveness is a necessary feature of the experience of identity (Apter, 1983; Codol, 1981, 1984b). Distinctiveness has also been understood as a core value of 'western' cultures (Farr, 1991; Lukes, 1973; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980; Triandis, 1989, 1993, 1995).

Studies conducted in 'western' cultures have shown that information is better memorised if it distinguishes the self from others (Leyens, Yzerbyt & Rogier, 1997); that groups are often rated as more heterogeneous if the rater is a group member\(^3\) (Brewer, 1993b; Park & Rothbart, 1982); that feelings of extreme similarity to others are associated with negative affect (Fromkin, 1972), positive evaluation of scarce experiences (Fromkin, 1970) and greater identification with distinctive groups (Brewer & Pickett, 1999); and that people generally describe themselves as less similar to others than others are to themselves (Codol, 1984a, 1987).

Within identity process theory, distinctiveness has been taken to refer especially to 'positive distinctiveness', as described by Tajfel and Turner (1986), which is a feature of the operation of social comparison processes (Festinger, 1954; Wills, 1991). However, a central issue within this thesis is the theoretical development of the distinctiveness principle, focusing in particular on the elaboration of different ways in which distinctiveness may be constructed and maintained according to culture and context.

\(^3\) It should be acknowledged that some studies have failed to find this effect, or have even found the opposite, where self-categorisation is at an intergroup level (Haslam, Oakes, Turner & McGarty, 1995), where the in-group is of a lower status than the out-group (Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1995), where the in-group is a minority (B. Simon & Brown, 1987) and under certain conditions of identity threat (Thompson, Kohles, Otsuki & Kent, 1997).
Chapter 2: Identity Process Theory

Continuity

The continuity principle refers to the motivation to maintain a sense of "continuity across time and situation" within identity (Breakwell, 1986a, p. 24). Continuity is an extremely important facet of identity. Indeed, Erikson (1968, p. 19) defines identity itself as "a subjective sense of an invigorating sameness and continuity" (see also James, 1892/1984, chap. 12). However, continuity should not be equated with 'sameness' or 'stability'. Continuity is not the absence of change, but that there is some conceptual thread connecting past, present and future within a person's identity (Breakwell, 1987, pp. 103-104; Chandler & Lalonde, 1995).

Studies have shown that information consistent with people's existing self-conceptions receives more attention, is better recalled and is interpreted as more reliable (Aitkenhead, 1980; Crary, 1966; Fitch, 1970; Shrauger, 1975) and that people often seek to occupy and to create social contexts which provide self-confirmatory feedback (Swann, 1987). Following disruptions of continuity such as job loss or bereavement, people often engage in inappropriate efforts to restore continuity (Breakwell, 1986a). The lack of continuity has been associated with negative emotive states (Rosenberg, 1986) and even suicide (Chandler & Lalonde, 1995).

In personological and constructivist perspectives, continuity is understood to be a key feature in the construction of identity (Harré, 1998; McAdams, 1988; Shotter & Gergen, 1989). Some research has focused on how continuity is constructed and maintained. Studies in developmental psychology (Chandler & Lalonde, 1995; Damon & Hart, 1988) suggest that children use various forms of information to establish a sense of continuity. Chandler and Lalonde argue that 'continuity warrants' are grounded in concepts of identity structure. Continuity constructions might also be anchored in concepts of time (cf. Gurvitch, 1964; Ramos, 1992).
Efficacy

The efficacy principle refers to the motivation to maintain feelings of "competence and control" (Breakwell, 1993, p. 205). Like distinctiveness and continuity, the experience of agency has been theorised as a defining feature of identity (Apter, 1983; Codol, 1981, Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983). According to R. H. Turner (1976), people experience their "real self" as the origin of actions rather than the object of self-perception.

People often create illusions of efficacy, treating situations of chance as situations of skill (Langer, 1975). Artificially induced feelings of efficacy have been associated with greater subjective well-being (Bandura, 1997), increases in actual personal and collective efficacy (Bandura, 1982) and even better physical health and increased life-span (Rodin & Langer, 1977). Negative behaviours, including hostility (Apter, 1983) as well as anorexia nervosa (Baumeister, 1991; Orbach, 1993), have also been attributed to efficacy maintenance. The loss of belief in one's own efficacy has been associated with severe forms of depression (Seligman, 1975).

Like self-esteem, distinctiveness and continuity, a sense of efficacy may be constructed in a number of different ways. Rothbaum, Weisz and Snyder (1982) outline several ways of establishing a sense of perceived efficacy. In addition to actually controlling the environment, strategies include attributing outcomes to a personal quality of 'luck', identifying with efficacious others and even, somewhat paradoxically, emphasising one's inefficacy within a situation, which may improve 'predictive control'.
Flexibility within the Theory

While the processes shaping identity are understood to be universal, biologically grounded and content-free, the principles guiding these processes are understood as "reifications of what society regards as acceptable endstates for identity" (Breakwell, 1987, p. 107), rather than essential or universal properties of identity or motivation. Thus it is stressed that the principles listed above may not be relevant in every culture or historical epoch, nor is it likely that they form an exhaustive list of principles operating within our own culture.

This has created the possibility of adding principles. Markowe (1996), using the theory as an interpretative framework for understanding the experience of 'coming out' among lesbian women, has argued for two further principles, a "need for authenticity and integrity" and a "need for affiliation" (p. 205). Lyons (1996), adapting identity process theory to theorise the role of social memory processes (after Middleton & Edwards, 1990) in constructing and maintaining group identity, has suggested adding a principle of "cohesion" (Lyons, 1996, p. 36), which would push towards the establishment of a sense of group solidarity or unity.

It is also possible to look at both cultural and historical variations in the relative salience of principles. Research conducted by Cullen (1996) into the debate over legalisation of abortion in the Republic of Ireland suggested that pro-life arguments were tied to a sub-cultural world-view emphasising continuity above the other principles, whereas pro-choice arguments were tied to an emphasis on efficacy. A longitudinal study by Speller, Lyons and Twigger-Ross (1999a) into the implications for identity of the enforced relocation of a traditional English coal-mining community suggested that the relative salience of the four identity principles was affected by cultural changes brought about by the relocation.
Identity Threat and Other Applications

Identity process theory was conceptualised originally as a framework for looking at coping responses to identity threat (Breakwell, 1986a, 1988). A threat to identity is understood to exist in situations where the processes of assimilation-accommodation and evaluation are unable to comply with the existing identity principles. The theory predicts that situations of threat will result in the operation of coping strategies. Strategies may be on one or more of three levels: intra-psychic strategies, involving the operation of assimilation-accommodation and/or evaluation to revise the identity structure; interpersonal coping strategies, involving changing one's relationships with others; and inter-group coping strategies, involving behaviour at a group level. The latter include the strategies of social mobility and social creativity theorised within social identity theory as responses to the threat posed by a negative social identity.

Breakwell (1986a) examined identity threat and coping strategies on intra-psychic, interpersonal and inter-group levels, in various situations including gender-inconsistent occupations and unemployment. Most applications of the theory have shared this focus, addressing a range of potential threats including the identity implications of adjusting to brain injury (D. P. Judd & Wilson, 1999), the incompatibility of cultural, religious and sexual identities among Jewish gay men (Rafalin, 1998), the 'coming out' process among lesbian women (Markowe, 1996), the impact of an organisational merger (Marson, Sullivan & Cinnirella, 1998), the enforced relocation of a mining community in the North of England (Speller, Lyons & Twigger-Ross, 1996), the threat to place identification posed by beach pollution (Bonaiuto, Breakwell & Cano, 1996), the abortion debate in the Republic of Ireland (Cullen, 1996) and the political changes associated with European integration (Breakwell, 1996).
A few studies have not focused explicitly on threat (Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996; Uzzell, 1996; Uzzell & Sørensen, 1999). Twigger-Ross and Uzzell studied place attachment in the London Docklands, examining differences between attached and non-attached interviewees in the use of distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy and self-esteem when talking about the area. Devine-Wright and Lyons studied the role of historical places in the construction of Irish identity by measuring the contribution of each place to feelings of distinctiveness, continuity, self-esteem and cohesion of Ireland and the Irish people.

Methodological Approaches

In many of the above applications, researchers have used identity process theory as an interpretative framework, rather than testing the theory. For example, Speller et al. (1996) used a thematic analysis (Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor & Tindall, 1994) of interview data in which they specifically focused on references to self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy; Rafalin (1998) used an interpretative phenomenological analysis (J. A. Smith, 1996) of interview data in a detailed examination of the perceived threats and coping strategies described by her participants; and Breakwell (1996) used identity process theory as a conceptual tool in the construction of a social psychological interpretation of cross-national longitudinal public opinion data from 'Eurobarometer' surveys.

On the other hand, studies by Boniauto et al. (1996) and Ethier and Deaux (1994) have provided statistical evidence for the operation of identity processes in coping with threats to identity, although the motivational principles guiding the processes were assumed.

Boniauto et al. (1996) demonstrated using path analysis that levels of local and national identification predicted variance in perceived levels of
beach pollution independently of both the European Union categorisation of the beach and the physical evidence of pollution. This suggested that place-attached participants were discounting information about pollution in order to cope with the threat posed by this information.

Ethier and Deaux (1994), studying identity threat among Hispanic students entering predominantly Anglo universities, found that those students with initially weak ethnic identification lowered their identification, which was interpreted in terms of self-esteem maintenance following social identity theory, while those with initially strong ethnic identification 'remoored' this identification through involvement in ethnic activities at university, which was interpreted in terms of the simultaneous maintenance of self-esteem and 'stability'.

Meanwhile, Marson et al. (1998) have investigated the role of distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy and self-esteem principles in determining a number of outcomes in a situation of organisational merger. Using a questionnaire measuring the perceived importance of and the perceived threat to each principle in a situation of organisational merger, they found that different combinations of these constructs predicted a range of variables including identification with the new organisation, mental health, coping strategies and organisational commitment.

Limitations of Existing Work

The conceptual framework of identity process theory has been used in a substantial range of applied domains and its predictions, where tested, have generally been supported. However, existing work within this framework is subject to some theoretical and operational limitations.
Within empirical work, the theory has been applied almost exclusively to situations of identity threat, with the result that the theory itself has been described as focusing exclusively on threat and coping strategies (Bosma, 1995). Situations of identity threat are useful environments for studying the processes shaping identity, providing empirical access to identity change (Deaux, 1993), but the theory implies that identity principles will be in operation at all times and not solely under conditions of threat. However, studies which have not specifically addressed threats to identity (e.g., Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Twigger-Ross & Uzzell, 1996) have generally treated identity principles as components of identity strength, rather than motivational pressures within identity as theorised above.

Another issue underrepresented in the empirical studies reviewed above is the structure of identity. While identity structure should not be reified as a fixed entity, it is important to acknowledge that identity is composed of multiple elements and that these elements are interrelated (cf. chap. 1; Deaux, 1992). However, existing research has generally focused on single elements of identity or at best multiple elements within a single domain.

The measurement of identity principles is another issue in need of development. Researchers have measured self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy either as identity states or as conscious priorities (e.g., Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997; Marson et al., 1998), have inferred the operation of identity principles from the phenomenological salience of these constructs (e.g., Markowe, 1996; Speller et al., 1999a), or have simply assumed the presence of identity principles underlying observed processes (e.g., Boniauto et al., 1996; Ethier & Deaux, 1994). However, the definition of identity principles as pressures towards particular states within identity entails neither that these pressures can necessarily be inferred from the states themselves, nor that they can necessarily be equated with the subjective importance or salience of these states.
The definition of identity principles as cultural values 'reified' within the individual has advantages in terms of flexibility, but potentially poses problems for both the parsimony and the internal consistency of the theory. With no argument for generality across cultures, the possibility is not ruled out that completely different sets of principles may apply within different cultural settings, resulting in a considerable potential reduction in theoretical parsimony. Furthermore, this definition implicitly reduces all principles to a central issue of 'value' which might arguably be equated with the self-esteem principle. The theory would be considerably strengthened by a more developed account of why self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy are important for identity.

A further theoretical and operational issue is to examine the implications of different ways in which self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy may be constructed. None of these appears to be a unitary construct (cf. Chandler & Lalonde, 1995; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Heine et al., 1999; Rothbaum et al., 1982). However, in its current form, the theory does not address the complexity of these constructs.

**Aims of This Thesis**

This thesis aims to address all of these limitations. A new method is developed for measuring the strength of pressures towards particular states within identity, focusing on the relationships between multiple elements within the structure of identity, and without recourse to the construct of identity threat. This method is used to test for pressures towards self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and self-efficacy, as well as possible additional principles, within the context of a study into identity, culture and distinctiveness among the Anglican clergy.
A substantial focus of this thesis is on the theoretical and empirical development of the distinctiveness principle. In the next chapter, the theoretical formulation of this principle is expanded, strengthening the position of this principle within the theory and developing the concept of distinctiveness. Predictions arising from this theoretical development are tested empirically, again among the Anglican clergy, in later chapters.
Chapter 3
THE DISTINCTIVENESS PRINCIPLE

Probably a crab would be filled with a sense of personal outrage if it could hear
us class it without ado or apology as a crustacean, and thus dispose of it.

"I am no such thing," it would say; "I am MYSELF, MYSELF alone."

WILLIAM JAMES, The Varieties of Religious Experience

Identity has been defined in representational terms and some implications
of this definition have been clarified. Additionally, it has been suggested
that the processes shaping identity are motivated by principles of
maintaining distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy and self-esteem.

This chapter focuses in detail on the distinctiveness principle, which is
understood here as a motive pushing towards the establishment and
maintenance of a sense of differentiation from others (after Breakwell,
1986a; Brewer, 1991). It should be emphasised that subjective feelings of
distinctiveness may be attained in many different ways. Furthermore,
both interpersonal and intergroup distinctions may be involved - given the
inclusive definition of identity adopted within this thesis, there is no
reason to assume that different sets of motivational principles will apply
respectively to 'personal' and 'social' aspects of identity.

The distinctiveness principle has been understood to guide the processes
shaping identity, in interaction with motives for continuity, efficacy and
self-esteem (Breakwell, 1986a, 1993) as well as belonging, inclusion
within groups and similarity to others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995;
Brewer, 1991, 1993a; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980). In focusing here on
distinctiveness, it is in no way intended to dismiss the vital significance of
these other motives for identity. As discussed later, distinctiveness and
similarity or inclusion are in fact especially closely connected in the
process of constructing a meaningful sense of identity.
Breakwell (1987, 1993) has identified three reservations about the distinctiveness principle. Firstly, the principle appears to push towards moderate rather than extreme levels of distinctiveness (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980). Secondly, distinctiveness has often been theorised as a source of self-esteem rather than a basic motive (see Abrams & Hogg, 1988), implicitly reducing the principle to a subordinate status within identity dynamics. Thirdly, the principle may be specific to individualistic cultures (after Shweder & Bourne, 1984; Triandis, 1995).

Given these reservations it seems difficult to support the assertion of a distinctiveness principle without careful examination of two key issues: (a) the nature of the role of distinctiveness within identity processes, and (b) whether--and, if so, in what sense--the importance of distinctiveness is moderated by culture. In this chapter, I review each issue in turn and outline some connected theoretical developments which have contributed to the research into the distinctiveness principle within this thesis.

**The Role of Distinctiveness in Identity Processes**

Many theorists have asserted the importance of distinguishing oneself from others on both individual and group levels of self-representation (Breakwell, 1986a; Brewer, 1991; Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Festinger, 1954; Lemaime, 1974; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), but comparatively little effort has gone into theorising explicitly why distinctiveness is important for identity. Yet, given the reservations identified above, it seems unwise to theorise a distinctiveness principle without an account of why distinctiveness should be a 'good thing'.
In this section, I review the assumptions underlying existing theories of distinctiveness motivation. Theorists have portrayed distinctiveness as a social value (Breakwell, 1987; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980), an aspect of self-enhancement (Breakwell, 1987; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Wills, 1991), a fundamental human need (Brewer, 1991, 1993a) and a basic property of the construction of meaning within identity (Codol, 1981, 1984b).

**Distinctiveness as a social value**

Some theorists suggest that distinctiveness has a role in shaping identity because of its social value. This argument is implicit in uniqueness theory (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980) and is made explicit by Breakwell (1987).

Uniqueness theory proposes that different degrees of similarity to others are encoded at different levels of acceptability, moderate similarity being the most acceptable and very high or very low similarity (very low or very high distinctiveness) the least acceptable outcomes. Empirical support comes from a series of studies in which the authors induced feelings of moderate to extreme similarity in participants, resulting in convergent evidence for the subjective value of moderate distinctiveness across a range of affective and behavioural outcomes (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980, pp. 38-53). The theory does not explain directly why distinctiveness should be evaluated according to this curvilinear pattern. The authors suggest that the pattern is moderated by individual differences in ‘need for uniqueness’ (Snyder & Fromkin 1980, chap. 5), but their research does not address the question of why people need uniqueness.

In theorising a relationship between distinctiveness and ‘acceptability’, uniqueness theory might also be understood to tie distinctiveness motivation to self-esteem maintenance, although this is not made explicit. One study appears to confirm this interpretation. Ganster, McCuddy and
Fromkin (1977, cited by Snyder & Fromkin, 1980) gave false feedback to participants about their similarity to others. They reported that feedback of moderate similarity led to higher levels of self-esteem than did higher or lower similarity. A possible understanding of this relationship is that distinctiveness may be important as a cultural value. Snyder and Fromkin (1980) describe uniqueness as “probably an integral and necessary part of existence within our Western culture, which emphasizes the individual” (p. 215), although they also note that “in many situations, people want not to be unique but to be similar to others” (p. 216).

Breakwell (1987, 1993) portrays the distinctiveness principle explicitly as a cultural value, which is ‘reified’ within individuals. Breakwell (1993) describes four identity principles, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy and self-esteem, which guide the intra-individual processes shaping identity, but which constitute “a socially-established set of criteria against which identity is measured” (1987, p. 107). Thus, in so far as the distinctiveness requirement is socially defined, what is accepted as an appropriate level or manifestation of distinctiveness will be culture-specific.

Unlike Snyder and Fromkin (1980), who focus exclusively on individual distinctiveness, Breakwell (1988, p. 195) notes that both individual and group distinctiveness may be valued within the identity of the individual. However, the evidence she presents is focused more on the role of distinctiveness in social comparison processes (see below) than on the social value of distinctiveness in itself. Thus the relationship between the social value of distinctiveness and its force as a principle underlying identity processes remains to be demonstrated empirically.
Positive distinctiveness and self-enhancement

The distinctiveness principle has also been related to processes of self-enhancement, in which self-esteem is enhanced through the establishment of positive distinctiveness (Breakwell, 1987; see also Gruder, 1977; Wills, 1991). Studies conducted in North America have shown that people display more confidence about the accuracy of social comparisons in which they are positively distinguished from others (J. M. Schwartz & Smith, 1976), overestimate the uniqueness of their positive attributes (Campbell, 1986; Taylor & Brown, 1988) and, especially in situations of threat, prefer to compare themselves with others from whom they are positively distinguished (Crocker, Thompson, McGraw, & Ingerman, 1987; Hakmiller, 1966; Wills, 1991), although similarity with positively valued others has also been associated with self-enhancement (Wheeler, 1966).

The importance of positive distinctiveness is further supported by findings that, where acquiring positive distinctiveness is not possible, people may seek or create alternative dimensions of comparison (Lemaine, 1974; Lemaine, Kastersztein & Personnaz, 1978), or may even try to avoid social comparison entirely (e.g., Breakwell, 1986b; Brickman & Bulman, 1977).

The quest for positive group distinctiveness has an important place within social identity theory. According to social identity theory, many features of intergroup behaviour are directed towards the establishment of positive distinctiveness within intergroup comparisons (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; J. C. Turner, 1975). Although the theory is not explicit on this point, one interpretation of why positive group distinctiveness is important is that it serves to enhance self-esteem (Abrams & Hogg, 1988). This interpretation has been extensively adopted in the social identity literature (see Long & Spears, 1997; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998).
Social comparison processes are understood to be most stable, and most effective as a means of achieving self-esteem, if the target is moderately similar to oneself on the dimension of comparison (Festinger, 1954, hypothesis III; Wills, 1991). This might help to explain the observed pressure towards moderate levels of distinctiveness (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980), which would provide a balance between difference and similarity.

However, as in the account based on social value, distinctiveness is arguably only important within this account as far as it is positively functional for self-esteem. The two accounts involve very different ways in which distinctiveness may contribute to self-esteem: within the 'social value' argument, it is the value of distinctiveness itself which ties distinctiveness to self-esteem; within the 'social comparison' argument, self-esteem is derived from positive distinctiveness on other dimensions of value. Nevertheless, neither account presents a strong case for a separate need for distinctiveness independent of the self-esteem principle.

**Distinctiveness as a fundamental human need**

An alternative view is that distinctiveness is a fundamental need in its own right. This is assumed within optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991, 1993a), which deals especially with group distinctiveness.

Optimal distinctiveness theory proposes two motivational principles, a need for “differentiation of the self from others” and a need for “inclusion of the self into larger social collectives”, which are understood to act in opposition to each other (Brewer, 1993a, p. 3). Optimal distinctiveness occurs at a point of equilibrium between the two needs, which will normally be a state of moderate distinctiveness. This explains the dynamics of the curvilinear relationship between distinctiveness and ‘acceptability’ described in uniqueness theory.
The predictions of this theory are similar to those of uniqueness theory but have been applied especially to questions of group identification, finding support across a wide range of experimental and applied contexts (Brewer & Pickett, 1999; Brewer & Weber, 1994; Chiu & Hong, 1999; Henderson-King, Henderson-King, Zhermer, Posokhova & Chiker, 1997; Hornsey & Hogg, 1999; Lee & Ottati, 1995; L. Simon et al., 1997).

According to Brewer and Pickett (1999), the needs for differentiation and inclusion are "universal human motives" (p. 85) rather than cultural values. Brewer (1991) describes the negative implications of failing to satisfy their requirements: "Being highly individuated leaves one vulnerable to isolation and stigmatization. ... However, total deindividuation provides no basis for comparative appraisal or self-definition" (p. 478). Nevertheless there is expected to be some cultural, individual and temporal variation in their relative strengths.

Brewer (1991) explicitly separates these needs from self-esteem maintenance: "optimal distinctiveness is independent of the evaluative implications of group membership, although, other things being equal, individuals will prefer positive group identities to negative identities" (p. 478). Supporting this, Brewer, Manzi and Shaw (1993) eliminated effects of group status on in-group favouritism for majority and minority minimal groups when they aroused their participants' need for differentiation by priming them with depersonalising information. When the differentiation motive was frustrated, participants showed more favouritism for minority than majority in-groups, regardless of group status. Further support comes from a series of studies by Mlicki and Ellemers (1996) into national identities among Polish and Dutch students. Poles described their national identity as negative, but identified strongly and stressed their national distinctiveness. This was interpreted as a reaction to the threat to Polish distinctiveness posed by Poland's historical status.
Although optimal distinctiveness theory is restricted to the discussion of intergroup distinctiveness, Brewer and Gardner (1996) extend the same logic to 'individual' and 'interpersonal' levels of self-representation, suggesting that the opposing needs for differentiation and assimilation are played out at the individual level in terms of uniqueness and similarity and at the interpersonal level in terms of separation and intimacy.

Thus the work of Brewer and her co-authors provides a stronger theoretical and empirical argument than the preceding accounts for the distinctiveness principle. Distinctiveness is theorised as a fundamental and universal human need, necessary for self-definition and not just for self-enhancement, and the motive for distinctiveness has been separated empirically from the motive for self-esteem.

**Distinctiveness and meaning**

Extending Brewer's (1991) account of distinctiveness, a theoretical argument can be advanced that distinctiveness has an essential role in the construction of a meaningful identity, rather than being a specific property of particular identities (after Codol, 1981, 1984b).

Identity has been defined here as *the subjective concept of oneself as a person*, and is therefore a form of representation. As discussed in the first chapter, a notable feature of any system of representation is that concepts are not meaningful independently of each other, but are defined in relation to each other, involving a process of differentiation. It is worth reiterating Saussure's illustration: "If I am to explain to someone the meaning of *stream* I must tell him about the difference between a stream and a river, a stream and a rivulet, etc." (cited by Culler, 1976, p. 24).
Chapter 3: The Distinctiveness Principle

The same principle applies to the representation of oneself. An illustration is the example identity statement, "I am a musician". Clearly, this statement implies that I have something in common with other people who are, or describe themselves as, musicians. But equally it implies a distinction from those who are not, or do not describe themselves as, musicians. Without such a distinction, it is not clear in what sense the statement would be meaningful. More generally, I cannot have a sense of who I am without a sense of who I am not, which entails distinctiveness.

In the same vein, Codol (1981) argues for the importance of individual distinctiveness as a basic property of self-awareness:

There is no self-image unless the individual can identify a certain object as defining himself. This identification assumes that the individual can conceive of himself as a particular object, different from all others. In this way self-awareness inevitably expresses in the first place the recognition by an individual, on a cognitive level, that he is different from all other objects, and especially that he is different from those specific objects which are other persons. (Codol, 1981, p. 114, my translation)

---

4 A competing view is offered by Niedenthal and Beike (1997), who distinguish between interrelated and isolated self-concepts. Interrelated concepts are defined in relation to other concepts at the same or a superordinate level of abstraction; isolated concepts are defined in terms of their subordinate features (after Goldstone, 1996). Applying this to the current example, being a musician might be defined in terms of the subordinate feature of being able to play music, rather than by direct comparison with other categories on the same or a higher level of abstraction. However, it remains unclear in this case how the key subordinate feature can be defined except in terms of a distinction at this level between those who are or are not able to play music.
Consistent with this, developmental studies suggest that the distinction between self and others arises very early in life in association with other dimensions of identity (Damon & Hart, 1988; Lewis & Brooks-Gunn, 1979; Stern, 1985). Furthermore, the absence of this distinction may be experienced as a loss of self in some forms of psychosis (Apter, 1983).

Extending this argument, it is also necessary that distinctiveness should be socially recognised (Codol, 1981, 1984b). Identity, in common with most forms of representation, is not solely constructed within the individual, but emerges through an interaction of processes of perception, cognition and communication, involving insertion of the individual within a social environment (Lewis & Brooks-Gunn, 1979; Marková, 1987; Reicher, in press). Thus, it will be important to project a sense of distinctiveness to others, and not solely to acquire a sense of distinctiveness for oneself.

This account also predicts that similarity will be important in constructing a meaningful sense of identity. In the example given earlier, the concept of “stream” was defined in terms of its distinctiveness from concepts of “river” and “rivulet”, but this distinctiveness was only useful in as much as the three concepts were also connected to each other—it would be less useful to attempt to define the concept of “stream” in comparison with alternative concepts of “gorilla” and “spaceship”. Similarly, in defining one’s identity, it can be expected that non-distinctiveness as well as distinctiveness will be important (Codol, 1984b). Without any perceived connection between self and others, there will be no available conceptual framework within which to anchor one’s concept of self.

It should be noted that distinctiveness will not only be important on an individual level of comparison, according to this account. Group distinctiveness will also be important in two senses. Firstly, multiple group identifications may be combined as a route to individual
distinctiveness (Snyder & Fromkin, 1980). Secondly, identification with a group will not be meaningful if the group is not distinguished at all from others (J. C. Turner, 1987). Even identities appearing to be extremely inclusive often turn out to have distinctive meanings – for example, a person defining herself as a ‘citizen of the world’ may do so partly in order to distinguish herself from others who do not have this self-understanding.

Research conducted with group identities is consistent with an account of distinctiveness as a source of meaning within identity. B. Simon, Hastedt and Aufderheide (1997) examined the influence of the perceived numerical distinctiveness and meaningfulness of participants' stated preferences for urban or rural life on measures of self-categorisation in terms of groups based on these preferences. Echoing previous findings (B. Simon & Hamilton, 1994), self-categorisation was more pronounced if the group was perceived to be numerically distinctive; however this was only the case if the categorisation was perceived as meaningful. Spears and Jetten (1998, as cited in Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1999, p. 42) examined the effect on intergroup discrimination of manipulating the meaningfulness of a minimal group categorisation. Participants displayed intergroup discrimination only in the low meaningfulness condition, implying that they were seeking positive distinctiveness in order to give meaning to the groups. Hogg and his associates (Grieve & Hogg, 1999; Hogg & Abrams, 1993; Mullin & Hogg, 1998, 1999) have also emphasised the importance of meaning for identity, suggesting that uncertainty reduction may be a central motive underlying identity processes.

The argument developed here proposes a central role for distinctiveness in the establishment and projection of a meaningful sense of identity. This illuminates Brewer's (1991) assertion that differentiation is necessary for self-definition, but does not contradict accounts of the social value of distinctiveness and the role of distinctiveness in self-enhancement.
Conclusions about the role of distinctiveness

I have discussed assumptions that distinctiveness is important for identity because of the social value of distinctiveness itself, as a means of self-enhancement through social comparison and/or as a basic property of self-definition and thus a fundamental human need. None of these assumptions is incompatible with the others. However, research has focused on the whole on demonstrating the relationship of distinctiveness to particular identity states, with these arguments invoked as explanations of the findings – the assumptions themselves have received comparatively little empirical attention.

The hypothesis that distinctiveness is important for identity because of its social value has not been addressed directly. An empirical demonstration would need to show that differences in the strength of distinctiveness motivation were accounted for by existing or experimentally induced differences in the subjective value of distinctiveness. To the best of my knowledge, no such research has been conducted. On the other hand, the role of positive distinctiveness in self-enhancement appears to be relatively well supported empirically within Western studies. However, it also appears that the motivation for distinctiveness is not entirely accounted for by self-esteem maintenance, providing implicit support for the assumption that distinctiveness is a basic property of self-definition, although this assumption has not been tested directly.

The latter account has a theoretical advantage in terms of parsimony. The role of distinctiveness in identity processes is explained in terms of more general principles of human representation. Given interaction of the distinctiveness principle with a motive for self-esteem, this account also subsumes the account of positive distinctiveness in self-enhancement.
It is notable that all of the theoretical perspectives outlined above and almost all of the empirical studies mentioned are of Western origin. While the social value account is by definition culture-bound, arguments for the role of distinctiveness in self-definition and self-enhancement are in principle more amenable to generalisation, as distinctiveness is viewed as a structural dimension of identity, rather than an aspect of identity content. I discuss the generalisation of the distinctiveness principle to non-Western cultures in greater detail in the following section.

An implicit or explicit feature of all the accounts is that the distinctiveness principle is balanced with pressures against distinctiveness, whether towards similarity (Festinger, 1954; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980), inclusion in social groups (Brewer, 1991) or belonging (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). These opposing forces have been understood to account for the limited size of observed effects of the distinctiveness principle. However, I return to the issue of how the distinctiveness principle interacts with other motivations in greater detail within the final section of this chapter.

Culture and the Distinctiveness Principle

The second issue reviewed within this chapter is that of whether—and if so in what sense—the distinctiveness principle may be moderated by culture. Breakwell (1987) has expressed caution that the distinctiveness principle, and especially the importance for identity of individual distinctiveness, may be specific to Western or individualistic cultures. This concern can be traced back to anthropologist Clifford Geertz' (1975) famous caveat:

The Western conception of the person as a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational and cognitive universe, a dynamic center of awareness, emotion, judgment, and action organized into a distinctive whole and set
contrastively both against other such wholes and against a social and natural background is, however incorrigible it may seem to us, a rather peculiar idea within the context of the world’s cultures. (p. 48)

The Western concept of personhood is saturated with individual distinctiveness: the person is ‘bounded’ and ‘unique’, contrasted with others and with the social and physical environment. But these features are not emphasised in concepts of personhood within non-Western cultures (Geertz, 1975; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder & Bourne, 1984).

The Western concept of personhood is tied to political, economic and ethical aspects of individualism (Durkheim, 1898/1969; Lukes, 1973; Marková et al., 1998; Triandis, 1993, 1995; Triandis, Chan, Bhawuk, Iwao & Sinha, 1995). Definitions of individualism vary considerably, but most accounts involve a core theme of “the conception of individuals as autonomous from groups” (Triandis, Chan et al., 1995, p. 462).

The emergence of individualism has been linked to specific historical circumstances, including the early development of Christianity, the Renaissance, the invention of the printing press, the Reformation and the rise of liberal social philosophy (Dumont, 1986; Farr, 1991; Marková et al., 1998), but individualism has since become a powerful and pervasive cultural phenomenon. Thus, core values have survived into the 1990s within central Europe, despite 40 years of totalitarian attempts to eradicate them (Marková, 1997; Marková et al., 1998).

Individualism has had a substantial influence on Western psychology, shaping both the content and structure of many theories (Farr, 1991, 1996; Sampson, 1977, 1978). For example, the ‘fundamental attribution error’ (Ross, 1977) has been accepted as a universal feature of person
perception, but is in fact closely tied to assumptions of individualism and does not appear to generalise across cultures (Ichheiser, 1949; Miller, 1984; Morris & Peng, 1994). It has been argued that social scientists should be aware of cultural assumptions other than their own as a means of reducing individualistic bias (U. Kim & Berry, 1993; Sampson, 1978).

Given the salience of distinctiveness within the Western concept of the person, it seems reasonable to consider that the distinctiveness principle may be moderated by culture. In this section, I focus especially on the argument for relativity advanced by Triandis (1995) in his theory of individualism and collectivism, which suggests that individual distinctiveness will be less important and inclusion within groups more important within collectivist than individualist cultures.

**Collectivism and distinctiveness**

Triandis' concept of *collectivism* is derived mainly from psychometric studies comparing North American and South-East Asian populations (Triandis, 1989, 1993, 1995; Triandis, Chan et al., 1995; Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990). Collectivism is defined in opposition to individualism: "The central theme of individualism is the conception of individuals as autonomous from groups; the central theme of collectivism is the conception of individuals as aspects of groups or collectives" (Triandis, Chan et al., 1995, p. 462).

These themes are understood to account for a range of cross-cultural differences in the self-concept, values, behaviour and social structure (Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990). According to Triandis (1993), the self is construed as independent and different from others under individualism but interdependent and the same as others under collectivism.
Triandis (1995, pp. 10-11) has integrated the concepts of individualism and collectivism with optimal distinctiveness theory. He suggests that cultural differences will affect the balance between the opposing needs for differentiation and inclusion, so that equilibrium will occur at a lower degree of distinctiveness in collectivist than in individualistic cultures.⁵ Thus it is implied that group identities (understood to be less differentiating and more including) will be more important, while individual identities will be less important, in collectivist than in individualist cultures (see also P. B. Smith & Bond, 1993, pp. 77-78).

**Evidence for cross-cultural variation**

Neither Triandis (1995) nor P. B. Smith and Bond (1993) presents evidence directly addressing the above assertions. Indeed, little attention has been paid to distinctiveness motivation within Asian literature on self and identity, although this fact may in itself be understood to speak against cross-cultural generality (a similar argument has been made about self-esteem by Heine, Lehman, Markus & Kitayama, 1999). Nevertheless some evidence exists for cross-cultural variation.

In a pan-cultural study of individual differences conducted in Japan, Korea and the US, Yamaguchi, Kuhlman and Sugimori (1995) found that allocentrism, an individual differences variable conceptually equivalent to collectivism, was negatively correlated with 'need for uniqueness'. Although the close resemblance of some items measuring the two constructs casts some doubt on the authors' interpretation of the reported

---

⁵ Triandis' (1995) account does not follow automatically from optimal distinctiveness theory. If the differentiation and inclusion needs are “universal human motives” (Brewer & Pickett, 1999, p. 85), the opposite version is also possible: it might be that the need for inclusion is less satisfied and hence more aroused in individualistic cultures, while the need for differentiation is less satisfied and hence more aroused in collectivist cultures.
correlations, the findings do indicate the presence of systematic differences in the endorsement of distinctiveness-related attitude items, which were partially accounted for by respondents' cultural backgrounds.

Meanwhile, Triandis, McCusker and Hui (1990) found that respondents from China and Asians living in Hawaii perceived members of their in-groups to be more similar to each other than members of a range of out-groups, an apparent reversal of the out-group homogeneity effect, which has been connected theoretically to the motivation for individual distinctiveness (Brewer, 1993b). However, in their study, participants rated in-group and out-groups together, a condition in which the effect has been observed elsewhere to be eradicated through the activation of an intergroup comparative context (Haslam, Oakes, Turner & McGarty, 1995). Furthermore, judgements were made in terms of agreement about values, which might imply a judgement of group cohesiveness, rather than similarity in traits or attitudes as in most studies of perceived homogeneity (C. M. Judd, Ryan & Park, 1991; Park & Rothbart, 1982).

Both of the above studies might be understood to show variation in the cultural value of individual distinctiveness (or its opposite, in-group homogeneity), which is not necessarily related to the importance of distinctiveness for identity. These results might lead to a prediction of cross-cultural variation in the distinctiveness principle, according to the 'social value' argument described earlier, which itself has yet to be tested empirically, but they have not demonstrated this variation.

More secure is the evidence for variation in the use of positive distinctiveness as a strategy of self-enhancement. Research conducted in Japan has generally failed to replicate the results of Western studies of self-enhancement (Heine et al., 1999). Takata (1987) found that Japanese participants were more ready to accept failures than successes in social
comparison, while Markus & Kitayama (1991) report a study in which they replicated the false-uniqueness bias found by Campbell (1986) among American but not among Japanese participants. These results at first appear consistent with Triandis' (1995) discussion of distinctiveness.

However, Heine & Lehman (1997) report parallel cross-cultural differences between Canadian and Japanese participants in both self-serving and group-serving biases. Canadians rated both themselves and their groups as significantly more positively distinctive than did Japanese participants. Thus, cross-cultural differences in self-enhancement cannot easily be accounted for by a shift in emphasis from individual to group identities when moving from individualist to collectivist cultures.

These findings question the cross-cultural generality of the function of distinctiveness as a means to self-esteem, but do not address the argument about distinctiveness and meaning, which specifically states that distinctiveness is important for identity independently of self-esteem.

**Indigenous perspectives on ‘collectivism’**

Triandis' (1993, 1995) portrayal of collectivism has not always been echoed within the indigenous psychologies of countries he classifies as ‘collectivist’. Theorists from South-East Asia and Asia Minor have described their own cultures as emphasising relationships between distinct individuals, rather than the anonymous membership of undifferentiated collectives (Ho, 1993; Kâgitçibasi, 1994; U. Kim, 1994).

U. Kim (1994) distinguishes between three modes of collectivism, involving different representations of the relationship between individual and group. The traditional conceptualisation of collectivism is focused on the ‘undifferentiated’ mode, characterised by "firm and explicit group
boundaries, coupled with undifferentiated self-group boundaries” (p. 33). The ‘relational’ mode is characterised by “porous boundaries between in-group members that allow thoughts, ideas, and emotions to flow freely” and “focuses on the relationship shared by the in-group members” (p. 34). The ‘coexistence’ mode is characterised by a separation between publicly collectivist and privately individual and relational selves (p. 36).

U. Kim (1994) argues that the ‘relational’ and ‘coexistence’ modes are generally representative of South-East Asian cultures (see also Chang & Lee, 2000; S. C. Choi, Kim & Choi, 1993; Hamaguchi, 1985; Ho, 1993, Lebra, 1992; Sinha & Tripathi, 1994), but that these modes are frequently mistaken for the ‘undifferentiated’ mode within the cross-cultural literature. The relational mode also appears consistent with Mexican (Lomnitz, 1976/1977), traditional African (Beattie, 1980; Ma & Schoeneman, 1997), and Pacific Island (White & Kirkpatrick, 1985) cultures, while forms of the coexistence mode can be recognised within Bedouin (Abu-Lughod, 1985) and Moroccan (Geertz, 1975) cultures.

Interestingly, the research of Yuki and Brewer (1999) suggests that the representation of groups as ‘undifferentiated’ may be more characteristic of North American than Japanese culture. Yuki and Brewer contrast this representation with a model of the group as a network of interdependent but distinct individuals, consistent with the ‘relational’ mode, which appears to be more characteristic of Japan, as well as the representation of smaller groups within America. This implies that Triandis’ (1995) predictions about distinctiveness might be associated with the misapplication of a North American concept of group to Asian cultures.
Relational orientation and distinctiveness

Many indigenous and anthropological portrayals of relationally oriented cultures demonstrate the possibility of alternative forms of distinctiveness to Western concepts of 'boundedness' and 'uniqueness'. The person is seen as interdependent with others and as part of a greater whole, but this does not involve denying the value or the existence of individual distinctiveness. On the contrary, distinctiveness may be derived explicitly from a person’s location within a social or natural environment.

Gao (1996) describes a Confucian understanding of selfhood: “Self ... is defined by a person’s surrounding relations, which often are derived from kinship networks and supported by cultural values such as filial piety, loyalty, dignity, and integrity” (p. 83). This definition can clearly be contrasted with the Western ‘bounded’ individual. According to Gao, the Chinese self “needs to be recognized, defined, and completed by others” (p. 84). However, under Confucianism, it is precisely through relationships with others that people define themselves as individuals: “Without others, the very notion of individual identity loses meaning” (Ho, 1995, p. 131).

This interpretation is supported by analyses of Chinese and Japanese words relating to self and identity. The Chinese word for ‘person’, ren, is primarily associated with “the place of the individual in a web of interpersonal relationships” (Hsu, 1985, pp. 32-34), while shenfen, ‘identity’, is also associated with “a person’s social ‘place’” (Ho, 1993, p. 256). Meanwhile, the Japanese term for ‘self, jibun, is a compound of bun, which means “portion, share, part, or fraction” (Lebra, 1976, p. 67).

The relational construal of self is not specific to South-East Asian cultures. Macdonald (1997) describes the significance of ‘localness’, in a community in the Scottish Hebrides, which provides both ‘belonging’ and
distinctiveness in terms of "who is and who is not 'part of the place'" (p. 131). Geographical location underlies a relationally oriented form of distinctiveness, which "locates individuals not just in a particular geography, but in a set of kin and neighbours" (p. 144).

An extreme example of relational orientation occurs in Geertz' (1975) description of Balinese culture, where the person is construed as the temporary occupant of a timeless social position. But far from indicating a negation of individual distinctiveness, it is precisely the importance of social position which differentiates one individual from another (p. 50). Again, distinctiveness comes from one's 'place' within social relations rather than from boundedness or uniqueness.

**Possible negations of the distinctiveness principle**

Although the evidence reviewed above is consistent with the importance of individual distinctiveness for identity within non-individualistic cultures, it is worth dealing with possible exceptions to this rule. I discuss here Ho's (1995) exploration of self and identity within the philosophical and religious systems of Taoism, Hinduism and Buddhism, as well as recent research into the distinction between analytic and holistic forms of thought (I. Choi, Nisbett & Smith, 1997; Peng & Nisbett, 1999).

According to Ho (1995), Taoism, Buddhism and Hinduism advocate forms of 'selflessness' which involve negating the 'self-nonself boundary'. Within Taoism, the goal is harmony with nature without "making distinctions" (p. 121). According to Hinduism, the illusion of individuated selfhood must be overcome in order to realise the true self, Atman (breath/spirit) (p. 124). Buddhism denies the ontological reality of the self altogether (p. 121).
These three traditions can be viewed implicitly as psychological theories, all of which are opposed to the argument that distinctiveness is necessary for the achievement of meaning in identity. However, the psychological realisation of these claims is less clear. Ho (1995) bases his discussion on 'pure forms' of each tradition, but notes that real life is somewhat different. Scientific research into the psychological implications of adopting these philosophies is in its infancy (de Silva, 1993; Ho, 1995).

Moreover, all three traditions acknowledge that 'selflessness' can only be achieved through the transcendence of pre-existing concepts of self and individual distinctiveness. Even Buddhism, in denying the ontological reality of the self, implicitly acknowledges its psychological reality. Buddhist and Vedic meditation techniques, which involve transcending self-nonself boundaries to eliminate self-consciousness (de Silva, 1993; Orme-Johnson, Zimmerman & Hawkins, 1997) are entirely consistent with the understanding that distinctiveness is essential for identity.

The negation of self-other distinctiveness advocated by these traditions might be connected with the observed inclination of members of Asian cultures towards holistic modes of thought (emphasising relationships between elements) as opposed to the dominance of analytic modes of thought (emphasising distinctions between elements) in the West (Fiske, Kitayama, Markus & Nisbett, 1998, pp. 933-936; Peng & Nisbett, 1999).

Research conducted by I. Choi et al. (1997) suggests that Americans use categorical distinctions in inductive reasoning more readily than do Koreans. Taken on its own, this result appears to cast some doubt on the generality of the importance of distinctiveness for the construction of a meaningful identity. If members of East Asian cultures are generally less predisposed to represent concepts in terms of distinctiveness, then this might be expected to apply to their representations of themselves.
However, when their reasoning task concerned categories of people, I. Choi et al. (1997) found the opposite effect: Koreans used categorical distinctions more readily than Americans. It should be noted that this condition is more relevant to identity, which concerns the processing of information about people rather than non-social categories. In fact this effect was interpreted specifically in terms of the relational orientation of Korean culture: it was argued that relationally oriented participants would be more sensitive than individualistic participants to distinctions between people within social relations.

**Defining the boundaries of cultural relativity**

In summary, contrary to the concerns about cultural specificity previously expressed by Breakwell (1987) and amplified in the work of Triandis (1993, 1995), the evidence reviewed here is entirely consistent with the importance of individual distinctiveness for a meaningful sense of identity within non-individualistic cultures. The only possible exception I have noted is where people actively seek to negate their distinctiveness through attempts to achieve 'selflessness' (Ho, 1995), but even this example implies the prior existence of a distinctiveness motive.

But distinctiveness appears to take very different forms according to individualistic or relational orientations. Under individualism, distinctiveness is constructed mainly in terms of difference and separateness from others, corresponding to the emphasis on 'uniqueness' and 'boundedness' within the Western concept of person (Geertz, 1975). Under relational orientation, distinctiveness appears to have more to do with one's position within social relationships, reflecting the significance of 'social place' within the Chinese concept of ren (Ho, 1993).
One possible approach would be to understand the distinctiveness principle as a 'generative structure', a universal potential which is realised differently across cultures (Fiske et al., 1998, p. 946). Thus it would be suggested that distinctiveness is a universal principle guiding identity processes, but that the sources of distinctiveness used to define identity will be inherently variable across cultures.

Even at this level, it is important to avoid over-exaggerating or reifying cultural differences. A common theme in accounts implicitly or explicitly dealing with cultural conceptions of self is the assertion that these constructs coexist and vary considerably within cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991): variations have been observed between groups (Hinkle & Brown, 1990; Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1995), and between individuals (Gudykunst, Matsumoto, Ting-Toomey, Nishida, Kim & Heyman, 1996; Triandis, Chan et al., 1995) within cultures.

Variations in outcomes associated with cross-cultural differences have also been observed within individuals according to social context (Chatman & Barsade, 1995; Holland & Kipnis, 1994), physical surroundings (Speller, Lyons & Twigger-Ross, 1999b), level of self-representation (Gardner, Gabriel & Lee, 1999), different identifications (Realo, Allik & Vadi, 1997) and the cueing of 'cultural frames' (Hong, Chiu & Kung, 1997; Hong, Morris, Chiu & Benet-Martínez, 1999).

Furthermore, given the current trends towards globalization of communication networks and international migration (Giddens, 1989; Hermans & Kempen, 1998; Waters, 1995), it is becoming increasingly problematic, at least within industrialised nations, to refer to 'cultures' as discrete entities in the traditional manner of cross-cultural research. Thus it will be important to theorise culture in such a way that nationality and ethnicity are not the only ways to operationalise the term.
Theoretical Development of the Distinctiveness Principle

This chapter set out to examine two questions: (a) the nature of the role of distinctiveness within identity processes, and (b) whether—and, if so, in what sense—this role is moderated by culture. In answer to these questions, it has been argued (a) that, at least within Western cultures, distinctiveness appears to have a fundamental role in the construction of meaning within identity, and (b) that the distinctiveness principle, thus theorised, is not incompatible with non-Western cultural systems, provided that ‘distinctiveness’ is understood sufficiently broadly to include relationally oriented as well as individualistic forms, although functions of distinctiveness as a means to self-esteem do not appear to generalise.

Stemming from these conclusions, I now turn to a formal theoretical statement of the distinctiveness principle, incorporating the following theoretical propositions:

P1. There exists a pervasive human motivation to see oneself as distinctive, which derives from the importance of distinctiveness for meaningful self-definition.

P2. Distinctiveness may be constructed in multiple ways, using dimensions of position, difference and separateness, on both interpersonal and intergroup levels.

P3. As sources of distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness coexist within cultures but vary in their availability, accessibility and value according to culture and context.

P4. These sources of distinctiveness have different implications for the interaction of the distinctiveness principle with other motives in identity dynamics.
The presence of a motive for distinctiveness

The preceding discussion of the role of distinctiveness in identity favoured the interpretation that distinctiveness is a basic necessity for the construction of meaning within identity. Thus a first proposition (P1) reflects the views of Brewer (1991) and Codol (1981), that there exists a pervasive human motivation to see oneself as distinctive, which derives from the importance of distinctiveness for meaningful self-definition.

In relating distinctiveness to self-definition within this proposition, the current perspective is distanced explicitly from the position that distinctiveness is important only as a source of self-esteem. This is not to deny that distinctiveness may be important for self-esteem in many circumstances (Breakwell, 1987; Gruder, 1977; Wills, 1991). However, it is suggested that the primary function of the distinctiveness principle is at a more basic level, prior to considerations of self-enhancement.

Also, it is not suggested that distinctiveness is the only important dimension of meaning within identity. On the contrary, similarity is also clearly important for the construction of a meaningful identity (Codol, 1984b, Festinger, 1954) as is some form of subjective continuity (Apter, 1983; Chandler & Lalonde, 1995; Codol, 1981).

Furthermore, it is not assumed that the distinctiveness principle is necessarily universal, although it is certainly expected to be pervasive. In linking the principle to processes of self-definition, it is possible to specify that the principle will be in operation – and the rest of this argument will hold – wherever people use distinctions between concepts to represent social entities (see I. Choi et al., 1997). Although it is hard to imagine such an occurrence, in the unlikely event that this condition were not met, it would be wrong to assume the presence of a distinctiveness motive.
Nevertheless, provided that this basic condition is met, the construction of a meaningful sense of identity must necessarily have some grounding in distinctiveness. In order to achieve and to project a meaningful sense of identity, it will therefore be advantageous to privilege information which distinguishes oneself and one's groups from others when processing identity content, and to show one's distinctiveness within social settings.

Empirical research conducted in Western cultures has shown that people seek to distinguish themselves from others, and their groups from other groups, both cognitively and behaviourally, independently of self-esteem considerations, and especially where distinctiveness is threatened or frustrated (Branscombe et al., 1999; Breakwell, 1986a; Brewer, Manzi & Shaw, 1993; Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1999; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980). However, research both within and across cultures is needed to examine in more detail the relationship between distinctiveness and meaning in self-definition, which is a central assumption of our account.

**Sources of distinctiveness**

The preceding discussion of identity and distinctiveness across cultures has highlighted the importance of defining distinctiveness broadly, in terms of the multiple ways in which people are able to differentiate themselves from each other within a given context. A second proposition (P2) is that distinctiveness may be constructed in multiple ways, using dimensions of position, difference and separateness, on both interpersonal and intergroup levels. These 'sources of distinctiveness' represent different aspects of the relationship between self and others which may be emphasised in order to achieve a sense of distinctiveness.
Difference refers to distinctiveness in what are perceived to be 'intrinsic' qualities of the individual, such as abilities, opinions, traits, physical characteristics, etc. Perceived difference may also serve as a basis for group memberships, according to defined criteria for membership—for example, most occupations require some demonstration of knowledge or ability before membership is granted—or through processes of social categorisation (Oakes, Haslam & Turner, 1994; J. C. Turner, 1987).

Perceptions of difference have been measured or manipulated, both in Western studies and cross-cultural replications, in order to operationalize theoretical constructs of 'distinctiveness', 'uniqueness', 'similarity', 'homogeneity', 'meta-contrast', and so on (e.g., Fromkin, 1972; Hakmiller, 1966; Haslam et al., 1995; Heine & Lehman, 1997; Jetten et al., 1999; C. M. Judd et al., 1991; Leyens et al., 1997; Park & Rothbart, 1982; Takata, 1987; Wheeler, 1966).

The construct of separateness is also derived from Western thinking, and is closely related to the concept of the 'bounded' individual (Geertz, 1975). Perceived separateness encompasses feelings of boundedness, independence or distance from others. Feelings of separateness may be reinforced through the manipulation of physical boundaries, such as designing housing for greater privacy (Speller et al., 1999b), or through the use of symbolic boundaries, such as a religious leader wearing robes to symbolise the conceptual boundary between sacred and profane (after Durkheim, 1912/1915). Separateness may apply to both interpersonal and intergroup differentiation. An extreme example of group separateness would be those religious orders which function as closed communities, avoiding contact with the outside world and thus combining both physical and symbolic boundaries.
Separateness has received considerably less attention than difference within research into identity. However, items referring to the subjective value of individual separateness can be found in some psychometric measures of individualism-collectivism (e.g., Triandis, 1995; Triandis, Chan et al., 1995).

Position, on the other hand, is tied to a relational orientation. Where separateness implicitly involves a negation of relationships, the concept of position refers explicitly to one’s place within social relationships. A paradigm example of distinctiveness constructed in terms of position is given by family relationships: the statement, “I am the brother of Peter”, does not entail that I necessarily feel different or separate from Peter, but it distinguishes me in that it locates me as an individual within the interpersonal network of my family. Intergroup distinctions may also be constructed in terms of position: many group identities entail particular relationships with other groups (e.g., teachers and students, doctors and patients, supporters of opposing football teams).

In operational terms, position is a complex construct, which may incorporate concepts of role (Hoelter, 1983; Stryker, 1987; Stryker & Statham, 1985), social status (Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1995) and positions within intergroup relations, which have been understood elsewhere as the outcome of identity processes, but may also contribute to the psychological meaning of groups themselves (Tajfel & Turner, 1986).

Although theorised initially as sources of individual distinctiveness, all three constructs have been related here to group/category distinctiveness in that groups or categories may have particular relations of position, difference or separateness between them. On the group level of self-representation, an additional dimension of distinctiveness may be the size
of the group or category, smaller groups or categories being more distinctive (Brewer, 1991; Brewer & Pickett, 1999; B. Simon et al., 1997).

These sources of distinctiveness are not necessarily functionally independent of each other, but they are independent concepts, in the sense that they can be defined without reference to each other. Furthermore, all three sources are necessary for a comprehensive conceptual or operational definition of distinctiveness. This is illustrated by analyses reported in chapter 10 of this thesis. Predicting the level of distinctiveness associated with a series of self-description items, it was found that position, difference and separateness each made a significant unique contribution to the perceived distinctiveness of different items.

But the importance of distinguishing between these three constructs lies also in the fact that each has different implications for identity and behaviour. The construction and projection of a meaningful sense of identity in terms of position, difference or separateness will be associated with a focus on different aspects of identity within self-representation, and different forms of behaviour in social settings. For example, a person seeking to emphasise their position in a given situation might do so by conforming to role prescriptions, whereas a person seeking to communicate their difference might do exactly the opposite.

It should be noted that the same identity may be distinctive in terms of more than one source and on more than one level of self-representation—for example, I might derive distinctiveness from my identity as a ‘musician’ in terms of individual difference (other people do not have my skills) or in terms of my inter-group position (I have a particular relationship with my audience as a performer). Moreover, different people may derive distinctiveness in different ways from the same identity, as illustrated by Millward’s (1995) study of how nurses represented being a
nurse: some focused on 'professional distinctiveness', stressing group-level difference, while others were more 'patient-centred', emphasising their individual position within interpersonal relationships.

Thus it is important to stress that the distinction between sources of distinctiveness is not intended to produce a typology of identities (cf. Deaux, Reid, Mizrahi & Ethier, 1995). Although different identities may provide different opportunities for achieving distinctiveness, the aim is not to categorise identities but to demonstrate that there are multiple ways in which a sense of distinctiveness may be constructed. A key issue in operationalising position, difference and separateness will be to establish the individual’s construction of his/her distinctiveness, rather than treating these dimensions as intrinsic properties of particular identities.

Culture and context

The distinction between sources of distinctiveness is theoretically related to cultural variations in individualistic and relational orientations, but the distribution of these orientations across cultures is far from clear cut, with considerable variation within cultures as well as trends towards globalisation blurring the boundaries between cultures. Hence, a third proposition (P3) is that, as sources of distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness coexist within cultures but vary in their availability, accessibility and value according to culture and context.

The availability of position as a source of distinctiveness within Western cultures has already been acknowledged. Manifestations include family relationships and many intergroup relationships. Similarly, difference and separateness are expected to be available as sources of distinctiveness in relationally oriented cultures.
Studies into self-perception (Cousins, 1989), causal attribution (I. Choi, Nisbett & Norenzayan, 1999), folk psychology (S. C. Choi, Kim & Choi, 1993; Enriquez, 1993) and indigenous theories of personality (Yang, 1997) show that members of South East Asian cultures make dispositional inferences about themselves and others, entailing the availability of difference as a source of distinctiveness, although these inferences are often tied to specific contexts.

The availability of separateness as a source of distinctiveness is harder to ascertain. Individual separateness is inconsistent with basic assumptions of relational orientation (Ho, 1993). On the other hand, some very salient symbolic boundaries might be understood as instances of group separateness: geisha might be understood as a separate group in Japan, while aspects of the caste system might be seen as a source of separateness in India. However, as noted earlier, it is the subjective meaning of identities which should be established. Empirical research would be needed to determine whether these and other boundaries are perceived within these cultures in terms of separateness.

A significant result of theorising distinctiveness to include relational as well as individualistic sources is that the arguments of Triandis (1995) and P. B. Smith and Bond (1993) may be re-evaluated. Rather than hypothesising a shift from individual to group identity, involving a reduction in the importance of individual distinctiveness for self-definition, it can be suggested that individual distinctiveness may be of comparable importance for self-definition in relationally oriented as in individualistic cultures, but that distinctiveness will be achieved in different ways, according to both culture and context.

Even if position, difference and separateness are available at some level in individualistic and relationally oriented cultures, their contextual
availability will vary in degree with cross-cultural differences in social organisation. Cultural variations in family structures, communication styles, child-rearing patterns, work and religion (see Fiske et al., 1998; Triandis, 1995) may all be expected to affect the chronic availability of sources of distinctiveness. Availability of the sources will also vary within cultures according to context. In some contexts (e.g., family meetings) position will be more available, whereas in others (e.g., public examinations) difference and separateness will be emphasised. Also, changes in the physical environment may lead to chronic changes in the availability of different forms of distinctiveness (Speller et al., 1999b).

Secondly, cultural assumptions about personhood and selfhood (Fiske et al., 1998; Markus & Kitayama, 1991) will affect the cognitive accessibility of the three sources when constructing a sense of distinctiveness. Difference and separateness are more consistent with an independent self-construal, prevalent in individualistic cultures, whereas position is more consistent with an interdependent self-construal, prevalent in relationally oriented cultures. Self-construals and implicit theories of personhood have also been shown to vary within cultures according to context, both in natural settings (Holland & Kipnis, 1994) and using subtle experimental manipulations (Gardner et al., 1999; Hong et al., 1999). Preliminary support for the importance of self-construals comes from research with parish priests reported in this thesis. Despite participating in a culture normally classed as individualistic (UK), the priests showed a strongly relational orientation in their self-construals (chap. 7) and emphasised especially distinctiveness in terms of position rather than difference or separateness in constructing their identities (chap. 11).

Thirdly, cross-cultural differences in values (S. H. Schwartz, 1994) will affect the subjective value of position, difference and separateness as sources of distinctiveness. For example, cultures emphasising the value of
relationships will be less likely to value separateness as a source of distinctiveness, cultures emphasising the value of individual autonomy may be less likely to value position, and cultures emphasising social order may be less likely to value difference. It seems reasonable to suppose, following the account of distinctiveness as a social value, that the social value of position, difference and separateness will affect their use as sources of distinctiveness in the construction of a meaningful and valued sense of identity. As with the availability and accessibility of position, difference and separateness, it seems likely that their subjective value as sources of distinctiveness will vary substantially within cultures. S. H. Schwartz and Bilsky (1990) have found individual differences in values within many cultures. Furthermore, the endorsement of individualistic or relational values is sensitive to manipulations of self-construals (Gardner et al., 1999) and 'cultural frames' (Hong et al., 1997).

For all of these reasons, it is expected that difference and separateness will be more important for self-definition in individualistic cultures, while position will be more important in relationally oriented cultures, but it is also predicted that the relative emphasis on position, difference or separateness in shaping self-definition will vary systematically within cultures, according to the contextual availability, accessibility and value of each source. Thus the use of distinguishing between sources of distinctiveness is not restricted to explaining cross-cultural differences.

**Interaction with other motives**

An important issue for further development is the relationship between the distinctiveness principle and other motivations within identity dynamics (Breakwell, 1987). The value of theorising relationships between multiple motivations has been exemplified by optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991). A fourth and final proposition (P4) is that these
sources of distinctiveness have different implications for the interaction of the distinctiveness principle with other motives in identity dynamics.

The three sources appear to have very different implications for the relationship between differentiation and inclusion needs, as theorised within optimal distinctiveness theory. Brewer's (1991) model is located on the group level of self-representation, with distinctiveness operationalized as group size. Thus there is a clear opposition between the needs for differentiation, satisfied by intergroup distinctiveness, and inclusion, satisfied by intragroup inclusiveness: the larger the group, the more inclusion; the smaller the group, the more differentiation.

On the individual level of self-representation, the opposition between needs for differentiation and inclusion can be generalised to the individualistic sources of difference and separateness. Difference is opposed with similarity, while separateness is opposed with intimacy or belonging (corresponding to the “individual” and “interpersonal” levels according to Brewer & Gardner, 1996). However, position may satisfy motives for differentiation and inclusion simultaneously: indeed, position actually depends on inclusion within social relationships. This is illustrated with another result from the study of parish priests within this thesis. Those identities which the priests associated with greater distinctiveness from their parishioners in terms of position were also associated with greater feelings of closeness to parishioners. Thus, where distinctiveness was constructed in terms of position, the opposition between differentiation and inclusion needs was removed (chap. 10).

Returning to the group level of self-representation, where group identities are represented as interpersonal relationships (cf. Millward, 1995), the situation is psychologically the same as for the individual level, and the same predictions can be expected to hold. On the other hand, where the
group itself is salient, predictions may be considerably more complex, depending on both the relationship between in-group and out-group and the relationship between members within the group. In this scenario, both inclusion and differentiation needs may potentially be met both within the group and within the intergroup relationship. Here it will be especially important to pay close attention to the subjective meaning for group members of the groups involved, and their relationship to each other, in order to make predictions about the distinctiveness principle.

Such a situation will be further complicated by the presence of other identity principles, such as motives for continuity, efficacy and self-esteem (Breakwell, 1993). It should be noted that the interrelationships between these principles may well be a function of contextual constraints, rather than necessarily being intrinsic to the principles themselves. For example, it can be expected that the relationship between distinctiveness and self-esteem principles will depend on the availability of positive distinctiveness of each source, as well as the positive or negative social evaluation of the sources in themselves. This is illustrated by Breakwell's (1986a, pp. 169-176, 1986b) explanation for the apparent absence of distinctiveness motivation among a group of disadvantaged young women on a youth training scheme. For these women, she argues, distinctiveness seeking would involve making negative social comparisons which would create an opposition with the self-esteem principle.

In order to theorise the expected contributions of these various motivations, and their interrelationships with each other, in the shaping of identity processes and social behaviour within a given context, it will be necessary to examine in detail the subjective meaning of identities, groups and intergroup relations to those involved in the context, focusing on the availability of different sources of distinctiveness, and the opportunities afforded for satisfying these other motives.
Conclusion

In summary, I have argued here that the distinctiveness principle has an important function in the establishment of meaning in identity, which does not appear to be specific to individualistic cultures. An important product of this argument has been the assertion that distinctiveness can be achieved in terms of difference, position or separateness. It is understood that these constructs coexist within cultures and individuals, but that they will be emphasised differently according to culture and context and will have different implications for identity processes and social action. In addition to these specific predictions, the distinction between sources of distinctiveness will be a useful theoretical tool for thinking about distinctiveness in different applied contexts, especially where multiple motives and goals need to be taken into account.

These ideas are addressed in the empirical part of this thesis. Among members of the Anglican clergy, I examine ways in which distinctiveness is constructed, in the context of representations of personhood and selfhood, and focus on the differential implications of position, difference and separateness for identity processes and behaviour.
Chapter 4

STUDYING IDENTITY AMONG THE CLERGY

Though this be madness, yet there is method in 't.
SHAKESPEARE - Hamlet

The empirical chapters of this thesis are derived from a programme of two studies conducted among members of the Anglican clergy. This chapter introduces the Anglican clergy drawing on historical, theological and psychological perspectives, describes my own and my supervisors' speaking positions in the research, and introduces the main research objectives of the thesis and the studies designed to address them.

The Anglican Clergy

The Anglican clergy appeared to be appropriate and interesting people among whom to study ideas developed within the preceding chapters.

In particular, an important issue running through all three chapters was the impact of culture on how identities are constructed. Studying the Anglican clergy seemed to offer several advantages for developing this issue. The clergy were understood to share in a very different social and cultural environment from many of the groups traditionally studied in identity research. For example, undergraduate students, who participate in an enormous amount of social psychological research on identity, generally have comparatively few responsibilities towards other people and share in a culture emphasising individual success and failure. Members of the clergy, on the other hand, are defined by their relationships to large numbers of people, within a culture which emphasises interdependence and unity in the 'body' of the Church.
Secondly, within the cultural context of what appeared to be a strongly relational orientation, the clergy themselves are in a position of extreme distinctiveness, as evidenced by their dress, their behaviour, their numerical scarcity within a given community, not to mention their visibility in the media. Hence it would be interesting to establish to what extent this tension would be addressed by attempting to remove or discount distinctiveness, as implied by Triandis’ (1995) elaboration of optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991), and/or by focusing selectively on relational forms of distinctiveness, as suggested by the ‘sources of distinctiveness’ account developed in the previous chapter.

Thirdly, it was expected that priests would be practised at introspection through meditation or prayer but that they would also be comparatively articulate in the expression of ideas about personhood, selfhood and identity for the purpose of interacting with parishioners whether in a preaching or a pastoral capacity. This represented a useful combination of qualities for the task of describing their own concepts of person, self and identity, which would form an important part of the research.

Additionally, there appeared to be no existing published research applying social psychological models of identity to the clergy. Thus the clergy presented an interesting case for assessing the generalisation of theories used within the thesis to a new population.

*Historical and theological background*

Before introducing the studies reported in this thesis, it will be useful to outline briefly some features of the Anglican clergy, including some of the concepts of priesthood which have been applied within Anglicanism.
Of necessity, this coverage is incomplete and oversimplified. Interested readers are directed to the original sources for more detailed treatment, in particular Worrall (1993) and Nichols (1993) for historical and theological perspectives, Brierley (1991a,b) for an in-depth quantitative survey and Maxtone Graham (1993) for a contemporary ethnographic account. Except where indicated otherwise, current statistics reported here are taken from the Church of England web site (http://www.cofe.anglican.org/).

Historical origins

The Church of England became independent from the Roman Catholic Church during the 16th century AD. While stressing its historical connection with Rome - even today, the church’s presentation of itself on the Internet reports that “its bishops have been consecrated in unbroken succession from St Peter” - the church also adopted Protestant innovations, such as simplifying liturgy for the benefit of lay people.

The Anglican Communion

The Church of England now has the status of ‘mother church’ of the Anglican Communion, which includes the Church in Wales, the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church of Ireland within the UK, as well as churches in North and South America, Australasia, Asia and Africa. The research reported in this thesis focuses on the four UK Anglican churches.

Theological distinctions

The initial tension between affirming Catholic roots and adopting Protestant reforms is still reflected in contemporary Anglican theology and practice. For much of its history, the Church of England has been described as a “broad church”, encompassing Catholic and Evangelical
'wings' with very different theological and practical orientations. The extent of theological pluralism is described by Nichols (1993, pp. xvi-xvii):

The Anglican Church is one of the most pluralistic churches in the world, certainly the most pluralistic of the historic churches. It has never had a single theological orthodoxy. Although it has promulgated confessional statements, and above all the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion of 1571, it has never committed itself to a single theological elucidation of those statements. There is no one theologian, in other words, who plays anything like the rôle of Calvin in the Reformed churches, or even that of Luther in Lutheranism.

According to Nichols (1993), the Church of England is currently divided into three basic 'sub-traditions', Catholics (High Church), Evangelicals (Low Church) and Liberals (Broad Church), although he notes that "within these sub-traditions there is also a degree of variety, just as between them there can be overlapping in certain cases" (p. 173).

These three sub-traditions are represented as 'churchmanships' within the 1989 English Church Census (Brierley, 1991a, 1991b), conducted across denominations, although the groups are further subdivided into Catholic, Anglo-Catholic, Liberals, Low Church, Broad, Broad Evangelical, Mainstream Evangelical, Charismatic Evangelical and All Others.

It will not be possible to provide full definitions of the terms Catholic, Evangelical and Liberal here. As applied to Anglican clergy, these terms are extremely complex, rooted in historical relations between different theological movements (Nichols, 1993; Worrall, 1993), and are obscured even more by a dislike of theological labels among the clergy themselves (Maxtome Graham, 1993, p. 19; Towler & Coxon, 1979, p. 107).
But without attempting to do full justice to the complexities, it will be useful to outline a few selective features of each of these three 'churchmanships'. The sketches below are my own constructions, based on a mixture of personal experience and the available literature (Maxtone Graham, 1993; Nichols, 1993; Ranson, Bryman & Hinings, 1977; Towler & Coxon, 1979; Worrall, 1993). They should be understood as 'ideal types', in Max Weber's sense of the expression (see Giddens, 1971, pp. 141-143).

_Catholic_ theology emphasises aspects of Anglicanism which are derived from the traditions of the Roman Catholic Church. Catholic worship is characterised by the use of formal liturgy, and a high importance is placed on sacrament. Priesthood is understood in terms of the Apostolic Succession: this doctrine asserts that priesthood is conferred as a sacrament through the laying-on of hands in an historical chain which began with St. Peter the Apostle, founder of the Christian church.

_Evangelical_ theology emphasises the Protestant side of Anglicanism. Evangelical worship often uses informal liturgy and popular styles of music, and a high importance is placed on evangelism. Ministry is understood in terms of Bible accounts of early Christians, with an emphasis on the Biblical doctrine of the 'priesthood of all believers': this doctrine stresses that Christian ministry is not the exclusive province of the ordained clergy, but should be in the behaviour of every Christian.

_Liberal or Broad_ theology, descended from the Latitudinarian tradition within Anglicanism, is less well defined. Differences of opinion are tolerated, and a critical approach to doctrine is encouraged, which may be characterised by non-Liberals as tending towards agnosticism. Morality is understood to be located within individuals, rather than within externally prescribed rules. Liberal theology does not prescribe a model of worship, which may take superficially catholic, evangelical or mixed forms.
It is important to recognise differences in churchmanship within the Anglican clergy for several reasons. Different churchmanships are subordinate categorisations within the superordinate category of 'clergy'. But these constructs are also intimately tied to ongoing theological debates about the meaning of the superordinate category itself.

*Church structures*

The Church of England, the Church in Wales, the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Church of Ireland are divided into dioceses, which are geographical regions, centred around cathedrals and served by bishops. Dioceses in England and Wales are split into archdeaconries (served by archdeacons), which are split into deaneries (served by rural deans) which are split into parishes (served by vicars or rectors). Dioceses in Scotland and Ireland are split directly into parishes (served by incumbents).

Parishes may include one or more 'daughter churches' in addition to the main parish church. Daughter churches may be served by priests-in-charge, curates-in-charge or deacons-in-charge. Some parishes are served by team ministries, with several vicars or rectors working together.

Members of the clergy are stratified into three orders: deacons, priests and bishops. Traditionally, members of the clergy remain deacons for just one year, which is widely seen as little more than a probationary year for the priesthood (Aldridge, 1992, p. 46). The vast majority of members of the clergy are ordained priests. Priests may be deployed in parish ministry (as vicars, rectors, incumbents, team ministers priests-in-charge, curates), as chaplains (to the armed forces, prisons, hospitals, hospices and educational institutions), as teaching staff in theological colleges or in cathedrals. Very few members of the clergy are bishops (currently less than 1% of members of the clergy in the Church of England).
Recent developments in ordination

The latter part of the 20th century has seen two significant developments in the ordination of clergy within the Anglican church.

Since 1968, it has been possible to ordain candidates into non-stipendiary ministry, initially known as auxiliary pastoral ministry. Non-stipendiary ministers combine priesthood with a secular occupation, from which they derive their income (Welsby, 1984). Just under 15% of non-retired clergy in the Church of England are currently in non-stipendiary ministry.

Since the mid-seventies women have been ordained to the priesthood in Anglican churches of Hong Kong, New Zealand, Canada and the United States (Worrall, 1993). But there has been much explicit and implicit opposition within the Church of England (see Aldridge, 1989, 1992; Nason-Clark, 1987). Nevertheless, the Church of England has ordained women as deacons since 1987 and as priests since 1994.

Women have now been ordained as priests in the Church in Wales, the Scottish Episcopal Church, the Church of Ireland, and in most other churches of the Anglican Communion. Within the Church of England, women currently constitute just over 13% of non-retired clergy.

Decline or growth?

Statistics from various sources suggest that Christianity and especially Anglicanism are currently in a state of historical decline within the UK. According to Giddens (1989, p. 473), the proportion of adults in England and Wales attending church each Sunday declined from about 40% in 1851 to about 11% in 1989. In 1970, just under 3 million UK adults were active members of the Anglican church. By 1990, the figure had dropped to
about 1.7 million (Office for National Statistics [ONS], 2000). Since 1990, the Church of England has been reluctant to report attendance figures. The historical decline in church attendance has been understood in terms of wider processes of secularisation, in which the clergy have become increasingly marginal within British society, losing control of education in the second half of the 19th century and losing political influence and social status over the course of the 20th century (Towler & Coxon, 1979).

However, this does not necessarily imply a decline in public religiosity. Towler and Coxon (1979) note that "it seems that at the end of periods of dramatic secularisation, in the sense in which we are using the word, people are more religious rather than less" (p. 191). In 1998, over 70% of British people still professed some form of religious belief (ONS, 2000). Furthermore, as noted by Brierley (1991a), the global figures mask a more complex pattern of growth in some areas and decline in others: factors implicated in growth include church location, evangelism, social involvement, leadership styles and the strength of church values.

**Research into identity among the clergy**

Psychologists have traditionally paid very little attention to the identity of members of the clergy. Psychological studies of members of the clergy have instead addressed burnout (Virginia, 1998), infidelity (Thoburn & Balswick, 1994) and sex offences (Haywood, Kravitz, Grossman, Wasyliw & Hardy, 1996); denominational variations in the role of clergy families (Mickey, Wilson & Ashmore, 1991); the relationship between locus of control and theology (Furnham, 1982); age and gender as predictors of survey response rates (Francis & Lankshear, 1994; Francis & Robbins, 1995; Randall & Francis, 1996); and the relationship between personality and mystical orientation (Francis & Thomas, 1996), patterns of ministry
(Francis & Lankshear, 1998; Francis & Rodger, 1994) and gender (Francis, 1991; Musson, 1998; Robbins, Francis & Rutledge, 1997).

Nevertheless, a handful of sociological and psychological studies are directly or indirectly relevant to the concerns of this thesis (Christopherson, 1994; Eberlein, Park & Matheson, 1971; Litzenberger, 1994; Peretti, Gorecki & Cedeck, 1988; Stevens, 1989; Verryn, 1972).

Eberlein et al. (1971) measured self-ideal congruence in a comparative study of counsellors and teachers in training, priests, high school students and army officer cadets. Priests had the highest self-ideal discrepancies. A possible explanation was in terms of priests' "idiosyncratic concern with the imperfection of man" (p. 101), but this was not discussed further.

Christopherson (1994) studied the relationship between 'calling' and 'career' in intensive interviews of US clergy of various denominations. He suggested that the sense of calling was a defining feature of identity and self worth, but that this conflicted with pressures for a successful career.

Peretti et al. (1988) studied the self-perceptions of 27 clergy counsellors in a US state prison, using open ended questionnaires and interviews. They identified 5 themes in their data: a pastoral role, in which they encouraged the inmate to form a relationship with God; an advisory role, in which they encouraged the inmate to behave according to Jesus' example; a focus on God as the ultimate reality; the importance of insight; and the importance of development through a relationship with God.

Verryn (1972), in a questionnaire study of Anglican and Roman Catholic priests in South Africa, examined priests' attitudes to social change in relation to their self-conceptions as priests. He distinguished between "other-worldly" priests, who saw contemporary society as "adrift from its
moorings" and understood their calling as priests to be one of resistance, and "this-worldly" priests, who saw contemporary society to be stimulating and understood their purpose to be one of engagement in social change.

Stevens (1989) applied the "different voice" hypothesis of Gilligan (1982) in a survey of 108 Anglican clergywomen in Canada, expecting that female clergy would show a distinctively relational orientation in their ministry. The hypothesis was supported within the sphere of interpersonal relationships but findings for social ethics were more heterogeneous.

Litzenberger (1994) reports qualitative case studies of two lesbian priests of the US Episcopal Church, 'Liza' and 'Melanie'. Both women described having experienced divisions within their self-concepts, for Liza in an internalisation of incompatible cultural images of lesbianism and priesthood, and for Melanie in a dissociation of her 'self' from her body. These divisions had been associated with considerable psychological pain, but both Liza and Melanie reported progress in dealing with them through an internal process of negotiating meanings of lesbianism and priesthood, coupled with evolution in their relationships with others and with God.

Although none of these studies are explicitly related to identity process theory, the distinctiveness principle or even social identity theory, some connections can be made with the issues of this thesis.

The finding of Eberlein et al. (1971) that priests showed higher than average self-ideal discrepancies, may indicate that priests had lower levels of self-esteem than the other groups within their study, although an alternative explanation could be constructed in terms of response bias.
Christopherson (1994) and Peretti et al. (1988) show the complex and multifaceted nature of priesthood as an individual identity constructed in relation to God and to other people, rather than a simple category membership. Verryn (1972), Stevens (1989) and Litzenberger (1994) show that the identity of priesthood may be constructed in a number of ways and that different constructions may be related to different conceptual or social environments, and may serve different purposes within them.

The study by Stevens (1989) is of additional interest, suggesting that female clergy are relationally oriented, even if more so in interpersonal contexts than in dealing with social issues. This is clearly relevant to the earlier discussion of relational orientation and distinctiveness (chap. 3). But whether or not this represents a 'different voice' of female clergy is not established by this study in the absence of a male comparison group.

The case studies reported by Litzenberger (1994), although described in their own terms without reference to theory, can clearly be related to the model of identity threat and coping which is included within identity process theory (Breakwell, 1986a, 1988). In particular, there is a resonance with Markowe's (1996) suggestion of an additional identity principle of authenticity/integrity in the women's struggles to achieve 'wholeness'.

**Speaking Positions in the Research**

In the first chapter, it was suggested that the process of research should be seen as an interaction between researchers' and researched systems of meaning, and that this process should be made visible to the reader rather than being hidden within reports of empirical work.
An important part of this is to acknowledge aspects of the researchers' meaning systems which may have influenced the conclusions reached within a study. Reflexive theorising about the role of the researcher within the study is accepted as good practice in qualitative approaches (Banister et al., 1994; Pidgeon & Henwood, 1997; J. A. Smith, 1996b), but is equally relevant to the evaluation of quantitative studies (Reicher, 1994).

It is therefore of central importance to acknowledge features of my own and my supervisors' backgrounds which may have shaped the transactions which were allowed to take place during data collection or which may have affected our subsequent analyses and interpretations of the data. An important aim here is therefore to acknowledge our speaking positions with respect to Christianity, the Anglican Church and the clergy.

None of us is currently a believing or practising Christian. Thus we do not share in certain beliefs and practices which are of immense importance to the people we have studied, undoubtedly shaping both identity and behaviour. Nevertheless, we have all had some experience of, or exposure to, Christian and in some cases Anglican beliefs and practices.

Between the ages of 9 and 13, I sang as a choirboy at Canterbury Cathedral, which gave me considerable exposure to a form of Anglican worship which I now recognise to have been “anglo-catholic”, and which resulted in my confirmation as a Christian at the age of 12.

I now describe myself as agnostic: I do not believe in God, but neither do I believe firmly that there is no God. This is my position both personally and in my role as social scientist. My view is that the truth or falsehood of beliefs which are a matter of faith and not empirical verification has no bearing on a social scientific understanding of their consequences.
Xenia Chryssochoou was baptised Greek Orthodox as a baby and received a Christian upbringing, although she describes this as having as much to do with “Greekness” as religion. She is now between agnosticism and atheism, but feels that agnosticism is a “coward position”.

Glynis Breakwell has some knowledge of Anglicanism, having lived all her life in England, but has no religious belief. Rather than categorise herself as an atheist, she feels that religious categories are not salient for her, to the extent that she finds it hard to describe herself in these terms.

It would be tempting to say that our various experiences of Christianity and current agnosticism/atheism provide the perfect balance of empathy and analytic distance for studying the clergy. However, it does not seem tenable to assume, for example, that my childhood experience of belief is comparable to the complex relationships with God experienced and described by participants in the research. Hence, we feel more comfortable approaching participants' religious beliefs as interested outsiders.

It should also be stressed that our primary orientation towards the Anglican clergy is not as atheists, agnostics or former Christians, but as social scientists. This thesis pursues a psychological agenda, not a theological or 'anti-theological' agenda, although it is acknowledged that this involves dealing at times with participants' theological beliefs and that some of the conclusions may be of interest to theologians.

For the purpose of this chapter, it will suffice to have introduced the speaking positions of the researchers. This issue will be taken up again in detail when findings are integrated and discussed in the final chapter.
Research Objectives

The research reported in this thesis focuses on three key objectives arising from the preceding chapters, within the context of investigating identity among members of the Anglican clergy resident in the UK.

Identity process theory

A central claim of identity process theory (Breakwell, 1992) is that motives for distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy should be given equal theoretical consideration to the need for self-esteem as guiding principles of the processes which shape identity. The first objective is to test this assertion, examining the force of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy principles, as well as investigating the possibility of additional principles within this particular group of people.

The distinctiveness principle

The second objective is to test the account of the distinctiveness principle, as described in chapter three. This involves examining the constitution of distinctiveness in terms of the three hypothesised sources, position, difference and separateness, and investigating the role of distinctiveness motivation in shaping both identity and behaviour. An important aspect of the discussion of distinctiveness within this thesis is the assertion that position, difference and separateness will be emphasised differently as sources of distinctiveness according to culture and context. Thus I also examine cultural and contextual features specific to the Anglican clergy, which may affect the operation of the distinctiveness principle. In particular, this involves describing similarities and differences in the representation of person, self and priest within this population, and relating these to the findings about the distinctiveness principle.
Phenomenological perspective

An additional objective is to contextualise these theoretical issues within participants' accounts of their own experience. Since, identity is defined in this thesis as an aspect of phenomenology, it would be strange to study these issues without any attention to participants' phenomenological worlds. While it is not assumed that theoretical constructs such as identity principles and sources of distinctiveness are necessarily represented on a phenomenological level, the degree to which these constructs account for the experience of identity is one indicator of their importance. Additionally, paying attention to participants' accounts of their own experience may serve to highlight issues which are not well represented within existing theoretical developments.

Research Strategy

These objectives were addressed using two complementary studies, both conducted among members of the Anglican clergy. The first study consisted of semi-structured interviews with 33 male and 9 female clerics within a single diocese of the Church of England. The second study took the form of a postal questionnaire, completed by 133 male and 16 female Anglican parish priests from across Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The analyses also followed two complementary strategies. Quantitative analyses were used to test hypotheses and models, while qualitative analyses gave voice to participants' accounts of their own experience.

Since there are substantial parallels between the aims of the two studies, I provide below an overview of the main aims and the methods of both studies. Subsequent chapters describe and discuss the results.
Interview Study

Forty-two Anglican clergymen and clergywomen participated in semi-structured interviews between March and June 1998. Interviews typically lasted from 1 hour 30 minutes to 2 hours and addressed issues of identity and distinctiveness, as well as beliefs about personhood and priesthood.

Aims and design

The interview study focused especially on the second and third objectives outlined above. A central aim was to elicit participants' own experiences of distinctiveness, including an exploration of each of the hypothesised sources, position, difference and separateness, on intra- and inter-group levels of categorisation with respect to the category of 'the clergy'.

This focus was complemented by a general exploration of identity structure and a set of open-ended questions aimed at eliciting Christian and Anglican teachings about personhood and the distinctiveness of members of the clergy with respect to society and to each other, participants' perceptions of stability or change in relationships between clergy and society and relationships within the clergy, and situational, motivational or theological negations of the distinctiveness principle.

A further aim was to collect some preliminary quantitative data on the distinctiveness principle, firstly in order to develop appropriate measures for examining constructs, some of which had previously received little empirical attention, and secondly in order to test some initial hypotheses about the constitution of distinctiveness and the workings of the distinctiveness principle within this population. Analyses of these data were intended to contribute to the design of the questionnaire study.
An important concern in designing the interview schedule was to manage the interview context effectively, so that contextual biases would be kept under control. It was not assumed that bias could be eradicated - the aim was to design the schedule in such a way that contextual biases would not confound the conclusions which might be drawn from each section.

It was especially important to control the participants' levels of knowledge about the aims of the study across different sections of the interview. This was achieved using a 'funnelling' technique (J. A. Smith, 1995, pp. 15-16), starting with more general questions and proceeding to more specific questions. In designing the schedule, it was important that participants were unaware of the interviewer's interest in distinctiveness during the first section on identity and that they were unaware of the hypothesised sources during the first part of the second section on distinctiveness.

Additional concerns were the identity relationship between interviewer and participant and the importance of maintaining a natural sense of progression within the interview to encourage natural responses.

**Participants and procedure**

Sixty Anglican clerics were selected from within a single diocese in the southern part of England. They were contacted initially by post and subsequently by telephone. The research topic was described as being to do with 'the individual in society'. Forty-two of these participated in the interviews, giving a response rate of exactly 70%. Of those who did not participate, the most common reason stated was lack of time, although two of those contacted said they did not wish to be interviewed.

All participants were ordained clergy serving in the Church of England. At the time of the interviews, 2 were deacons, 39 were priests and 1 was a
retired bishop; 33 were men and 9 were women; 31 were working in stipendiary (full-time, paid) and 11 in non-stipendiary (part-time, unpaid) ministry; 6 were single, 34 were married and 2 were widowed of which one had subsequently remarried. Participants were aged between 26 and 83 years (median = 51.5 years; inter-quartile range: 41.75 to 60 years) and had been members of the clergy for between 10 months and 60 years (median = 10.75 years; inter-quartile range: 3.938 to 24.25 years).

Participants were interviewed in their homes, in or outside churches or church centres, in cafeterias and in a psychology laboratory. The interview included some written tasks\(^6\), but was mostly spoken. Spoken parts were tape recorded, while quantitative data were included in the interviewer's field notes. The interviews used a fairly rigid structure, described below.

**Assurance of confidentiality and anonymity**

At the beginning of the tape recording, participants were assured that nobody would hear the tape except for the interviewer, who would transcribe it, omitting all identifying information such as names of people or places. It was explained that the interviewer might quote directly from the transcriptions but that quotes would not be attributable. These guarantees have been observed at all stages of the research process.

**Section I: Exploring identity and rating distinctiveness**

The interview began with those parts which required that participants should be naïve about the focus of the research on distinctiveness. At this point, the only information made available to them was that the research was about 'the individual in society'.

---

\(^6\) Materials for the written parts are reproduced in Appendix A. Two participants were unable to write. They dictated their answers to the written parts.
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- Preliminary tasks: Twenty Statements Test and the 'typical member'

The interviews began with two written tasks. One was the Twenty Statements Test (TST) (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954). The participant was given a sheet of paper with twenty numbered spaces and was asked to write twenty answers to the question 'Who am I?', which they should ask themselves without worrying about the logic or importance of the answers.

The other task involved imagining a 'typical member of the Anglican clergy' and writing a list of qualities or characteristics. Again, a sheet with twenty spaces was provided, but this time the participant was asked to write only as many words or phases as they felt were appropriate.

These free-response tasks came first in the schedule while participants were still unaware of the focus of the research. To address concerns about the effect of each task on the other, the order of the two tasks was randomised, and this manipulation was encoded as a variable.

- Exploration of the TST responses

When both preliminary tasks had been completed, the participants returned to their TST responses and performed the following tasks.

Firstly, they were asked to pick a 'top ten' from their responses and to put these ten items into rank order (if there were insufficient responses, they ranked them all). The criterion for choosing and ranking the responses was their importance to the participant 'as a member of the clergy'.
Next they were asked to explain their choices and then to explain “What would be the difference in you if you were not each of these things?”. 

Finally, they rated all of their responses for the extent to which each one was something which distinguished them from other members of the Anglican clergy, giving each item a score from 1 to 10 for *intra-group distinctiveness*, and for the extent to which each one was something which distinguished members of the Anglican clergy from other people in society, giving each item a score from 1 to 10 for *inter-group distinctiveness*.

- **Self-typicality ratings using the ‘typical member’ responses**

Participants then rated the applicability to themselves of each of their ‘typical member’ responses on a 10-point scale. They were asked to give 10 if the item described them very well, 1 if it did not describe them at all.

*Section II: Focusing on distinctiveness*

Participants were told that the interviewer was interested in “the ways people use to distinguish themselves as individuals from other people within society and within social groups”.

It was explained that the next part of the interview would be based around two questions, “how you are distinguished as a member of the clergy from other people within society, and how you personally are distinguished from other members of the clergy within the church”. These questions would be addressed generally, then explored in greater detail.
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- **Exploration of distinctiveness**

Participants were asked to speak about ways in which being a member of the clergy distinguished them from other people in society. Then they rated the extent to which they perceived themselves to be distinguished as members of the clergy from other people in society (self-report of inter-group distinctiveness) and the importance to them of being distinguished in this way (subjective importance of inter-group distinctiveness). As in the previous section, each rating was made "on a scale from 1 to 10".

Participants were asked to speak about ways in which they were distinguished from other members of the clergy within the church. They then rated the extent to which they perceived themselves to be distinguished from other members of the clergy within the church (self-report of intra-group distinctiveness) and the importance to them of being distinguished in this way (subjective importance of intra-group distinctiveness). Each rating was made "on a scale from 1 to 10".

- **Sources of distinctiveness**

Participants then discussed their inter-group distinctiveness as members of the clergy within society and their intra-group distinctiveness within the clergy specifically in terms of "roles" as an index of *positional distinctiveness*, "personal qualities" as an index of *difference* and "being set apart" as an index of *separateness*.

Each construct in turn was introduced and explored using the format of the previous section. On each level of categorisation, the construct was discussed, then scores from 1 to 10 were taken for the perceived extent of this type of distinctiveness and for its importance to the participant.
Section III: Wider issues and final tasks

The final section was more exploratory in character. Ideally these questions might have come before the interest in distinctiveness was made explicit, but this might have prejudiced the contents of section II by increasing the pressure towards normative responses. Hence, distinctiveness was inevitably contextually salient within this section.

Nevertheless, the section was announced as a departure from “ways in which you are distinguished from other people” to a more general focus on “the individual in society”, with an interest in “your perspective as a Christian and as an Anglican”.

This passage was intended to transform the interview relationship, so that participants would feel freer to expand on their own world views, after a section in which the interview had been constrained by the theoretical constructs of position, difference and separateness. To an extent this appeared successful, although by now time was short in many interviews.

- Beliefs about the individual in society

An opening question was used: “What does it mean to be an individual, according to your beliefs?”. Depending on the response to this first question and on the remaining time available in the interview, one or more of the following questions was used to explore further: “What do you understand by the concept of a person's identity?”, “According to your beliefs, how are people distinguished from each other as individuals?” and/or “What are the implications of this for the way people behave?”. Additionally, in some cases, questions were improvised to follow up lines of thought arising from answers to these questions.
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- **Beliefs about distinctiveness of the clergy**

This was followed by a section investigating Anglican beliefs about the clergy, with a focus on inter- and intra-group distinctiveness. The opening question was “How does Anglican doctrine distinguish the clergy from other people?”. This might be followed with the question, “How does this translate in terms of the role of the clergy in society?”, depending on the response to the first question and on time constraints. The second line of enquiry was “How does Anglican doctrine distinguish between individual members of the clergy within the church?”. This was sometimes followed with the question, “How does this translate in terms of the roles of members of the clergy within the church?”.  

- **Stability and change**

Two questions were included to explore issues of stability and change: “We’ve talked a lot about the relationship between clergy and society. To what extent do you see this as something which is stable or something which is changing?” and “Still on the question of stability or change, how do you see the relationships of members of the clergy with each other?”.  

- **Negations of distinctiveness**

Three questions explored negations of distinctiveness, both actual and desired. The first asked whether there were “any aspects of your membership of the clergy which make you less distinguishable as an individual”, the second asked “Are there any situations where you might prefer not to be distinguishable?”, and the third asked if there were situations where distinctiveness in terms of any of the sources previously explored “would run contrary to your religious beliefs”.

Final written tasks

To conclude the interview, participants were asked to complete two short written scales: a five item measure of 'satisfaction with life' using 7-point ratings (Diener, Emmons, Larson & Griffin, 1985) and a seven item measure of 'work satisfaction' using 5-point ratings (adapted from 'job satisfaction scale': Price & Mueller, 1981). A third sheet provided demographic and occupational details. This concluded the interview.

Debriefing

Participants were thanked for their time, and any questions about the research were answered. It was requested that they should avoid talking to any colleagues about the contents of the interview so as to avoid exposing the focus of the research to possible future participants.

Questionnaire Study

One hundred and forty-nine Anglican parish priests responded to a postal questionnaire between August and November 1998. The questionnaire took about an hour to complete and measured constructs related to identity, distinctiveness, representations of personhood and priesthood, self-construals, churchmanship, affect and the clerical collar.

Aims and design

The questionnaire study focused on the first two research objectives, integrating a global test of identity process theory with a more detailed examination of the distinctiveness principle, contextualised in relation to representations of person, self and priest within this population.
The design of this study incorporated a number of methodological and theoretical insights from both quantitative and preliminary qualitative analyses of the interview data (see chapters 6, 7, 9, 10 & 11).

**Participants and procedure**

Two hundred Anglican parish priests were recruited by telephone to participate in a study about "processes of identity among the Anglican clergy." Potential participants were selected at random from the most recent edition of *Crockford's Clerical Directory* (1997) and those who were listed as ordained priests, currently attached to a parish, and currently resident within the UK were telephoned. Each of the 200 men and women who had agreed to participate received by mail a questionnaire, a pre-paid envelope for returning it and a personalised covering letter reiterating the topic of the research, thanking them for their effort and guaranteeing their anonymity.

One hundred and forty-nine participants (133 men and 16 women; mean age = 51 years, range: 28 to 69 years) returned their questionnaires by the cut-off date. This represented a response rate of 74.5%. At the time of the study, these respondents had been ordained for a mean period of 18 years (range: 2 to 40 years); 132 were working in stipendiary, 16 in non-stipendiary and 1 in partially stipendiary ministry. Most of them (132) were married, although 11 were single, 3 divorced, 2 separated and 1 widowed. As an index of the respondents' level of interest in the study, 108 of them (72.5%) asked to see a summary of the findings.

---

7 Because of time constraints, it was necessary to design the questionnaire before the formal qualitative analyses of the interviews could be completed.
Questionnaire

The questionnaire contained the following sections: 8

- Generation of identity content.

Given the inclusive definition of identity used in this work, which presupposes that identity process theory should be applicable across all identity domains and not just those which are theoretically convenient, it was important that the items used in the subsequent rating tasks should not be constrained by the researchers' prior expectations.

The questionnaire began with a slightly adapted version of the Twenty Statements Test (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954), in which respondents had the opportunity to specify their own items of identity content. This task was located at the very beginning of the questionnaire in order to minimize any constraint on responses caused by the research. The wording was identical to that reported by Kuhn and McPartland, except that just 12 responses were requested.

As Wylie (1974) notes, it is common for a sizable proportion of respondents to supply well under 20 responses when presented with this task. Also, it was felt that participants would find the ratings which followed intolerable with 20 items to rate on each dimension. However, too few items would leave little scope for variance between items within the response profile of each participant. The number of items was set at 12 with the aim of balancing these considerations. Just under 85% of participants provided 12 responses. The mean number was 11.5.

8 The questionnaire is reproduced in full in Appendix B.
• **Free descriptions of personhood and priesthood**

Participants were given the opportunity to write 5 statements in answer to each of the questions "What is a person?" and "What is a priest?".

• **Self-ratings for distinctiveness and closeness**

Participants were asked to rate themselves on a series of 20 dimensions, presented as 7-point scales, measuring perceived levels of distinctiveness ("... feel unique") and closeness to others ("... feel close to other people") in general, and perceived levels of distinctiveness ("... feel unique ..."), closeness ("... feel close to ...") and distinctiveness in terms of position ("... distinctive position ..."), difference ("... different personality ..."), and separateness ("... see yourself as separate ..."), beliefs ("... different beliefs and opinions ..."), role ("... definite role ..."), abilities ("... different in terms of your abilities ..."), and independence ("... feel independent ...") in relation to their parishioners and to other members of the clergy.

• **Rating of identity content items.**

Participants were then asked to rate each of their 12 responses to the initial task on a series of 27 different dimensions. Each dimension was presented as a question at the top of a new page with a block of twelve 7-point scales positioned underneath to line up with the items.

Two questions measured the perceived centrality of each item within the respondent's identity structure: "How much do you see each of these things as peripheral or central to your identity?" and "How much does each of these things give you a sense of who you are?".
A single question measured the perceived value of the items: "How much do you see each of these things as positive or negative?"

Six questions followed measuring subjective feelings of distinctiveness, "How much does each of these things make you feel that you are unique?", continuity, "How much does each of these things give you a sense of continuity within your life?", efficacy, "How much does each of these things make you feel effective in doing the things you do?", self-esteem, "How much does each of these things give you a sense of self-esteem?", purpose, "How much does each of these things give you a sense of purpose?", and closeness, "How much does each of these things make you feel close to other people?", associated with each of the items.

Two questions measured the association of each item with feelings of distinctiveness, with respect to 'parish' and 'clergy' targets: "How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you from your parishioners?" and "How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you from other members of the clergy?"

Fourteen questions followed measuring feelings of distinctiveness from each target in terms of position ("distinctive position"), difference ("different personality") and separateness ("see yourself as separate"), as well as additional constructs of beliefs ("different beliefs and opinions"), role ("definite role"), abilities ("different in terms of your abilities") and independence ("feel independent"), associated with each of the items.

Two further questions measured the association of each item with feelings of closeness to each target: "How much does each of these things make you feel close to your parishioners?" and "How much does each of these things make you feel close to other members of the clergy?"
• **Representation of personhood task**

There followed a list of eight statements about personhood, paraphrased from the interview data (e.g., “Every person is unique”; “Every person is loved by God”). Respondents were asked to delete any statements with which they disagreed and then to mark the four statements which they saw as “most important in understanding what it means to be a person”.

• **Representation of priesthood task**

In the same format, nine statements about priesthood were presented, also paraphrased from the interview study (e.g., “A priest is someone who has been called by God”; “A priest is someone who proclaims the Gospel”). Respondents were asked to delete any statements with which they disagreed and then to mark the four statements which they saw as “most important in understanding what it means to be a priest”.

• **Self-construal scale**

Respondents were then asked to respond to the self-construal scale of Gudykunst et al. (1996). This was a scale of 29 attitude-type items, with which participants were invited to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement using a 7-point Likert scale. 9

---

9 I am grateful to Bill Gudykunst for providing the list of items.
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- Churchmanship

Next came a list of nine categories of churchmanship and an “other: please specify” option, derived from the 1989 English Church Census (Brierley, 1991a, 1991b). Following the Church Census, respondents were invited to tick up to three of the descriptions. The criterion for selecting a category was whether it “might be used to describe your own ministry”.

- Measure of affect

This was followed by the Positive And Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). Participants were asked to rate a series of 20 mood adjectives as descriptions of “how you generally feel”, using a 5-point scale ranging from “very slightly or not at all” to “extremely”.

- Clerical collar

Respondents were asked to rate their frequency of wearing a clerical collar, using a 5-point scale ranging from “always” through “most days”. “some days” and “rarely” to “never”.

- Demographic and occupational information.

The final page included questions about age, sex, marital status, position within the clergy and year of ordination. Respondents were also given the opportunity here to request a summary of findings from the study.
Analyses and Results

Results from these two studies are presented and discussed in chapters 5 to 11, each of which addresses particular theoretical issues. These chapters are ordered so as to provide a coherent theoretical progression, rather than preserving the integrity of each study.

Analyses of the interview data included interpretative phenomenological analyses (J. A. Smith, 1996a), focusing on issues relating to identity, personhood and distinctiveness, which are reported respectively in chapters 5, 7 and 8 of this thesis, as well as quantitative analyses, focusing on the distinctiveness principle, which are reported in chapter 9.

Analyses of the questionnaire data included comparing models of identity motivation, describing representations of personhood and priesthood, modelling sources of distinctiveness and examining predicted consequences of the distinctiveness principle. These issues are addressed respectively in chapters 6, 7, 10 and 11 of the thesis.
Chapter 5

EXPLORING QUESTIONS OF 'WHO AM I?'

God answered, “I AM; that is who I am.”
EXODUS 3:14 (New English Bible)

In this chapter, I present the first of three analyses of the qualitative data from the interview study. The intention of these analyses is to introduce the participants as people, contextualising the theoretical issues within their accounts of their own experience and thus to produce a richer and fuller account of understandings, feelings and processes of identity and distinctiveness than would be possible using solely quantitative means.

The approach used is a form of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA, after J. A. Smith, 1996a). In keeping with the epistemological stance of this thesis, IPA assumes that participants’ cognitions are in some way reflected in their verbal productions and aims to uncover the former by examining the latter. Hence, the aim of IPA is to make sense of participants' phenomenological worlds. However, it is acknowledged that this aim necessarily involves the researcher in using his or her own conceptual framework in an active process of interpretation. Thus the approach is both phenomenological and interpretative.

Aims of the Analysis

IPA is often used in exploratory studies, where the aim is purely to reconstruct participants' experiences of a particular situation and theory is developed from this reconstruction (cf. grounded theory: Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser, 1992). But here, it was intended that the study should elaborate issues arising from identity process theory. Hence some quite specific questions were to be asked of the data, focusing on participants' experiences of identity, personhood and distinctiveness.
In this chapter, I present an analysis focusing on identity, as expressed within the specific context of participants' elaboration of their responses to the Twenty Statements Test (TST) in the first part of the interview.

The aim of this analysis was to identify themes explaining the subjective importance of each of the chosen responses. These themes might have some theoretical relationship with identity principles (chap. 2; Breakwell, 1986a, 1992), although this is not to say that the themes should be equated with identity principles, which are not necessarily assumed within the theory to be represented on a phenomenological level.

**Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis**

In order to avoid falsely portraying themes as 'self-evident' or 'emerging from the data' as if unaided, it is important to describe the process of interpretation as transparently as possible. As a relatively new approach, IPA offers a set of guidelines rather than prescribing rules for analysis, acknowledging that particular data sets and research questions may be best served by different strategies. The procedure used here is derived from, but develops the ideas of J. A. Smith, Jarman and Osborn (1999).

Smith et al. (1999) outline two alternative strategies for conducting an interpretative phenomenological analysis. The first strategy, described as an idiographic approach (pp. 220-228), involves focusing in detail on each participant as a single case, extracting a set of themes from each and then integrating themes across cases. The second strategy, intended for exploring and theorising shared experiences (pp. 228-238), involves

---

10 An alternative idiographic approach involves using the themes extracted from case 1 to begin the analysis of case 2, and so on. However, this appears to run the risk that earlier cases will have an especially strong effect on the interpretation of later cases.
identifying one or more general themes which are applicable to all participants and then focusing in detail on each theme separately.

According to Smith et al. (1999), the idiographic approach works well with samples of up to about 10 participants, while the shared experiences approach is more appropriate for larger samples of up to about 20.

The basic analytic construct within IPA is the 'theme'. Smith et al. (1999) note that themes may be at varying levels of abstraction, and may be more descriptive or more explanatory within different analyses. Additionally, it is expected that some themes will "follow closely" questions on the interview schedule while others may be "completely new" (p. 224).

**Specific features of the data**

The qualitative data from the interview study differ in two important ways from those used in most IPA studies. Firstly the data set is substantially larger, and secondly the interviews were more structured.

IPA has typically been used to analyse comparatively small data sets, from single case studies (J. A. Smith, 1991; Smith, Flowers & Osborn, 1997) to studies involving a maximum of about 20 participants (Coyle & Rafalin, in press; Flowers, Smith, Sheeran & Beail, 1997, 1998; Rafalin, 1998). This reflects the intensive involvement required in interpreting each case. This data set is somewhat larger, involving 42 participants and with over 60 hours of interviewing recorded on audio tape.

A significant feature of IPA is that it is able to reflect the accounts of individual participants rather than solely averaging or examining trends in the data. In this way, IPA complements the quantitative analyses
within this thesis. Hence, it was important to devise an interpretative procedure in which individual voices would not be lost in the crowd.

IPA has usually been applied to data from exploratory interviews, in which the participant has considerable scope to influence the direction of the interview (e.g., Flowers et al., 1997, 1998; Golsworthy & Coyle, 1999; Osborn & Smith, 1998). In this study, the interviews were directed quite rigidly using a 'funnelling' technique (J. A. Smith, 1995, pp. 15-16), in which an exploratory section on identity was followed by more specific questions on distinctiveness, personhood and priesthood, and within the middle section general questions about distinctiveness were followed by more specific questions about each of the hypothesised sources.

The comparatively rigid interview structure meant that the contextual status of particular constructs, especially those related to distinctiveness, but also theological concepts of personhood and priesthood, varied over the course of the interview, according to whether they had yet been introduced explicitly by the interviewer or whether they were discussed spontaneously by the participant. Hence it was also important that the different epistemological status of quotations occurring in different contexts within the interview should be reflected in the analysis.

**Analytic strategy**

Given that the contextual status of each issue varied systematically over the course of the interviews, and that the relevant questions asked of the data are quite distinct, each issue is addressed in a separate analysis and is presented here in a separate chapter of the thesis. However, the three analyses are derived from broadly similar procedures.
An important challenge within this study was to deal with a sample size of 42 without losing track of individual voices within the analysis. This appeared to pose problems both for the analyst, for whom the task of keeping 42 voices in mind would inevitably reduce the possible depth of the analysis, and for the reader, who would have little chance of getting to know any of the individual characters within such a large sample.

It was therefore decided to focus mainly on a subset of 21 interviews in constructing the analyses presented in this thesis, although reference was made to the researcher's field notes as well as the tape recordings of the remaining interviews in the course of the analytic process. Clearly, this strategy privileged some participants' accounts above others in contributing to the analyses, but this was balanced against the advantage of making it possible to deal with these cases at a greater level of sophistication than would be possible in treating the sample as a whole. The 21 interviews were not chosen at random, but were carefully selected following a theoretically driven set of criteria:

1. The original sample included two deacons, one bishop (retired) and one priest serving as a cathedral canon. To maximise comparability with the population sampled in the subsequent questionnaire study, only priests currently serving in parish ministry were selected.

2. However, within this selective focus on parish priests, care was taken to include as much heterogeneity as possible in terms of age, gender, theological orientation and stipendiary or non-stipendiary ministry. The aim was to achieve a broad rather than a representative sample, a strategy in some ways related to the technique of 'theoretical sampling' within grounded theory (see Glaser & Strauss, 1970).
3. Within these constraints, preference was given to those participants who had provided the 'richest' data, using the researcher's field notes as a guide; 'richness' reflected the degree of complexity or elaboration of responses, suggesting openness and engagement with the questions. An important concern was to represent the voices of participants who had reacted against questions within the interview schedule and not solely those who had conformed to theoretical expectations.

The selected interviews were transcribed verbatim and the transcripts were both printed and saved as text files. These transcripts constituted the data set for the main formative stages of each analysis. Once a provisional analysis had been constructed, attention was paid to the remaining interviews. Field notes were examined and many of the tape recordings were played, focusing not only on parts which appeared to be interesting from the field notes but also on those interviews thought to be less interesting, which were disadvantaged in the provisional analyses.

**Focused analysis**

It is recognised that the analyses presented are neither the only possible reading, nor are they a full account of the interview data. Instead, the approach is a selective focus on particular constructs which are understood to be theoretically significant (cf. Flowers et al., 1997; Jarman, Smith & Walsh, 1997). Given that the aim of these analyses is to address the theoretical framework developed for this thesis, and not solely to explore participants' accounts, attention has been focused selectively on the specified issues of *identity*, *personhood* and *distinctiveness*.

However, within these limits, an effort has been made to avoid imposing theoretical constructs on the data on a more fine-grained level, as this would interfere with the possibility of developing phenomenological
themes which are less well represented within the current theory. Hence, the approach used within all three analyses has been to develop an interpretative phenomenological account in its own terms and only subsequently to examine the relationship between the account and theory.

*Issues of reliability and validity*

Inevitably, a process such as this raises questions of the reliability and validity of interpretations. Traditional indices such as inter-rater reliability are inappropriate within this context, firstly because the analysis does not involve quantification, and secondly because it is not assumed within IPA that the interpretation offered is the only possible reading of the text. Nevertheless it is important to have some indication that the interpretation presented is not entirely idiosyncratic.

This is addressed in three ways here. Firstly, an effort has been made to keep interpretations as close as possible to the text and not to over-interpret (J. A. Smith, 1991, p. 227). Secondly, in the normal course of the supervision of this thesis, the analysis has been checked and discussed with my supervisors with the aim of ensuring that the interpretations offered are warranted by the text. Thirdly, care has been taken to make explicit the textual grounding of assertions within the report and to distinguish between text and interpretation at all times, helping the reader to assess the extent to which interpretations are convincing.

*Procedure*

A full description of the interview procedure is given in chapter 4. The first analysis was based on participants' discussions of the importance of items within their TST responses. Participants had generated items of identity content in response to the question “Who am I?”, and had then
generated a rank order of the ten (where available) most important items to them "as a member of the clergy". They were now asked (a) to explain their order of responses and (b) to describe the difference in themselves if they were not each of the items they had chosen (e.g., for the response "a priest", "What would be the difference in you if you were not a priest"). These data were generated at the beginning of the interview, before the interviewer's interest in distinctiveness had been made explicit.

The aim of the analysis was to identify themes explaining the subjective importance of the items within participants' phenomenological worlds.

Each transcript was read several times. Passages were underlined and notes were jotted in the margins. The notes were summaries of the material, references to other passages or preliminary interpretations. For each transcript in turn, a small number of themes (2 to 4) were then identified which either summarised a large proportion of the data or which were especially strongly represented in particular passages.

These themes were then compared and clustered together, resulting in a provisional set of superordinate themes. All transcripts were searched again for evidence of each theme, quotations being coded from the text files using the software package ATLAS/ti for Windows. In this process, some modifications were made to the themes. A comprehensive list of quotations was printed for each of the resulting themes. The quotations coded for each theme were examined and summarised in order to establish a working definition of the theme which was closely related to the data.

The next phase of the analysis involved examining relationships between the superordinate themes, with constant reference to the working definitions, the individual themes and the original transcripts. This resulted in some further adjustments to the contents of the themes.
A provisional summary was then written. Discussions of relevant theoretical issues were inserted, and minor modifications were made, arising from the remaining interviews. The analysis is reported below.

**Analysis**

Two superordinate groups of themes were identified, referring to different senses of the subjective 'importance' of the items. These are discussed in separate sections within the following report. A first section examines the importance of items which were portrayed by participants as fundamental aspects of their self-understandings, including relationships with God, priesthood, family relationships and inclusion within humanity. Themes identified as relevant to importance in this sense were temporal continuity, internal cohesion, relationships and a sense of purpose. A second section discusses the importance of items for participants' work as members of the clergy. Themes included participants' portrayals of the nature and purpose of their ministry and the importance of resources for performing their ministries and for coping with related pressures.

*The subjective importance of elements within identity*

*Some 'fundamental' aspects of identity*

Certain aspects of identity appeared to be seen as especially fundamental by a substantial proportion of the participants. These aspects included references to Christianity or the participant's relationship with God, to priesthood, to family relationships and to the human condition. The importance of these aspects of identity was asserted directly in participants' use of language and was underlined by the difficulties they reported in imagining alternative possible selves without them.
Gerry defined himself primarily in terms of his relationships with God and with his wife, discussing the items "child of God" and "husband to Jane" as follows:

A child of God, because I can't be me, not with my understanding of me, nor can I actually be a member of the church, nor can I be a priest unless I have a relationship of dependence upon God, who is at the heart of what we're about.

I'm a husband to my wife Jane. And that might seem strange that that comes fairly high up the list if we're talking about being a member of the Anglican clergy. But I married Jane before I became ordained or even before I went to theological college, and she is part and parcel of what I am in my ministry.

Within this excerpt, Gerry's use of the verb 'to be' illustrated the importance of both relationships within his self-understanding. Without his relationship with God he couldn't "be me", while Jane was "part and parcel of what I am". Thus he conveyed an impression of these relationships as essential rather than peripheral aspects of his being.

Gerry underlined the significance of these parts of his identity with some further information. Being a child of God was a precondition for two other aspects of his identity, being "a member of the church" and "a priest", while the importance of his marriage was reinforced by the continuity of this relationship from a time prior to his becoming a priest. These characteristics foreshadow the themes of temporal continuity and internal cohesion which are discussed below in greater detail.

11 All names and other identifying details have been changed.
12 Within the quotations reported here, all punctuation is my subjective interpretation of the recording. "..." indicates a pause; "[...]" indicates an omission of transcribed material.
Matthew made similar use of language in his account of the importance of being a “priest of the Church” within his list of responses:

Historically, being a human being and being a husband and being a father came before I was a priest, but in terms of what it means to me, I suppose I have to say that my priesthood, as I understand it, is something which is fundamental to who I am.

In contrast to Gerry’s discussion of marriage, Matthew here separated historical continuity from importance, but he echoed Gerry’s use of the verb ‘to be’ in affirming his priesthood as “fundamental to who I am”. The equation of his identity with his priesthood was further developed later in the interview, when Matthew was asked to imagine an alternative self if he were not a “priest of the Church”:

If an Oliver Cromwell came along and abolished me, well I would still be alive I suppose, but in a sense I would regard my priesthood as not being merely an administrative nicety, but something deeper in my personality.

Here, the status of his priesthood as “something deeper in my personality” rather than “merely an administrative nicety”, was reinforced by his suggestion that a contemporary Oliver Cromwell might come along and abolish not “the priesthood” but “me”, indicating that the two were coterminous and interchangeable within his self-understanding.

Meanwhile, Paul emphasised the importance of seeing himself as a member of humanity, discussing the item “wounded human being”:

I see myself first and foremost as a member of the human race, which implies that I have an awful lot in common with everyone around me. And that’s the beginning of everything.
For Paul, humanity came "first and foremost" and was "the beginning of everything". Paul's use of temporal precedence as a metaphor for importance mirrors Matthew's use of depth in the previous quotations. The significance of having "an awful lot in common with everyone around me" foreshadows the theme of 'relationships' which is discussed later.

The importance of these aspects was also underlined by participants' difficulties in imagining alternative possible selves. This could be seen within David's discussion of the items "a priest" and "a husband":

I can't ever not be a husband. I shall always be a husband, I might be a divorced husband, a widowed husband, but I shall always be a husband and I shall always be a priest. I mean you can't, once it's happened it's happened, and it's not possible to, unless you suffer from total amnesia, it's not possible to wipe out that kind of self-understanding.

Well I mean we could say the other way round, if you could imagine if you hadn't been a priest, rather than if you -

I can't.

You can't imagine it.

I just can't imagine it at all. I mean I can't think myself back into the person I was before I was ordained and I can't imagine what I would have been if I hadn't taken that course. I mean there isn't any other me, that's the only me there is really, now.

David's refusal to imagine an alternative self provided a powerful demonstration of the subjective importance of these parts of his identity. Furthermore, this extract gives a strong sense of the subjective continuity of both identities. David's statement that "it's not possible to wipe out that
kind of self-understanding" is applied not only to an imaginary future self - "I shall always be a husband and I shall always be a priest" - but also to David's memory of his own autobiography, as manifested in his inability even to "think myself back into the person I was before I was ordained".

Charles, when asked to imagine an alternative possible self if he were not a Christian, doubted whether he would necessarily be alive:

I almost think that if I weren't a Christian that I might not actually be alive, because I don't know that I can see or find anything, anyone else other than Christ who makes sense of life, and who actually gives it zest and direction and richness and colour. So I think that could be a serious possibility.

For Charles, the subjective importance of being a Christian appeared to lie in the pervasive effect of his relationship with Christ on disparate aspects of his life, providing meaning ("makes sense of life"), purpose ("direction") and enjoyment ("zest [...] and richness and colour"), foreshadowing the themes of internal cohesion and purpose discussed later.

The analysis presented so far has shown the importance of relationships with God, priesthood, family relationships and humanity within participants' accounts of their identities. The themes which follow are focused on participants' accounts of why these parts of their identities were important and how they would be different without them. The subjective importance of these aspects seemed to arise especially from their temporal continuity, either in terms of stability over time or growth, their connections with other parts of identity, the establishment of a sense of inclusion within spiritual and social relationships with God and with others, and their association with a sense of purpose or calling.
A recurrent theme within participants' discussions of their chosen responses was the importance of temporal continuity, whether established in terms of stability over time or in terms of progression or development.

The importance of stability over time has already been seen in the quotes from Gerry, for whom it was the fact that he had been married "before I became ordained or even before I went to theological college" which made his wife "part and parcel of what I am in my ministry", and from David, whose identities as husband and priest affected not only his imagination of possible future selves, but also his recollections of the past. Consistency over time was also invoked by both Timothy and John in their explanations of the items, "priest" and "non-stipendiary minister C of E":

I've been a priest both married and unmarried, with a family and without a family, and whatever way you look at it that always comes first. (Timothy)

The first one is non-stipendiary minister: that is what I am, that is who I am, and that is the job I'm doing until next week, and it's very important to me because this is my life, and has been for the last ten years. (John)

According to Timothy, it was the consistency of being a priest across different family circumstances, "both married and unmarried, with a family and without a family", which explained the priority of "priest", his first item in the rank order, over "husband" and "father", his second and third items. John's comment that being a non-stipendiary minister "is my life, and has been for the last ten years" implied consistency across situations ("my life") as well as time ("the last ten years"). At the time of the interview, John was about to retire from his ministry, hence his description of this role as "the job I'm doing until next week". However, he explained a later item, "keen gardener", in terms of future consistency:
And a keen gardener is one of the things I do and one of the things I'll be doing more of when I fully retire.

The theme of temporal continuity within participants' accounts of the importance of their selected responses can be related to the 'continuity principle' hypothesised within identity process theory (chap. 2). According to Breakwell (1986a) the processes shaping identity "work to produce ... continuity across time and situation" (p. 24).

However, Breakwell (1987) stresses that continuity does not refer solely to consistency over time, but "can be associated with growth and change ... so long as the person perceives these changes to be congruent with the development of identity" (p. 104; see also Chandler & Lalonde, 1995). Here, temporal continuity did not necessarily mean an absence of change. Equally important was a sense of development or growth.

This could be seen in the next passage from Matthew's interview, in which he had been asked to imagine not being a "priest of the church". Although he had previously contrasted the "fundamental" importance of priesthood to his identity with the "historical" place of being a human being, husband and father, he now gave an implicitly historical account of the fundamental nature of his priesthood:

For me, Christianity, which is the faith that I've had since I've been a child, found its natural and ultimate expression in being a priest. If I wasn't a priest, I probably wouldn't be a Christian. You know, I can't conceive of the one without the other for me.

By associating his priesthood so strongly with his childhood faith ("I can't conceive of the one without the other"), Matthew here established a sense of continuity for his identity as a priest, as the "natural and ultimate
expression" of “the faith that I’ve had since I’ve been a child”. But the impression that Matthew saw his priesthood as a development of his faith, and not merely a particular expression of it, was reinforced by his assertion that “if I wasn’t a priest, I probably wouldn't be a Christian”.

Christine referred explicitly to a process of development which reinforced for her the importance of her identity as a woman within the priesthood:

> Being a woman is a very important aspect of it [priesthood], to me. Because it's something I've really had to work at over the last 10 years, working out what it means to be a woman ... and a clergyman. See? [laughs]

The importance to Christine of “being a woman”, apparently came from her engagement in a long-term process of identity work “over the last 10 years”, in order to reconcile her two identities as a “woman” and a “clergyman” (sic). Christine’s difficulties with simultaneously occupying these identities, an inconsistency highlighted here in her choice of language, are discussed within the theme of ‘internal cohesion’.

Meanwhile Michael, describing the item, “an evolving person”, portrayed the concept of development as an explicit part of his identity as a priest:

> I was ordained quite young, and I've a clear sense of having developed in a whole variety of ways over the years since, and in a sense I think I’ll be able to share that journey with people and to help them along their journey.

Here, Michael translated his sense of “having developed in a whole variety of ways” into the standard metaphor of a “journey”, drawing an equivalence between his experience and the experiences of his parishioners, with whom he could “share that journey”.

The analysis presented above has described the features of 'temporal continuity' as a theme within participants' accounts of the importance of various parts of their identities. This theme has been related to the continuity principle within identity process theory (Breakwell, 1986a), but also speaks more generally for the importance of including the dimension of subjective time within accounts of identity dynamics (Cinnirella, 1998; Markus & Nurius, 1986; Stokols & Jacobi, 1984).

An important feature of this theme is that continuity can be warranted in multiple ways (cf. Chandler & Lalonde, 1995), which here included stability over chronological time (John), stability over biographical time (Timothy), generalisation to the future (David, John), generalisation to the past (David) and a sense of development (Matthew, Christine, Michael).

**Internal cohesion**

A second theme which appeared to underlie the subjective importance of items was the internal cohesion of participants' identities. Although the structure of the interview treated each item of identity content as a separate unit, participants frequently stressed the connections between the items they had chosen and often appeared to prioritise items which were seen to have a pervasive effect in shaping other aspects of identity.

The theme of internal cohesion was seen earlier in Gerry's description of his wife as "part and parcel of what I am in my ministry", in which he avoided drawing a boundary between his identities as "husband" and as "priest", and in Christine's account of the necessity of establishing a connection between "what it means to be a woman ... and a clergyman".
Timothy portrayed the items "a man of prayer", "a spiritual director", "educator" and "pastor" as providing an interface between his identity as a priest and his individual personality:

And obviously there are certain characteristics of being a priest which - some of them listed here, for example a man of prayer, a spiritual director, an educator, a pastor - all characteristics which are part of me, and perhaps fit in with my personality as well as an individual.

This theme was also noticeable on a wider scale in the way that participants explained their rank orders of identity items. Rather than focusing on the relative importance of items as requested, some participants appeared to have constructed the sequence as a 'story' of their responses, with each one connected to the previous and following items. For example, Charles made connections between each response and the next within the sequence, "a Christian", "disciple", "follower of Jesus Christ", "husband", "father", "pastor", "a preacher" and "an evangelist":

I've described myself as a Christian first and foremost. [...] I suppose a development of that, the term 'disciple'. [...] My third is a further unpacking of that, again echoing the Gospels. As a follower of Jesus Christ [...] And then my fourth priority is that of a husband. After my calling to follow Jesus Christ, I regard myself as called to be a husband, [...] Arising out of being a husband, having a family, so I am a father. [...] So those callings and aspects of identity I consider to have primacy over my calling as a clergyman. But that calling comes in next, as a pastor. [...] And then, related to that, a preacher. It's very much part of my understanding of my calling as a clergyman that I am [...] set aside in order to proclaim the good news of Jesus Christ, and specifically to be an evangelist.
Over the course of this sequence, Charles moved from describing his relationship with God, to family relationships and finally to his identity as a clergyman. Within each of these areas, items were introduced as a "development" of, an "unpacking" of, "arising out of" or "related to" previous items. Meanwhile, Charles used the superordinate concept of "calling" as a bridge from one area to the next, constructing a sense of internal cohesion across the account as a whole.

One specific manifestation of the theme of internal cohesion was in the subjective importance of authenticity, in the sense of a consistency between one's 'true self' and one's behaviour. This was illustrated by Rachel's description of her identity as a "child of God" and Christine's account of the difference in herself if she were not a "Christian":

I see myself first of all as a child of God and have, a relationship with God direct. And that seems to me to be fundamental because if I didn't recognise that relationship and feel a sense of dependence on God in myself as well as in my role as a priest, that would be somehow phoney. (Rachel)

I wouldn't be able to fulfil my life without being a Christian. I can't imagine the effect of trying to preach on Sunday if you didn't believe what you were preaching. I mean I think it would just be totally impossible. And the same thing then with the rest of your life, really. (Christine)

The importance of authenticity can be seen here in Rachel's account of the "fundamental" importance of seeing herself as a "child of God" both "in myself" and "in my role as a priest" – without this consistency, her identity would be "somehow phoney". Similarly, for Christine, if her beliefs were not coherent with her actions, then not only "trying to preach on Sunday" but also "the rest of your life" "would just be totally impossible".
Authenticity has been described elsewhere as an important value, especially within individualistic cultures (Fiske et al., 1998). Bugental (1965), drawing on the central status of this concept within the philosophy of existentialism, treats the achievement of authenticity as the “central concern” of his brand of “existential-analytic psychotherapy” (p. 31). Markowe (1996) has suggested including a “need for authenticity and integrity” as an additional principle within identity process theory, reflecting the phenomenological importance of “being yourself” (p. 196).

An additional manifestation of the theme of internal cohesion was in the priority given to items which were described as having a pervasive effect in shaping other aspects of identity. Matthew and David described the importance of being a husband and a father in terms of the pervasive influence of these family relationships on both life and priesthood:

Being a husband and a father has clearly shaped who I am, and having to live with another person and relate with another person and have the responsibility for children, and, working through that, has clearly made a great difference to who I am as a priest as well. (Matthew)

A husband, because it's an important part of what I am, and I can't dissociate that central bit of me from what I am and do as a priest, because it colours I suppose my perceptions and appreciation of other people and situations, and in lots of different ways. (David)

For Matthew, “being a husband and father has clearly shaped who I am”, and hence has “clearly made a great difference to who I am as a priest as well”, through the experience of ‘living’ and ‘relating’ with another person as well as having “the responsibility for children”. Similarly, David was unable to separate being a husband (“that central bit of me”) from either his being or his actions in ministry (“what I am and do as a priest”), noting
the pervasive effect of this identity on “my perceptions and appreciation of other people and situations” and “in lots of different ways”.

Similarly Mark, asked to imagine the difference in himself if he were not a priest, described the pervasive influence of priesthood on his daily life:

If I wasn't a priest then I would not be most of the things that I think I am most of the week. I wouldn't be the person whom the children greeted in the street as I walked out of the front door as they went on the way to school because I wouldn't know them. I wouldn't be coming to church in order to say my prayers, because if I wanted to say my prayers I could say them at home, or if I was a lay person I wouldn't be bound by law that I had to say them. I think the truth of the matter is therefore I wouldn't. [...] So my whole day and my whole life every day is shaped so much by being a priest.

The influence extended from his public relationships with others (“I wouldn’t be the person whom the children greeted in the street”) to his private relationship with God (“I think the truth of the matter is therefore I wouldn't [say my prayers]”) leading him to conclude that “my whole day and my whole life every day is shaped so much by being a priest”.

The preceding quotations have some resonance with the earlier discussion of the continuity principle (Breakwell, 1986a), which can be seen especially in Mark’s reference to “my whole day and my whole life every day”. However, the subjective importance of these items does not appear to be simply a function of their continuity over time and situation, but is related to their perceived force in shaping identity. The fact that being a husband and father has ‘made a difference to’ or ‘coloured’ Matthew’s and David’s understandings of their priesthood and that being a priest ‘shapes’ Mark’s behaviour every day appears to be equally significant.
Another way of looking at the importance of internal cohesion is to examine the repercussions of a loss of cohesion. The negative effect of a perceived inconsistency within identity can be seen in a later excerpt from Christine’s discussion of being “a woman ... and a clergyman”:

When I wasn't able to be a priest, and I felt the calling to be a priest, it was awful, schizophrenic almost, not being recognised for what I felt I was.

Here, Christine’s use of the metaphor of schizophrenia (in the lay rather than the psychiatric sense of the term), combined a sense of the division within her identity brought about by “not being recognised for what I felt I was” with a powerful statement of her affective reaction to this division.

The analysis above has described the theme of ‘internal cohesion’ which was understood to be a significant feature of participants’ accounts of the importance of various parts of their identities. Connections were made with the related concepts of authenticity (Bugental, 1965; Markowe, 1996) and continuity (Breakwell, 1986a). However, the theme is not equated with either of these concepts. The main point of the theme is to highlight the importance for participants of drawing connections between elements within identity, rather than focusing on individual elements in isolation.

This theme has some resonance with the ‘rules’ of representation discussed in the first chapter of this thesis. There, it was emphasised that the meaning of any element within a representational system was at least partly a function of its relationship with other elements of the system.

This theme was also especially consistent with an individualistic concept of personhood, reflecting Geertz’ account of the “Western conception of the person as a bounded, unique, more or less integrated [italics added] motivational and cognitive universe” (1975, p. 48).
Chapter 5: Exploring Questions of ‘Who am I?’

Relationships

A third theme elicited from the data was entitled ‘relationships’. This theme referred to the importance for participants of their relationships with other people and with God. The significance of these relationships was seen earlier in Gerry’s discussion of being a “child of God” and “husband to Jane”, and in a more abstract form within Paul’s description of himself “first and foremost as a member of the human race”.

The importance of family relationships was illustrated by the feelings participants expressed when they were asked to imagine the difference in themselves if they did not have these relationships. Ian and Christine described their reactions to the thought of life without their spouses:

I've been married for a long time and I can’t imagine not having somebody with me who's sort of sharing more or less everything and it would be quite devastating if I wasn't. [...] Having been married a long time, and happily married a long time, I just find it very difficult to conceive of not being married so the loss, if I'd gone through life without being married, I would have found that - I wouldn't have known what I was missing, I suppose - but having experienced that I know I would have lost an enormous amount. (Ian)

Not being a wife. I can't imagine it. It fills me with great fear, the fact that something could happen to Andrew, and I'd end up on my own. I just can't imagine life without him. (Christine)

Both Ian and Christine “can’t imagine” life without their partners. For Ian “it would be quite devastating” not to be married, while for Christine the thought of losing her husband “fills me with great fear”. For Ian, the loss would be “an enormous amount” in terms of “sharing more or less everything”, while Christine's fear is that she would “end up on my own”.

Similarly, when asked to imagine the difference in himself if he were not a father, Neil said that he would find it “very difficult indeed”:

I would find it incredibly difficult not to be a father, more than a husband, I think [...] but father I think would be very difficult if I was not a father. I enjoy my children a lot and I've learned a lot from them and as my wife does you know they keep you sane and on demand, although they cost me an absolute fortune. I would find that very difficult indeed.

In this extract, Neil portrayed fatherhood as a source of pleasure (“I enjoy my children a lot”), experience (“I've learned a lot from them”) and realism (“they keep you sane and on demand”), which compensated for the financial disadvantage that “they cost me an absolute fortune”.

Meanwhile, Mark imagined the difference if he were not “a friend”:

If I wasn't a friend, then I would just go mad, more quickly than anything else. Everything else in a sense could go quickly or for a time, but if I had a friend that would somehow make it all right.

Echoing Ian’s and Christine’s accounts of the importance of their relationships with their spouses, according to Mark, “everything else in a sense could go ... but if I had a friend that would somehow make it all right”. But without friendship, Mark suggested, “I would just go mad”.

Friendship was also an important value for Christine and Martha:

I prefer to think of people I come across most of the time as friends, not as parishioners. (Christine)
I hope that I would be seen by at least some of the congregation as a friend, and I think I probably am, not by all obviously it can't be like that. (Martha)

While Christine described preferring to see her parishioners as friends, Martha hoped that members of her congregation would also see her as a friend, although she was cautious about the extent of this possibility.

Both Martha and Christine also referred to the importance of having good working relationships with their colleagues in the church:

It happens that I get on very well at the moment with my two ordained colleagues, and indeed with our lay reader. We all four of us have I think a very good working relationship. [...] But I also put colleague in there because I have worked with people who might be fine for public but aren't awfully good to work with. In fact really until relatively recently. (Martha)

I know what it feels like not to have colleagues' support as well, and that's dreadful. So I like to be a good colleague to those I work with and hope that it's a reciprocal arrangement. (Christine)

Common to both accounts was the previous experience of a bad working relationship. Martha described her experience of "people who might be fine for public but aren't awfully good to work with", while Christine noted that "I know what it feels like not to have colleagues' support".13

The quotations reproduced so far have highlighted the importance of social support for these participants. Christine described lacking support from her colleagues as "dreadful" and the thought of losing her husband as filling her with "great fear". Without friendship, Mark expected that he

13 In Christine's case, it emerged later in the interview that the source of difficulty in the relationship was her non-acceptance by colleagues opposed to the ordination of women.
would "just go mad". Social support, defined as "those social interactions or relationships that provide individuals with actual assistance or with a feeling of attachment to a person or group that is perceived as caring or loving" (Hobfoll & Stokes, 1988, p. 499), has been widely understood to play an important role in subjective well-being, especially as a buffer against stress (see Cohen & Wills, 1985; Duck & Silver, 1990).

Participants also appeared to perceive their relationships with God as a source of implicit social support. Michael described being "a child of God":

I feel quite secure [...] in who I am, and in God's love for me. I may question or doubt details of the thing but I find myself quite secure in that sense of being accepted by God. [...] Things don't easily throw me off balance because, whatever they are, in a sense my roots are secure.

Michael described a feeling of security "in who I am" arising from his sense of "being accepted by God". His identity was grounded in his relationship with God, and this provided a sense of resilience: "things don't easily throw me off balance because ... my roots are secure". Joanna used the concept of 'acceptance' similarly to tie together the significance of her relationships with God, the "church family" and her "own family":

I am accepted by God, I am accepted as part of the church family, within my own family, and that is what sustains me, and that is what encourages me to achieve.

Joanna described these relationships as the source of both support, "that is what sustains me", and motivation, "that is what encourages me to achieve", echoing Michael's emphasis on having 'secure roots'.

Keith was unwilling to create a rank order of his responses to the 'who am I?' task, but talked in some detail about his relationship with God, his relationship with his wife and children and his priesthood:

Being a very ordinary and simple and straightforward physical human being, I actually rely on my wife and children phenomenally. Although I don't at times feel very loving towards this God that I know has created me, I do actually look towards God for strength, you know, partly because of my physical condition, and as such I believe that, you know, that He shows His love primarily through the family and the personal relationships. [...] So in a nutshell I suppose wife and priesthood are the two that I find, you know, is my life. We're talking about two vocations basically. [...] So really I'm saying that really the two vocations in my life are the most important things in my life, and the things that make my life unique, and different from other people. Inasmuch as I have a happy marriage and so far God seems to be quite content with me, even though He throws things at me.

Keith appeared to see these relationships as a source of support: "I actually rely on my wife and children phenomenally" and "I do actually look towards God for strength". The two relationships appeared to be closely interconnected within his self-understanding, with the belief that "[God] shows His love primarily through the family and the personal relationships" as well as his equation of "wife and priesthood" as "two vocations". This also seemed to underlie a connection in Keith's mind between his "happy marriage" and the impression that "so far God seems to be quite content with me". There is also a strong sense that Keith's experience of God was that of a personal relationship and not just an abstract belief. Keith referred to God's personal involvement in his life, observing that "He throws things at me", as well as his own personal reaction to this, that "I don't at times feel very loving towards this God that I know has created me [...] partly because of my physical condition".
These relationships also appeared to have a dual significance in terms of commonality and distinctiveness. On the one hand, Keith described himself as “a very ordinary and simple and straightforward physical human being” in relying on his wife and children, stressing his commonality with others. On the other hand, he described his “vocations” as husband and priest as “the things that make my life unique, and different from other people”, providing a strong sense of distinctiveness.

The importance of feeling included within humanity, seen earlier in Paul’s description of the item “wounded human being”, which meant “that I have an awful lot in common with everyone around me”, was also reflected within Michael’s account of the difference if he were not “someone with an active inner life” and David’s explanation of the item “a sinner”:

I don’t think it’s true that some people haven't got an inner life, or the potential for it. So I think I'd be less of a person if I wasn't like that. This is one of the ones where I think it would matter if I weren't like that. I think it's part of being fully human. (Michael)

Sinful, because it's an essential part of my understanding of the human predicament and of our relationship with God and of what the Christian faith is about. So to know that I am part of that is important. (David)

Michael described his inner life as “part of being fully human” and suggested he would be “less of a person” without it. But the value of inclusion in humanity was not restricted to the sharing of positive characteristics. For David, being “a sinner” could not be understood as a positive attribute - he later described the possibility of not being a sinner as “completely happy”. However, being a sinner included him within “the human predicament” and “to know that I am part of that is important”.

Chapter 5: Exploring Questions of 'Who am I?'

The theme of 'relationships' can be related to the 'belongingness hypothesis' of Baumeister and Leary (1995), which states that the need for "frequent, nonaversive interactions within an ongoing relational bond" is a "fundamental human motivation" (p. 497). This was reflected here in the strong associations with subjective well-being in participants' accounts of their relationships with friends, family and God, and the negative implications of actual or potential loss of these relationships.

Significantly for this thesis, Baumeister and Leary (1995) suggest that this need is an underlying motive of social identification processes:

Clearly, patterns of group behavior and close relationships can be understood as serving the need to belong. It is thus not necessary to derive all group and intimate affiliation patterns from other motives, such as the fact that groups may confer pragmatic benefits or bolster self-esteem. ... People may simply desire to belong to groups. (p. 521)

The importance of relationships also appeared to have some significance for the construction of distinctiveness among these people. Emphasis was given to feelings of inclusion (cf. Brewer, 1991, 1993a) within humanity (Paul, Keith, Michael, David) as well as "the church family" and "my own family" (Joanna). At times, this involved explicit denials of difference from other people – Keith described himself as a "very ordinary and simple and straightforward physical human being", while David acknowledged that he was "sinful" – as well as negative evaluations of separateness – Christine and Martha preferred to see their parishioners as "friends". On the other hand, relationships were also a source of distinctiveness for Keith, making his life "unique, and different from other people".
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Sense of purpose

A final theme describing the subjective importance of fundamental aspects of participants' identities was entitled 'sense of purpose'. Participants often described the importance of their chosen items in terms of their significance for the fulfilment of divine and/or personal goals or purposes.

For Peter, being "God's child" explained "the purpose of life":

If I wasn't God's child, what would the purpose, what's the purpose of life? What do you have to say to people who have had a bummer of a life? What do you have to say to the child of four who's dying from leukaemia, and in great pain? What do you have to say to suffering, if you are not God's child? Apart from saying the whole thing's a complete screwed up mess.

Peter described his relationship with God as a resource for coping with the problem of "suffering". This reflected Michael's description of the same relationship as a source of 'security', but was generalised to "people who have had a bummer of a life" rather than being solely personal. But where Michael portrayed God as a source of implicit social support through "being accepted by God", Peter portrayed this relationship as making sense of "the purpose of life", protecting against the meaninglessness of "saying the whole thing's a complete screwed up mess".

Mark made a similar point in his description of the item "child of God":

A child of God, that unless you fundamentally see yourself in relationship to the one living God, then everything else is also going to be futile.

Both Peter and Mark described their relationship with God in terms of somewhat abstract notions of "purpose" and "futility". On the other hand,
Joanna described feeling “loved by God” in much more concrete terms as providing a “point” for her actions in ministry and her identity:

That is about my identity so in a sense if I had no sense of being loved by God what is the point of me wanting to serve him? I wouldn't be serving him. I would not be wanting in any way to be part of a church that was geared towards sharing him with people round about. So again I wouldn't be a minister. I wouldn't be myself, really.

Within this extract, Joanna explained the purpose of her role as a “minister” in terms of her feeling of “being loved by God”. This feeling explained her desire to “serve him”, to take part in “a church that [is] geared towards sharing him with people” and hence to be “a minister”. The quotation begins and ends with broader statements of the significance of this relationship for Joanna’s self-understanding. The feeling of being loved by God was initially described as being “about my identity”, hence its force in directing her ministry. But Joanna summarised the effects of this force, suggesting that “I wouldn't be myself, really”, returning from the specifics of ministry again to a more general statement of identity.

The theme of ‘purpose’ has considerable resonance with the previously described theme of ‘internal cohesion’, especially in relation to the priority apparently given by respondents to items which were perceived to have a pervasive effect in shaping other aspects of identity. For Joanna, it seemed as if the purposive force derived from her feeling loved by God is what subjectively makes her who she is, both as “minister” and as “myself”.

However, in addition to playing a unifying role within identity, having a ‘purpose’ was important in orienting participants within the world and in relation to God. Michael, explaining the importance of the item “an altruistic gentle carer”, suggested that this item reflected his ‘motivation in life’, which was the underlying purpose of his priesthood:
'An altruistic gentle carer' was a more general comment about one's approach to the world at large. I mean it's not really an arena in which to exercise petty ambition and try to sort of become more important or to make more money. So I guess it's the flip side of that, it's actually to do with being motivated in life by, I don't know, trying to make the world a better place or something.

Within this extract, Michael appeared to derive a sense of personal value from "trying to make the world a better place" as a positive alternative to more self-interested motives "to exercise petty ambition and try to sort of become more important or to make more money". However, it is possible that the qualifiers, "I don't know" and "or something", attached to this description may have reflected Michael's awareness of making an evaluative judgement which might be understood to conflict with his primary self-description as a "caring, non-judgemental person".

A significant manifestation of the theme of purpose was in participants' discussions of 'callings' - the various tasks to which they felt that they had been called by God. The concept of 'calling' was used by Charles to explain the items "a preacher and "an evangelist":

It's very much part of my understanding of my calling as a clergyman that I am authorised, recognised, ordained, liberated, set aside in order to proclaim the Good News of Jesus Christ, and specifically to be an evangelist and to proclaim that Good News, whatever way I can, to those who do not have a Christian faith.

Here, Charles described his calling to preach and to evangelise using a string of verbs incorporating notions of empowerment ("authorised, recognised, [...] liberated") to perform these tasks, as well as a sense of the distinctiveness of this calling ("ordained [...] set aside").
Ian, a non-stipendiary minister working as a school teacher, described the significance of being a “teacher” in terms of ‘calling’:

Teacher, I've put there as two senses, one professionally as a teacher at school and two as a teacher of people in the church, so that perhaps ought to have come higher on the list but it didn't, and that's there because as I say I like, I feel that's one of the callings that I have is to both teach at school in that sort of sense and also as a priest to teach people about the faith.

For Ian, the concept of ‘calling’ appeared to be a means of integrating the “two senses” in which he saw himself as a teacher, drawing together the two different domains of his working life, “at school” and “as a priest”, and echoing the earlier theme of internal cohesion.

Meanwhile, David used the concept of ‘calling’ to explain the significance of his most important item, “uniquely ‘myself!’”:

Well first 'uniquely myself' because I recognise that I am a priest because God has called me as I am. And while I may not think I have too much of myself, I ought to have at least the same confidence that God has in me.

Here, David described his calling by God as a source of self-confidence, which allowed him to negotiate a balance between the Christian value of humility (“I may not think I have too much of myself”) and preserving a sense of self-esteem (“I ought to have at least the same confidence that God has in me”). There is also a sense of distinctiveness implicit in combining the item itself, “uniquely myself”, with the assertion that “God has called me as I am”. This implies that God had called David individually and that this calling was related to David’s unique nature.
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The value of a sense of purpose as a source of both meaning and individual distinctiveness was also illustrated by Martha, who described re-evaluating her personal quality of ‘irritability’ as she had come to relate it to a sense of her individual “role” in ministry:

I may be trying to rationalise this, but I'm increasingly convinced that one of my roles as a minister, and we may well have very different roles here, is not just to sit around saying ‘yes yes, there there’, but sometimes I think to lead people on, and this may often step out of irritability. It shouldn't I think manifest itself as irritability but I think, what I'm saying is, I don't see myself as a mother but as I hope as someone who leads some people on. It's something I'm increasingly trying to work out even with very old people. I don't think anyone should necessarily be cosseted in their current state, they should be moved on a bit. And I think that may stem a bit from a sense that entrenched positions should be challenged, I think is probably what I'm saying here.

Noting that “we may well have very different roles here”, Martha suggests that one of her own particular roles as a priest, stemming from her personal characteristic of “irritability”, may be to ‘move people on a bit’, rather than being a “mother” figure, “saying ‘yes yes, there there’ ”. A notable feature of this account is that the implicitly negative characteristic of “irritability” is re-evaluated as an asset within the context of ministry.

Having a sense of purpose has been described by Baumeister (1991) as an important way in which people understand their lives as meaningful: “the person’s current activities derive meaning from the ideas of possible future events, states, or outcomes” (p. 36). Thus Martha was able to make sense of her “irritability” by interpreting this characteristic in terms of her purpose to “move people on a bit”. Similarly, Peter made sense of suffering in terms of the “purpose” entailed by being “God’s child”.

Understandings of purpose appeared to be especially central to participants’ constructions of spiritual meaning within their lives, including strategies for coping with suffering or re-evaluating negative characteristics. This was consistent with previous findings concerning the function of religious beliefs as a meaning-making resource. For example, Golsworthy and Coyle (1999) describe the "search for meaning" following bereavement among older adults with Christian beliefs. Within their study, one of the routes by which participants made sense of their loss was by attributing the death to God’s purposes or plans.

The concept of ‘purpose’ also appeared to be closely tied to issues of temporal continuity, internal cohesion and belonging. The sense of ‘calling’ or ‘motivation in life’ might be expected to have a pervasive presence over time and across different domains of experience (cf. Ian, Joanna). Additionally, discussions of ‘calling’ involved relationships with God, “because God has called me as I am” (David), and relationships with others as “evangelist” (Charles) or “teacher” (Ian) or “priest” (David).

Furthermore, understandings of calling or motivation appeared to be a potential source of satisfaction for both distinctiveness (David, Martha) and self-esteem (David, Michael) requirements (cf. Breakwell, 1986a).

*The subjective importance of aspects of ministry*

The second group of themes describes the importance of participants’ chosen items within their understandings of their work as members of the clergy. In the following pages, I describe participants’ portrayals of the nature and purpose of their ministry and their discussions of resources for performing their ministries and for coping with related pressures.
Portrayals of ministry

According to Nichols (1993), the Anglican Church is notable for its theological pluralism. This was reflected in a substantial degree of variation in participants' portrayals of their ministries as they discussed the importance of their chosen self-descriptions. This section reports some of the main areas prioritised within their accounts of ministry. The term 'theme' is thus in some respects a misrepresentation of the ideas discussed here, which are characterised as much by the diversity of perspectives represented as by any fundamental point of consensus.

According to Michael, an important role of the clergy was to "reflect the nature of God to people":

I guess in many ways clergy, like all Christians, but I guess especially clergy should in a sense reflect the nature of God to people, so that we deal with one another the way that God deals with us. [...] It's not just us trying to be nice to people but somehow we're a resource, we're a bit of a channel for something beyond us I guess, the power of God changing people's lives. It sounds rather grand, but it's something to do with that.

This entailed "that we deal with one another the way that God deals with us". Thus, he saw the clergy as "a channel for [...] the power of God changing people's lives", although he acknowledged the potential loss of humility implied by this understanding with the qualification that "it sounds rather grand, but it's something to do with that".

Echoing this understanding, Joanna described being a "listener":

I see listening as being part of being as it were God with a skin on to people in the town.
However, unlike Michael, Joanna seemed to be adopting the perspective of “people in the town” rather than voicing her own perspective, in describing her representative role as “as it were God with a skin on”.

Martha described a sense of empowerment arising from her priesthood:

Well, I've put priest first because that is important and because I suppose I have still lived the bulk of my ministry not as a priest. So I'm conscious of the difference, in that this has given me an authority which I think I'm more conscious of within myself than I think I actually impose. It's that sort of authority I think rather than the one which one would impose on others. Which centres on the celebration of the Eucharist and the Absolution, which I still feel very strange about.

Martha referred to “an authority [...] which centres on the celebration of the Eucharist and the Absolution”, sacraments in which the role of the priest is to represent God. Like Michael, Martha distanced herself from a complete identification with this role, noting that this was “an authority which I think I'm more conscious of within myself than I think I actually impose”, and observing that she felt “very strange” about it.

Neil also referred to a sense of empowerment. Before becoming a priest, he said, “I didn't feel enabled to do what I would be doing now”. But for Neil, this empowerment came from representing people rather than God:

I also feel that I'm not necessarily set aside to be a priest but I have been chosen if you like by people to be a priest and therefore I'm a representative of the people so that's why I think that's first.

Here, Neil rejected the traditional theological language of being “set aside to be a priest” and described himself as “a representative of the people”, because he had been “chosen [...] by people to be a priest”.

Despite acknowledging a sense of empowerment, Neil’s focus was on empowering others. He described himself as an “enabler”, noting that “I don't feel that I am the one that's necessarily got all the right answers”. This appeared to be an important aim of his work as a priest:

I also wouldn’t have had the opportunity to actually help the parishes where I am to actually get to a stage where they can run themselves if I hadn't been a priest.

Far from ‘running a parish’, Neil’s aim was to help his parishes to “get to a stage where they can run themselves”. However, Neil also discussed the pressures against adopting this approach to ministry.

If I wasn't an enabler? It's very easy not to be actually. It's very easy to be on a pedestal and think you know all the answers. And in fact most parishes try and push you that way anyway, and it's very difficult not to slip into it every now and again, too. If you're not careful, you can de-skill everybody you know, saying this is what I want and I do it this way and you're doing it this way as well.

According to Neil, the pressure to “be on a pedestal” was both internal (“it's very easy to [...] think you know all the answers”) and external (“most parishes try and push you that way”). But the effect of succumbing to this pressure would be to “de-skill everybody” in the parish.

The importance of ‘enabling’, and the pressures against, were also noted by Simon, who described himself as a “team builder”:

I put 'team builder' second, because there's a great pressure to be a one man band in this job, but I think, and my experience would be, that it's more effective if you are good at identifying people's gifts and building them into some sort of team.
Despite the "pressure to be a one man band", Simon stated his belief and cited his "experience" that it was "more effective" to make use of "people's gifts" by "building them into some sort of team".

For Timothy, on the other hand, priesthood was "to do with charisma and personality". Timothy described himself as "an individual":

Individuality is very important because that's what flows over into your ministry. If you lose sight of being the person you are, then ultimately you haven't got anything to offer to the job, if you want to call it a job, because it's very much a personality type job. It's to do with charisma and personality.

Timothy portrayed his ministry as derived from his "individuality", noting that "it's very much a personality type job". He elaborated on his understanding of being a "charismatic leader" later in the interview:

I like to think in terms of being a charismatic leader, and that charisma's very important to me. I'm not led by others. I lead and others follow. I might be wrong, but I'm prepared to take the consequences of being wrong as well, and I take full responsibility for everything that I do, rather than say it's someone else's responsibility.

Timothy's description of charismatic leadership - "I lead and others follow" - appeared to be diametrically opposed to Neil's aim of helping his parishes to "get to a stage where they can run themselves". Timothy appeared to be the "one man band" referred to by Simon, an approach which Neil would be likely to understand as 'de-skilling everybody'.

Where Timothy stressed the importance of individuality, according to Gerry, the meaning of his role came from his relationships with others as “member of local church family”, “member of [parish] community” and “member of whole church”, the latter added to his list as no. 10½:

I can't just be vicar without actually being part of the family in the same way that I can't be a father of this household without actually having sons. It's got to belong. [...] 

People often talk about 'church and community', and we do that as a sort of throwaway phrase. But the church has to be part of the community, it can't be separate from it. [...] 

But I would have actually put, you know sort of ten and a half, member of the whole church. Because the Anglican bit is saying something about belonging to something bigger, so I have to put the extra half on.

Thus, where Timothy focused on his individual qualities as a “charismatic leader”, Gerry focused on his location within a series of contexts the “local church family”, the “community” and the “whole church”. In each case, Gerry portrayed his inclusion within the wider context as necessary: “I can't just be vicar without actually being part of the family [...] the church has to be part of the community” or as a matter of definition “the Anglican bit is saying something about belonging to something bigger”.

The differences between participants in their emphasis on leadership or enabling and on individuality or relationships appeared to centre on an issue of distinctiveness. Thus it is interesting to compare Mark's account of being “a priest” with Jenny's account of being “the lady next door”: 
In order to be an Anglican clergyman, I have a very high view of seeing that you're not just a lay person who's dressed up in clerical clothes, but in fact are holding a tradition of two thousand years and holding a distinctive ministry within the Body of Christ. (Mark)

There's nothing special about me, I'm just an ordinary person doing this. It's my vocation. But I'm not up on a pedestal and if people think I am, or think I'm putting myself there, then again there's not going to be good communication. So I'm just like anybody else they might know, I just wear a funny collar. (Jenny)

Where Mark advanced a "very high view" of "holding a tradition of two thousand years and holding a distinctive ministry within the Body of Christ", Jenny described herself as "just an ordinary person" and "not up on a pedestal". Furthermore, where Mark stressed that "you're not just a lay person who's dressed up in clerical clothes", Jenny argued that "I'm just like anybody else they might know, I just wear a funny collar".

These differences appeared to have some resonance with the distinction between forms of churchmanship described in the preceding chapter. On the one hand, an emphasis on distinctiveness, empowerment and leadership was consistent with the Catholic doctrine of the Apostolic Succession, which asserts the sacramental nature of priesthood and the connection of the clergy to St. Peter. On the other hand, an emphasis on inclusion in relationships and enabling or team building was consistent with the Evangelical doctrine of the 'priesthood of all believers', according to which the ordained priest has no special ontological status. Although categories of churchmanship rarely appeared in participants' chosen self-description items, it is worth noting that both Mark ('distinctiveness') and Timothy ('charisma') located themselves elsewhere in the interview within the Catholic tradition of the Church of England, whereas Simon ('team building') located himself within the Evangelical tradition.
A central aspect of ministry for Evangelical and Catholic participants was communication. This was seen earlier in Charles’ calling “to proclaim the Good News of Jesus Christ”. James described being a “good communicator” as the single most important feature of “being a clergyman”:

I think in terms of being a clergyman, from a biblical point of view, if one was writing a job description there would actually only be one thing on it. And that would be 'apt to teach', to quote the Bible. [...] So the job is a teaching, communication job actually.

Citing the Bible as authority, James described “being a clergyman” as “a teaching, communication job”, an observation echoed within Simon’s description of the nature of his “job” as a priest:

A lot of my job is about teaching either in the sense of preaching up front, or going to schools and talking about Jesus Christ, or organising home groups, which we do a lot of in our church, that sort of thing.

Simon described several different aspects of his work as being “about teaching”. This applied to his “preaching up front” in church, his “talking about Jesus Christ” in schools and his “organising home groups”.

Matthew, discussing his self-description as a “proclaimer of the Good News”, stressed that communication went beyond explicit “teaching”:

What proclaiming the Good News means of course has many, many different facets to it. St Francis once said, 'preach the Gospel, use words when necessary'. In other words, it's much more than what you say, it's about what you are. I would hope that the Gospel is something which is integral to who I am.
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Matthew’s assertion that “it’s much more than what you say, it’s about what you are”, together with his stated hope “that the Gospel is something which is integral to who I am”, echoed Michael’s initial description of Christian ministry as “reflect[ing] the nature of God to people”. For Michael, this involved being “a caring, non-judgemental person”:

As I see it as a Christian, it is the fact that God accepts us and loves us as children whoever we are, whatever we’ve done, that actually is the sort of, the spring of all our completeness as people and so forth. I suppose grace is the word for it. And I think trying to be like that with people, or perhaps not just trying to be like that but being like that with people, I think it sets them free to grow or to be healed or to change, perhaps to dare to open their lives up to receive God.

Michael suggested that members of the clergy should accept and love people “whoever [they] are, whatever [they’ve] done”, rather than being “judgemental”. This focus on showing unconditional acceptance and love was shared by Peter, discussing the importance of being “welcoming”:

We should engage with people where they are at, in order to show them God’s love, and God’s purposes for them. [...] And engage with them in a way that is non-threatening and accepting. That's your starting point. And I think that's what Jesus did so very well in his ministry. The religious people of his time, the Pharisees, got really uptight about him talking to prostitutes and tax collectors. Yet he came alongside them, and he didn't endorse their actions, but he came alongside them as people and loved them.

Peter's focus was on ‘coming alongside’ people “where they are at” and, without necessarily ‘endorsing their actions’, to ‘accept’ and ‘love’ them. Like Michael, Peter appeared to see this as an integral part of “reflect[ing] the nature of God to people”, noting that “that’s what Jesus did so very well in his ministry [...] talking to prostitutes and tax collectors”. Michael,
asked the difference if he were not “caring and non-judgemental”, noted that this approach was not universal among the clergy:

I think one does actually meet people who aren't, one even meets clergy who aren't, very noticeably that, one meets judgemental clergy. I would hate that, I'd be an entirely different person, really. I mean it's crucial to me. I rely so much on other people's acceptance of me because I've made some dreadful mistakes, and really I just, I'd feel wretched if people weren't tolerant of me. [...] I value it very highly in receiving it, so I think I'd want to value it very highly in giving it.

It was “very noticeable”, said Michael, that “one meets judgemental clergy”, which he would “hate” to be, noting an equivalence between the needs of his parishioners and his own reliance on “other people’s acceptance of me” - “I value it very highly in receiving it, so I think I'd want to value it very highly in giving it”.

In selecting their important self-description items, participants covered a wide range of aspects of their role in the clergy. Some of these aspects appeared to reflect an implicit tension or dialogue between Evangelical and Catholic positions within the clergy (cf. Nichols, 1993).

On the other hand, many of the aspects described here did not appear to be fundamentally incompatible with each other, but could be understood better as differences of emphasis within the multiplicity of roles expected of the clergy. As Johnson (1970) notes, the parish minister “serves as priest, preacher, pastor, teacher, administrator, organizer, and promoter [...] and is] pulled in many directions by the many needs, desires, and expectations of the people around him [sic]” (pp. 51-52; cf. Blizzard, 1956). It is not surprising that individual participants should place different emphases on these various roles within their accounts of ministry.
Resources for ministry

Participants also discussed the importance of a range of qualities and circumstances in contributing to their effectiveness in ministry and to their ability to cope with the pressures of ministry. This section describes some of the more commonly mentioned constructs.

Both Simon and Jenny stressed the importance of empathy:

I've put 'compassionate' first because a lot of my ministry is involved with dealing with people and I think unless you're prepared to have some ability to feel with people, which is what compassion means, then you're not going to be very good at the job. (Simon)

I've put number one against 'someone who feels'. And that's because I think it's very important in ministry to be able to understand emotions and feelings. Because generally speaking that's what you're coming up against. And if you feel yourself, you understand other people feeling. (Jenny)

Simon described the necessity of having "some ability to feel with people", while Jenny saw it as important that "you feel yourself" in order to "understand other people feeling". The necessity of empathy came from the nature of their ministry. According to Simon, "a lot of my ministry is involved with dealing with people" while, according to Jenny, "emotions and feelings" are "generally speaking [...] what you're coming up against". Jenny later described the possibility of not being "someone who feels", suggesting that "I wouldn't be able to be much of a comfort", and comparing herself to "clergypeople who don't seem to feel" whom she described as "not very comforting".

A related aspect was the importance of being "somebody whom people can trust". Neil discussed his role as a "confidante":

I think you have to be somebody whom people can trust, people who you know would come to you and feel that you're not going to just go and gas about it to anybody else, and you'd want to be somebody who they can talk to and they know that you're not going to be shocked by what they're saying, or offer any trite answers, you know, God will sort that out, or anything like that.

Neil referred to three aspects of trust. He should be trusted to preserve confidences ("not going to just go and gas about it to anybody else"), to be accepting ("not going to be shocked by what they're saying") and to be helpful (not to "offer any trite answers" such as "God will sort that out").

Both empathy and trust were important qualities for the pastoral aspects of ministry. In connection with this, a number of participants prioritised self-descriptions which they described as giving them "common ground" (John) with their parishioners. Richard described how being "married" helped him to "connect in a pastoral situation with people".

I also think there's a great value, in being the leader of a community, a person who is involved in marrying people and counselling people that are maybe having difficulties in their marriage, basically to have the - because the other person will have the confidence that you know what this is all about and that you're not just talking out of a textbook - I think it's helpful that you have the experience of an ongoing relationship yourself, the struggles and the joys, and that enables you to connect in a pastoral situation with people.

According to Richard, the fact that he was married gave people "confidence" in his ministry, that he was "not just talking out of a textbook", especially within his roles of "marrying people and counselling people that are maybe having difficulties in their marriage".
Similarly, John described the importance of his self-descriptions as “retired businessman”, “soldier in the war” and “former sports player as young man” in providing “common ground” with his parishioners:

As a retired businessman, I've put that fairly high because it means that I can talk to quite a lot of men in the parish, and I can find common ground with them in that quite a number of them are businessmen. And a soldier in the war means that I can talk to older men, nearly all of whom have either been soldiers or sailors or airmen or something like that. And the same reason that I played sport, I can find a contact with men in the parish as having played lots of sports as a young man, and so did they.

John described the significance of these aspects of his identity in broadly equivalent terms, that he could “find common ground with”, “talk to” and “find a contact with” those towards whom his ministry was directed.

Participants also stressed the importance of intellectual gifts for the fulfilment of their ministries. For example, Simon discussed the significance of his self-description as “imaginative”:

I put 'imaginative' fourth, because modern culture is changing fast, and it seems to me that if you don't have any imagination to try and work out where it's going and why it's going there, you won't really be able to steer the church very effectively to make it relevant.

Simon described imagination as contributing to his ‘effectiveness’ in making the church “relevant” to “modern culture”. Where the resources of empathy, trust and points of contact discussed previously were related to the pastoral aspect of ministry, Simon related the resource of imagination to leadership, in his role “to steer the church [...] to make it relevant”.
Similarly, Mark discussed the importance of being “an intellectual”:

An intellectual because unless you're able intellectually to engage with the culture of the world and the questions that have to come out of being mad enough to believe in God, to believe that God would reveal himself supremely as an obscure Jew two thousand years ago, who ended up on a cross, and to claim that either of those realities has any impact on the daily life people live now, or its future, one is going to be less effective as a priest.

Echoing Simon, Mark portrayed the importance of being an intellectual in terms of being “effective as a priest” by engaging with “the culture of the world”. Mark described the “questions” posed by “the world” to the priest, which focused on being “mad enough to believe” that there was a God, that Jesus was God (“an obscure Jew two thousand years ago”) and that these beliefs were relevant to “the daily life people live now, or its future”.

James’ description of ministry as “a teaching, communication job” was reflected in his prioritisation of “wanting to communicate faith”:

That is something that's very important to me, not in any way brow-beating other people, because I've got very much a gentle approach, both personally and something that I encourage in the church, too, that faith is communicated in a natural easy going way. I mean not pressurising people, not button-holing them in any way too, but making it easy for them to sort of get alongside, build relationships, and use those as bridges to communicate faith in some way to people.

Here, James stressed his personal approach to communication, which he described elsewhere as “helping people gently towards faith”, distinguishing this tactic especially from “brow-beating”, “pressurising” or “button-holing” people. Later, James described himself as “a good communicator, which I genuinely think I am”.

Chapter 5: Exploring Questions of 'Who am I?'

Meanwhile, Michael noted the importance of maintaining a relationship with God, describing himself as "someone with an active inner life":

Some of the people I deal with, perhaps I misunderstand them, but a lot of them seem to live very much on the surface, I guess partly because they're so busy and pressured. And I think that's quite dangerous for somebody who's a clergyman, we can't just be reacting on the hoof to everything, I think we actually need to have some roots [...] and to be, I don't know I guess in spiritual language actually somebody who walks with God.

Michael contrasted his "roots" as "somebody who walks with God" with living "on the surface" and "reacting on the hoof to everything", suggesting that this would be "quite dangerous for somebody who's a clergyman".

Meanwhile, John referred to the importance of support from his wife, without which his ministry "wouldn't be possible", while Grace described the value of being single and retired:

The fact that I'm married is important because my ministry wouldn't be possible without the support of my wife. (John)

The fact that I'm single, the fact that I am now retired is a great advantage of course because it gives me time to do this sort of thing. (Grace)

Finally, some participants described the importance of inner resources for coping with the pressures of ministry. Jenny noted that "you need to be happy with your own company", discussing her self-description as "not quite who I'd like to be but close", while Michael attached a similar importance to being "an easy-going, relaxed person":
I think you need to be happy with your own company and with yourself in this job, it's a tremendously demanding job, and if you don't feel comfortable and, you know, able to get on with your thoughts and your own feelings, then you're in trouble. (Jenny)

One meets plenty of folks who aren't. I would hate not to be like that. I mean really, I'd go bananas I think if I just couldn't say well stuff it all sometimes and sort of shrug and everything. I don't think I hold, hang on to anxieties and guilt and pain and nasty stuff too much. A lot of it washes over I think, I just, I tend to think there's not many things that a good pint of beer can't cure really. And I think, yeah I'd hate to sort of hang on to troubles too much, because plenty come my way as a clergyman, and I guess as a human being. (Michael)

Echoing Jenny's description of her ministry as a "tremendously demanding job", Michael noted that "plenty [of troubles] come my way as a clergyman, and I guess as a human being". Thus, Jenny noted that she would be "in trouble" if she did not feel "comfortable" with her own "thoughts" and "feelings", while Michael suggested that he would "go bananas" if he were not "an easy-going, relaxed person". But Michael's relaxed nature allows him to cope with "nasty stuff" - "I tend to think there's not many things that a good pint of beer can't cure really".

The theme of 'resources for ministry' might be connected with the efficacy principle, hypothesised within identity process theory (Breakwell, 1993). A great deal of research has demonstrated the importance for subjective well-being and health of maintaining a sense of self-efficacy (e.g., Bandura, 1982, 1997; Seligman, 1975). Efficacy has also been understood as an important basis for self-esteem (Gecas & Schwalbe, 1983). Here, participants described the value of intellectual and social skills, as well as common ground, in performing their ministries, as well as the importance of both social support and personal resources for coping with pressure.
Summary and General Discussion

The overarching aim of this analysis was to introduce the interview participants as people through their expressions of identity. Certain elements of identity appeared to be especially important to many of the participants. These were Christianity and relationships with God, priesthood, family relationships and inclusion within humanity.

A particular focus was to identify themes summarising participants’ accounts of why particular elements of identity were especially important to them. The most important items appeared to be those which gave participants a sense of temporal continuity, contributed to the internal cohesion of identity, located participants within spiritual and social relationships and gave them a sense of purpose in their lives.

Participants also listed as important items which they associated specifically with their work as members of the clergy. Overarching themes were the nature and purpose of their ministries and resources enabling them to perform their ministries and to cope with related pressures.

Methodological issues

It is not assumed that the analysis presented above is the only reading which could have been made of the material. Indeed it is an inevitable feature of IPA that the researcher’s conceptual framework is implicated in constructing interpretations (J. A. Smith, 1996a). However, a concerted attempt has been made to give voice to participants’ own perspectives within this chapter. Firstly, the data were generated using non-directive questions at the beginning of the interview, before the main theoretical focus of the interview had been introduced. Secondly, care has been taken to keep the analysis close to the data, with constant reference to the
transcripts at all stages of the analytic process. Thirdly, a substantial amount of raw data has been quoted in the report, allowing the reader some freedom to engage directly with participants' verbal accounts.\textsuperscript{14}

A second question is whether the participants cited here are understood to speak for all of those interviewed, or for participants in the questionnaire study, the Anglican clergy or wider populations. While this question cannot be answered definitively, it was certainly intended that the issues identified would have some relevance to all participants in the studies reported in this thesis. Interviews selected for the main formative stages of the analysis involved parish priests only, as did the questionnaire study, but reflected as broad a range of age, sex, position and theological orientation as possible. Themes identified from these interviews appeared to be strongly represented in the remaining interviews, implying a degree of homogeneity across the interview sample. Furthermore, most themes appeared to be related to psychological constructs which had been studied elsewhere and therefore did not seem to be peculiar to the clergy.

\textit{Theoretical implications}

It is important to clarify the relationship between the phenomenological themes above and identity principles, as described by Breakwell (1986a, 1993). Identity principles have been defined here as pressures towards particular states within identity. However, it is not assumed that these pressures are necessarily accessible on a phenomenological level. Thus the themes described above are not equated with identity principles.

Nevertheless, if the processes shaping identity are guided by a particular set of identity principles, it would seem reasonable to expect that some

\textsuperscript{14} It is acknowledged that this freedom is limited by the selection of data presented, as well as the interpretation imposed on the data through punctuation.
trace of these principles should be detectable within people's accounts of important aspects of their identities. Of the identity principles introduced in chapter 2, those most strongly represented here were the continuity principle, which was clearly related to the theme of 'temporal continuity', and the efficacy principle, which appeared to be related to the theme of 'resources for ministry'. Participants described the importance of elements of identity which they associated with a sense of continuity over time and with a sense of efficacy within their ministry. Concerns for self-esteem and distinctiveness were less salient, although both surfaced occasionally.

Concerns for 'internal cohesion' and a 'sense of purpose' might both be understood partly in terms of achieving a meaningful identity. Internal cohesion involved constructing relationships between elements with the effect that identity could be perceived as a meaningful whole; having a sense of purpose, in addition to enhancing internal cohesion, involved locating oneself meaningfully in relation to the world and God. Meanwhile 'relationships' appeared to be a significant source of value in identity through the medium of social support (Cohen & Wills, 1985), as well as more general feelings of social inclusion (Brewer, 1993a).

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have examined how a group of members of the Anglican clergy described their own identities, focusing on what was important to them and why they believed it was important. As far as possible, I have used participants' own words to illustrate the themes I have extracted. While the intention of this chapter has been to explore without theoretical preconceptions, these themes provide a phenomenological context in which the theoretical constructs discussed elsewhere can be viewed. Echoes of these themes appear from time to time through the rest of the thesis.
Chapter 6
EVALUATING MODELS OF IDENTITY MOTIVATION

I am what I am,
And what I am needs no excuses.
JERRY HERMAN - La Cage Aux Folles

In this chapter, I present analyses of data from the questionnaire study testing the importance of motivational principles of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy, as well as purpose and closeness, in shaping the perceived centrality of multiple aspects of identity.

Motivational Models

The central aim of these analyses was the evaluation and comparison of three competing models of identity motivation: the self-esteem model implied by social identity theory (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), entailing that the processes shaping identity are driven by a need to maintain self-esteem; the model of identity process theory (Breakwell, 1987, 1993), according to which identity processes are guided by multiple principles of maintaining self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy; and an 'expanded model', customised with the addition of two further principles of maintaining a sense of 'purpose' and a sense of 'closeness to others', which were relevant to members of the clergy.

Breakwell (1987, 1993) stresses that the four principles hypothesised within identity process theory are unlikely to be an exhaustive list of the motivations underlying identity dynamics, especially when cultural and historical differences are taken into account. Hence, an 'expanded model' was also tested here, incorporating two possible additional principles which might be especially relevant to members of the clergy.
Within preliminary analyses of the interview data\textsuperscript{15}, two themes which were identified both as important dimensions of identity and as essential properties of the abstract 'individual' were a sense of purpose and a sense of closeness to others. These were understood as culturally valued constructs which might have some motivational force in directing identity processes among the Anglican clergy. Furthermore, the former theme appeared to be conceptually related to the suggestion by Abrams and Hogg (1988) of a need for 'meaning' underlying identity, and the latter to hypotheses of a motive for 'inclusion' (Brewer, 1993a), 'affiliation' (Markowe, 1996) or 'belonging' (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) within theories of identity dynamics. These constructs were translated here into potential additional principles of purpose and closeness.

**Perceived Centrality**

The motivational models described above were applied to the empirical problem of predicting the perceived centrality of elements of identity content within participants' subjective identity structures. At this point, it will be useful to clarify what is meant by perceived centrality.

The concept of perceived centrality is understood here in terms of the dynamic model of representational structure and processes outlined in the first chapter of this thesis. Following this model, identity structure comprises the subjective organisation of elements within identity, which is continually formed and transformed throughout the life-span, the product of interacting processes of perception, cognition and communication. Thus the perceived centrality of elements within identity is not understood in terms of a fixed model of identity structure, but as a 'snapshot' or a cross-sectional view of the outcome of these processes at a single moment.

\textsuperscript{15} The questionnaire was designed before the interpretative phenomenological analyses reported here in chapters 5, 7 and 8 were completed.
The question of which elements of identity will be perceived as most central has received comparatively little direct attention within most social psychological research into identity, with greater attention focused on the prediction of short-term fluctuations in the contextual salience of elements (J. C. Turner, 1987). However, the perceived centrality of a given element of identity is likely to be of substantial relevance to predictions of affective and behavioural consequences connected with that element.

Perceived centrality is not equated with identification, although these concepts are closely linked. Identification is understood as referring to the subjective positioning of oneself in relation to other members of a group or category within a 'social' conceptual field. Perceived centrality, on the other hand, refers to the subjective positioning of an element of identity in relation to other elements of identity within an 'individual' conceptual field. Thus the concept of perceived centrality (a) is not restricted to group or category identifications but can be applied to any element of identity, and (b) refers to the relationships between elements within identity rather than treating each element in isolation. Thus the conceptualisation of perceived centrality here reflects the assumptions of this thesis.

**Rationale Underlying the Predictions**

An important theoretical issue in addressing motivational issues empirically is not to confuse motives pushing towards particular states with the states themselves. Thus, the arousal of a motive for self-esteem, for example, cannot be inferred directly from an individual's level of state or trait self-esteem. As theorised here, identity principles were not states of identity with particular implications for affect or behaviour, but pressures towards particular states within identity. It was not believed that the identity states measured were causing each other directly, but that the relationships between them were shaped by these pressures.
The underlying rationale of the study was as follows: if the various processes shaping identity are guided by motives pushing towards certain states within identity, then it should follow that those parts of identity which best satisfy these motives will be privileged by the processes, and will therefore be perceived as most central within subjective identity structures. Thus it was expected that the perceived centrality of multiple content items within the identity of each participant would be predicted by the degree to which each item was perceived as a source of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, purpose and closeness.

Predictions

Following the implicit model of identity dynamics underlying social identity theory (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), it was hypothesised (H1) that participants' ratings of the level of self-esteem associated with multiple items of identity content would be a positive predictor of the perceived centrality of these items within identity.

As an initial test of the model of identity process theory (Breakwell, 1992), it was similarly hypothesised (H2) that ratings of the levels of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy associated with identity content items would all be positive predictors of perceived centrality.

In addition to demonstrating the role of identity principles of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy in shaping identity, an important issue was to establish the added value derived from theorising four principles, as in the basic model of identity process theory, as opposed to just a self-esteem principle, as in social identity theory. Hence, it was hypothesised (H3) that including distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy would substantially improve predictions of perceived centrality in comparison with a model incorporating only self-esteem as predictor.
As a more rigorous test of the predictive value of each principle within this model, it was also hypothesised (H4) that each predictor individually would make a significant improvement to the modelling of perceived centrality after controlling for effects of the other three predictors.

In order to test the ‘expanded model’, it was hypothesised that purpose and closeness would behave similarly to the existing principles in the prediction of perceived centrality of identity content (H5), that including these two constructs would improve predictive power in comparison with the basic identity process theory model (H6), and that each of the six predictors within this model would significantly improve the model fit after controlling for the other five predictors (H7).

Identity process theory also suggests that there may be situational or individual variations in the relative strengths of identity principles. Although it was not feasible within this study to separate chronic individual differences from contextual fluctuations, it was possible to estimate the extent of variation between participants in the weights of each predictor at the time of responding to the questionnaire. It was hypothesised (H8) that allowing for variation of this form would significantly improve the fit of each of the three models.

Method

The method is described in full within chapter 4. Participants completed sections of a questionnaire, in which they freely generated items of identity content, then rated these items on two dimensions measuring perceived centrality, followed by six single dimensions measuring associations of the items with feelings of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, ‘purpose’ and ‘closeness to others’.
Results

The analyses were conducted in two stages. A preliminary analysis of within-subject correlations showed that ratings of the identity content items on all six dimensions were related to ratings of perceived centrality. Models of identity motivation were then evaluated and compared in a series of multilevel regression analyses using the MIXREG software package (Hedeker & Gibbons, 1996). Using an alpha level of .01, H1 to H6 and H8 were fully supported, while H7 received partial support.

Measure of perceived centrality

Ratings on the two scales measuring perceived centrality were strongly correlated with each other across all of the identity content items ($r = .699, N = 1657$). Hence, the mean of the ratings on these two scales was taken as the perceived centrality score for each item.

Preliminary analysis

The first analysis involved estimating the strength of each hypothesised principle within each participant from the within-participant correlations between ratings of the identity items on each dimension.

Correlations were calculated within each participant between the measure of perceived centrality and ratings of the identity content items for self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, purpose and closeness. The raw correlations were subjected to Fisher's $r$ to $z'$ transformation, so that they would be suitable for use in inferential statistics. The resulting variables were approximately normally distributed, and were interpreted as measuring the strength of each hypothesised principle in predicting the perceived centrality of identity content within each individual.
One-sample *t* tests were used to test null hypotheses stating that each of the six predictors, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, self-esteem, purpose and closeness, was unrelated to perceived centrality. The null hypotheses predicted that variables measuring the strength of each principle would be distributed around a mean of zero. All six null hypotheses were rejected (table 6.1).

**Table 6.1**

*T*-tests of mean *z* scores showing intra-individual relationships between each predictor and perceived centrality of identity items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Mean <em>z</em> (r) a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.727 (.621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.477 (.444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>.794 (.661)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.673 (.587)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>.837 (.684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>.513 (.472)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>146</th>
<th>.489</th>
<th>17.95***</th>
<th>145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>12.09***</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>17.92***</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>15.33***</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>17.08***</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>12.11***</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Figures in brackets after the mean *z* scores are the corresponding values of Pearson's *r*. These had no immediate function in the analyses, but are included here as an aid to interpretation.

b This is the *t* value for the difference of each mean *z* score from a null value of zero.

*** *p* < .001.

This provided initial support for hypotheses H1 and H2, that the perceived centrality of multiple items of identity content would be predicted by the degree to which each item was perceived as a source of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy, as well as hypothesis H5, that purpose and closeness would behave similarly to these four constructs.
**Multilevel regression analyses**

Having established that ratings of the identity items for satisfaction of all six hypothesised principles were generally related to ratings of perceived centrality within subjective identity structures, the main analyses focused on the comparison of three models of identity motivation, the self-esteem hypothesis (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), identity process theory (Breakwell, 1992) and the ‘expanded model’, across the data set as a whole.

This involved treating the identity item and not the individual as the primary unit of analysis, since the hypotheses were based on the modelling of variance between items within individuals in the outcome measure of perceived centrality. A traditional multiple regression approach would ignore the clustering of items within individuals, which might lead to an underestimation of error variance and hence to an increased probability of making type I errors (Barcikowski, 1981). We therefore opted for a multilevel regression approach, which would avoid this potential pitfall (Hox, 1995; Kreft & de Leeuw, 1998).

Multilevel regression is an analogue of traditional multiple regression suitable for the treatment of nested data structures - in this case identity items nested within individuals. Using this analysis, it was possible to evaluate the relative contributions made by different combinations of principles to the prediction of perceived centrality of the identity content items within participants, and thus to test models of identity motivation.

Multilevel regression also allows the researcher to estimate variation between higher level units - here, differences between participants - in the magnitude of lower level relationships within a model. This was used to address hypothesis H8, that there would be significant variation between participants in the weights of the principles within each model.
All multilevel regression analyses were computed with the MIXREG software package (Hedeker & Gibbons, 1996), which performed 20 iterations of the EM algorithm followed by a Fisher-scoring solution with convergence criterion of .001.

Participant mean centring

For conceptual reasons, it was necessary to transform the raw data before they could be used to test hypotheses H1 to H8. These hypotheses were concerned with modelling the variance between identity items within the individual, and not the variance between individuals: it would be meaningless within the current theoretical framework to aim to model individual differences in 'perceived centrality'. However, as noted by Bryk and Raudenbush (1992, pp. 117-121), the regression weights obtained in an analysis using the raw data would represent a combination of both within-individual and between-individual relationships.

To obtain unbiased estimates of the within-individual regression weights in each model, a strategy of participant mean centring was used (cf. group mean centring: Hofmann & Gavin, 1998; Kreft & de Leeuw, 1998; Raudenbush, 1989), in which the six predictors $\bar{x}_j$ were calculated as deviations from the participant mean,

$$\bar{x}_j = x_{ij} - \bar{x}_j$$

where $x_{ij}$ was the raw rating of the $i^{th}$ identity item by the $j^{th}$ participant, and $\bar{x}_j$ was the mean rating of all identity items by the $j^{th}$ participant.
Where group mean centring is used in multilevel regression, it is common practice to reintroduce group means into the model as separate predictors (Hofmann & Gavin, 1998; Kreft & de Leeuw, 1998). This would not have been appropriate here for several reasons. Firstly, as already stated, the hypotheses concerned within-individual and not between-individual effects - between-individual effects would have no obvious interpretation here. Secondly, including these extraneous variables would have contaminated the likelihood ratio tests which we used to compare models. Thirdly, the inclusion or exclusion of participant means did not substantially change any of the model parameters reported, which was to be expected as the participant means by definition shared no variance with participant mean centred ratings (see Raudenbush, 1989).

After participant mean centring, all six predictors still showed substantial zero order correlations with perceived centrality ($r = .37$ to $.54$). Predictors were also extensively correlated with each other (table 6.2).

Table 6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-esteem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Continuity</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Efficacy</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Purpose</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Closeness</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Centrality</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Values below diagonal use raw ratings of the association of items with the hypothesised principles, values above diagonal use participant mean centred ratings. Scores for perceived centrality were not centred.
Baseline model and strategy for model comparison

As a baseline for subsequent model comparisons, a 'null model' was computed first in which the ratings of perceived centrality were predicted using only a random intercept - a constant within participants, which is allowed to vary randomly between participants. Table 6.3 summarises the parameter estimates calculated for this model.

Table 6.3
Summary of baseline multilevel regression model predicting perceived centrality of identity content items (Level 1: n = 1593) nested within individuals (Level 2: n = 142) using random intercept only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed parameter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviance = 5453.26

*Note.* Deviance is calculated as \(-2 \times \log \text{likelihood}\).

This model provides a baseline measure of model fit, the deviance, which can be compared statistically with that of more complex models using a likelihood ratio test: the difference in deviance between two nested models is distributed as \(\chi^2\) with degrees of freedom equal to the number of extra parameters estimated within the more complex model (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992, pp. 55-56; Hedeker & Gibbons, 1996, p. 233).

This model also provides a baseline estimate of the residual variance within participants (level 1), which can be compared with that of later models in order to estimate \(R^2_w\), defined as the proportional reduction in
mean squared error for predicting variance within participants using a given model in comparison with the baseline model (after Snijders & Bosker, 1994). Following this definition, $R^2_w$ is calculated by

$$R^2_w = \frac{\sigma_0^2 - \sigma_i^2}{\sigma_0^2}$$

where $\sigma_0^2$ is the level 1 residual variance of the null model and $\sigma_i^2$ is the level 1 residual variance of the model being evaluated (Bryk & Raudenbush, 1992, p. 70; Snijders & Bosker, 1994).

It should be stressed that the conceptualisation of $R^2_w$ within multilevel models is somewhat limited. It is meaningful only for models which do not include random slopes, and it is not used to make statistical inferences (see Kreft & de Leeuw, 1998, pp. 115-119). Estimates of $R^2_w$ have been included here only where appropriate as an aid to interpretation. Likelihood ratio tests have always been used for model comparisons.

**Self-esteem model**

The first model of identity motivation evaluated here was the self-esteem model implied by social identity theory (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This was modelled by adding a fixed slope for self-esteem to the baseline model. Parameter estimates are summarised in table 6.4 (a).

---

16 Snijders and Bosker (1994) also propose an alternative definition of $R^2$ at level 1 as “the proportional reduction in mean squared prediction error for predicting individual values [here, individual item ratings]” (p. 342). Both conceptually and operationally, this definition involves combining within- and between-participant variance. Since I did not aspire to model between-participant variance here, I have used the formula of Bryk and Raudenbush (1992), which better reflects the theoretical aims of this chapter.
Table 6.4
Summary of multilevel regression models predicting perceived centrality of identity content items (Level 1: $n = 1593$) nested within individuals (Level 2: $n = 142$) according to the self-esteem hypothesis (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), using (a) random intercept and fixed slope and (b) random intercept and random slope.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Model with fixed slope</th>
<th></th>
<th>(b) Model with random slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>26.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random slope variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviance = 4882.54

Deviance = 4791.48

*Note.* Deviance is calculated as $-2 \times \log$ likelihood. Values of $z$ are based on the parameter estimates and standard errors within the model. Values of $\chi^2$ for each parameter are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing the model deviance with that of an alternative model without that parameter.

**p < .001**
Within this model, the parameter estimate for self-esteem was clearly significant ($z = 26.61, p < .001$). Additionally, the model as a whole represented a significant improvement over the baseline model without self-esteem as a predictor (likelihood ratio test: $\chi^2 = 570.73, df = 1, p < .001$). Comparing the residual variance at level 1 to that of the baseline model gave an $R^2_{w}$ of 32.5%. Thus H1 was strongly supported.

*Identity process theory*

To evaluate hypotheses H2 to H4, a multilevel model based on identity process theory (Breakwell, 1992) was computed, in which fixed slopes for distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy were added to the existing slope for self-esteem. Parameter estimates are summarised in table 6.5 (a).

Supporting H2, all four constructs were significant predictors of perceived centrality within this model ($z = 4.18$ to 14.44, all $p < .001$), and the model provided a significant reduction in deviance compared to the baseline model (likelihood ratio test: $\chi^2 = 997.53, df = 4, p < .001$).

Supporting H3, this model also provided a significant reduction in deviance compared to the previous model based on the self-esteem hypothesis (likelihood ratio test: $\chi^2 = 426.80, df = 3, p < .001$). $R^2_{w}$ was calculated at 49.7%, which appeared conceptually to represent a substantial improvement in predictive value over the previous model.

In order to test H4, four additional models were computed, assessing the effect of individually eliminating each of the predictors. All four predictors made significant individual improvements to the model fit, after accounting for the other predictors (likelihood ratio tests: $\chi^2 = 17.40$ to 195.22, $df = 1$, all $p < .001$). Thus H4 was also supported.
Table 6.5

Summary of multilevel regression models predicting perceived centrality of identity content items (Level 1: $n = 1593$) nested within individuals (Level 2: $n = 142$) according to identity process theory (Breakwell, 1992), using (a) random intercept and fixed slopes and (b) random intercept and random slopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Model with fixed slopes</th>
<th></th>
<th>(b) Model with random slopes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed parameters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>4.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>5.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>14.44***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>11.01***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random slopes variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.5 (continued).

**Residual variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>-.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.</td>
<td>-.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviance = 4455.73

Deviance = 4247.90

*Note.* Deviance is calculated as \(-2 \times \text{log likelihood}\). Values of \(z\) are based on the parameter estimates and standard errors within the model. Values of \(\chi^2\) for each parameter are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing the model deviance with that of an alternative model without that parameter.

**\(p < .01\)**

**\(p < .001\)**
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The 'expanded model'

In order to evaluate hypotheses H5 to H7, a multilevel regression model was computed based on the 'expanded model', in which fixed slopes for purpose and closeness were added to the slopes for self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy estimated within the previous model. Parameter estimates are summarised in table 6.6 (a).

Supporting H5, both purpose and closeness were significant predictors of perceived centrality within this model ($z = 9.07$ and $6.70$, both $p < .001$), and the model provided a significant reduction in deviance compared to the baseline model (likelihood ratio test: $\chi^2 = 1145.39$, $df = 6$, $p < .001$).

Supporting H6, this model also provided a significant reduction in deviance compared to the previous model based on identity process theory (likelihood ratio test: $\chi^2 = 147.86$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$). $R_w^2$ was calculated at 54.6%, which appeared conceptually to represent a modest improvement in predictive value over the previous model.

In order to test H7, six additional models were computed, assessing the effect of individually eliminating each of the predictors. Five of the six predictors made significant individual improvements to the model fit, after accounting for the other predictors (likelihood ratio tests: $\chi^2 = 35.31$ to 109.81, $df = 1$, all $p < .001$). However, the fixed slope for self-esteem was no longer significant within this model. This was the case both for the individual parameter estimate ($z = 1.06$, $p > .01$) and for the comparison of models with and without self-esteem as a predictor (likelihood ratio test: $\chi^2 = 1.12$, $df = 1$, $p > .01$). Thus H7 received only partial support.
Table 6.6
Summary of multilevel regression models predicting perceived centrality of identity content items (Level 1: n = 1593) nested within individuals (Level 2: n = 142) according to ‘expanded model’, using (a) random intercept and fixed slopes and (b) random intercept and random slopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fixed parameters</th>
<th>(a) Model with fixed slopes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>(b) Model with random slopes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>$\chi^2$ (1df)</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.06ns</td>
<td>1.12ns</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.37ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6.37***</td>
<td>39.99***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.71***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>10.67***</td>
<td>109.81***</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>8.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>5.98***</td>
<td>35.31***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4.71***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>9.07***</td>
<td>80.03***</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>7.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>6.70***</td>
<td>44.24***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>4.37***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Random slopes variance

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>3.15***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.47**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.6 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>.04</th>
<th>.01</th>
<th>3.60***</th>
<th>42.61***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.40***</td>
<td>27.65***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residual variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>.49</th>
<th>.07</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>.51</th>
<th>.07</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviance = 4307.87

Deviance = 4042.00

Note. Deviance is calculated as -2 x log likelihood. Values of z are based on the parameter estimates and standard errors within the model. Values of \( \chi^2 \) for each parameter are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing the model deviance with that of an alternative model without that parameter.

**p < .01

***p < .001
Individual differences in the strength of each principle

In order to evaluate H8, the multilevel regression models discussed in the previous three sections were recalculated using random rather than fixed slopes for each of the predictors. Conceptually, this meant that the weight of each of the six rating dimensions in predicting the perceived centrality of identity items within each participant was allowed to vary between participants. Parameter estimates are summarised for the self-esteem model in table 6.4 (b), for the identity process theory model in table 6.5 (b) and for the 'expanded model' in table 6.6 (b).

In the random slopes models, all fixed slopes from the previous analyses were replicated, reinforcing the conclusions drawn above about H1 to H7.

However, all three random slopes models also resulted in significant reductions in deviance compared to the corresponding fixed slopes models. Likelihood ratio tests gave values of $\chi^2 = 91.06$ (df = 2, $p < .001$) for the self-esteem model, $\chi^2 = 207.84$ (df = 14, $p < .001$) for the identity process theory model, and $\chi^2 = 265.88$ (df = 27, $p < .001$) for the 'expanded model'.

Furthermore, in all three models, the random slope variance terms for all hypothesised identity principles were significant ($z = 2.47$ to 4.69, all $p < .01$). As a further test of the significance of each random slope, additional models were computed, assessing the effect of replacing each random slope with a fixed slope within each of the models. In all three models, all random slopes made significant individual improvements to the model fit (likelihood ratio tests: $\chi^2 = 17.86$ to 91.06, df = 2 to 7, all $p < .01$).

Thus H8 was clearly supported by the data: there was significant variation between participants in the strengths of each predictor within all three of the models of identity motivation examined here.
Discussion

Participants' ratings of identity items for associations with self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, purpose and closeness were all significantly and substantially related to their perceived centrality within subjective identity structures. Comparing models of identity motivation, the self-esteem hypothesis predicted an estimated 32.5%, identity process theory an estimated 49.7% and the expanded model an estimated 54.6% of the within-participants variance in perceived centrality of identity items.

**Self-esteem is not the whole story**

Results for the self-esteem hypothesis (table 6.4) were consistent with previous findings (Gecas, 1982; Rosenberg, 1986; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Those identities which were most associated with self-esteem were also perceived as most central within subjective identity structures (H1).

However, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy behaved comparably to self-esteem in all analyses (H2). All four constructs exhibited a similar pattern of correlations with perceived centrality in the preliminary analysis (table 6.1), and all four were significant predictors in a multilevel regression model accounting for an estimated 49.7% of the within-participants variance in perceived centrality (table 6.5). Including distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy in the model resulted in a significant improvement in fit ($\chi^2 = 426.80, df = 3, p < .001$) and a substantial increase of 17.2% in the predicted within-participants variance in perceived centrality, compared to the simpler model with self-esteem only (H3), and each of these four constructs contributed uniquely to the fit of the model after controlling for the other three (H4).
These results were interpreted as strong support for the central assertion of identity process theory that principles of distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy should be given equal theoretical consideration to self-esteem as motives guiding identity processes (Breakwell, 1987, 1992).

**Customising predictions for the Anglican clergy**

The possibility was examined of improving predictions of subjective identity structure with the inclusion of two potential additional principles of purpose and closeness, which were expected to have particular relevance for identity processes among members of the Anglican clergy.

Results for the ‘expanded model’ were mixed. These constructs behaved similarly to the four existing principles throughout the analyses (H5), but provided only a moderate improvement to the predictive power of the model as a whole (H6). Furthermore, the contribution of self-esteem was eradicated, and those of continuity and efficacy considerably eroded, with the addition of purpose and closeness to the model (comparing tables 7.5 and 7.6), which suggested that these new constructs were substantially duplicating variance already accounted for by the existing predictors.

With hindsight, it may be that these constructs were not as distinct conceptually from the existing principles as had been assumed. Both constructs were understood to be core social values within this population and might therefore be expected to be core constituents of self-esteem—indeed, participants’ ratings of the identity items for ‘purpose’ and ‘self-esteem’ were especially closely correlated (table 6.2). Thus it is not entirely surprising that these constructs should have accounted for the variance attributed to self-esteem within the previous model. Furthermore, items which gave participants a ‘sense of purpose’ might in so doing have contributed also to feelings of both continuity and efficacy,
while part of the value of 'closeness' in the context of priesthood may have been the positive implications of closeness to one's parishioners for efficacy in the role of priest, hence the marked reductions in fixed slopes for continuity and efficacy when purpose and closeness were added to the model.

This is not to assume that self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy constitute an exhaustive list of the motivations underlying identity dynamics across all contexts, nor is it to negate the small but significant improvement which was made to the model here with the inclusion of purpose and closeness. Nevertheless, for the sake of parsimony, theoretical priority should be given to those constructs which have been shown to generalise across a range of populations before population-specific constructs—which may be specific ways of satisfying general principles—are theorised as separate motives in their own right.

**Individual differences within the models**

An interesting finding was that there was significant variation between participants in the size of the contribution of each rating dimension to predictions of the perceived centrality of identity items in all three of the models tested (H8). Theoretically, this implied that the relative strengths of motives for self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, purpose and closeness within identity dynamics were not the same across all participants, whether as a function of chronic individual differences or contextual fluctuations at the time of responding to the questionnaire.

An interesting avenue for further research will be the exploration of these differences and the identification of individual and contextual variables which may predict them. A contextual predictor identified in previous
research is the presence of threat with respect to any given principle (e.g., Breakwell, 1986a; Brewer & Pickett, 1999; Ethier & Deaux, 1994).

**Relationships between identity principles**

Another area in need of future development is the investigation of relationships between multiple motives within identity dynamics. Within this study, ratings of the identity items for satisfaction of each principle were in many cases quite strongly intercorrelated (table 6.2). This does not compromise the model comparisons reported here as we have at all times evaluated the unique contribution of each predictor to each model after controlling for the other predictors within that model (H4 and H7).

Nevertheless, given the correlations observed here, it seems untenable to assume that identity principles of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy affect identity processes independently of each other. Breakwell (1987) suggests that the interactions between identity principles may well be context dependent. This suggestion was developed in chapter 3 of this thesis, in which it was argued that interactions between the distinctiveness principle and other motives within identity dynamics are likely to depend on the various ways in which distinctiveness can be constructed within different contexts.

**Consequences of the methodology**

A central assumption underlying these analyses was that the role of principles of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, purpose and closeness in guiding the processes which shape identity could be inferred by using these constructs to predict the relative perceived centrality of items within participants' subjective identity structures.
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It should be acknowledged that the correlational design of the study did not show identity processes in action. In particular, it was not possible to tell from these data to what extent the observed relationships were a function of processes shaping the perceived centrality of the items within identity or processes shaping the meanings of the items themselves, in the form of associations with self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, purpose and closeness. Both types of process have been shown in operation elsewhere (e.g., Ethier & Deaux, 1994), and both can be expected to be guided by identity principles, but their effects cannot be separated within this study. These findings would therefore be usefully complemented by experimental research into the effects of these principles on processes shaping both the structure and the content of identity.

However, the design of this study also has particular strengths, especially in terms of ecological validity, which would be hard to reproduce with experimental techniques. Manipulating the levels of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy associated with particular identities, as well as the centrality of identities, would make it easier to distinguish between different processes but harder to assess the importance of these processes for identity within natural settings. Although the questionnaire is an artificial context in itself, it is also--almost by definition--not so artificial as a context in which aspects of identity are deliberately and systematically manipulated.

This becomes especially important in the light of a recent criticism of identity process theory. Bosma (1995) argues that Breakwell’s (1986a) focus on identity threat and coping makes the theory a “reactive model” (Bosma, 1995, p. 13) rather than a full-blown model of identity dynamics. Contrary to that position, these analyses show that this theory is not restricted to the analysis of situations of identity threat or experimental manipulation, but has the potential for general explanatory use.
In modelling the unique contributions of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity, efficacy, purpose and closeness to predictions of the perceived centrality of items within subjective identity structures, the analyses presented here have taken account of the substantial intercorrelations between these predictors (see table 6.2). In an experimental situation, where these factors were artificially constrained to be independent of each other, it would not be theoretically appropriate or statistically possible to compare models of identity motivation in the manner of these analyses.

A further strength of this study was its inclusive treatment of identity, encompassing 'social' and 'personal' aspects across all domains and with no restriction on the possible relationships between them. Previous studies into identity processes have generally focused on particular identities selected by the researcher. Where multiple identities have been investigated, these have usually been within a single content domain and with a particular logical relationship between them, such as hierarchical nesting (for a notable exception, see Deaux, Reid, Mizrahi & Ethier, 1995). However, relationships between multiple identities can take a number of different forms, of which hierarchical nesting is just one (Brewer, 1999). Identity process theory does not depend on any particular model of identity structure and so is able to take full account of the 'multiplicity of identity' (after Deaux, 1992). Within this study, participants were allowed to generate their own identity content for the rating tasks. The predictions were meaningful and held true across the items as a whole, not solely items which had a particular a priori logical relationship between them.

**Generalising beyond the current study**

An unusual feature of this study, in the context of 'western' social psychology, was the use of Anglican parish priests as participants. Theorists have warned against claiming generality for the results of
studies using student participants in the absence of replications with other populations (e.g., Banyard & Hunt, 2000; Newstead, 1979; Sears, 1986). Thus similar caution might be expressed about a study of priests.

From a statistical perspective, these results can only be assumed to generalise to Anglican priests who are currently attached to a parish and resident in the UK, the population from which potential participants were randomly sampled, although even this rests on the assumption that the sampling was not substantially biased by the omission of those who either declined to participate or did not return their questionnaires.

However, given the impossibility of sampling randomly from all possible cultures and contexts, it may be more sensible theoretically to evaluate the generalisation of predictions to different populations, rather than abstracting findings from any single population, 'typical' or otherwise.

Although Anglican parish priests share their own idiosyncrasies, they also do not share certain features characteristic of the populations of children and young adults most commonly studied within social psychological research into identity. For example, college students are likely as a function of their age and circumstances to have a weaker sense of self, to be more egocentric and to participate in less stable relationships than older adults (Sears, 1986), all of which factors are potentially extremely relevant to the study of identity processes. By contrast, participants in this study were distributed over a wide age range, almost all were married and most were in full-time paid (stipendiary) work, characteristics not shared with college students but more representative of most adult populations. Furthermore, Anglican parish priests appear to construe themselves as less independent and more interdependent than do US college students (see chap. 7), showing a profile more commonly associated with 'eastern' than 'western' cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).
It therefore speaks strongly for the generality of identity process theory that motivational principles of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy, identified largely from studies conducted with a very different range of participants, were shown here to generalise so powerfully to Anglican parish priests, predicting almost 50% of the within-participants variance in perceived centrality of items of identity content.

Nevertheless, further evaluation of this model over a range of populations and contexts would be desirable. It might be especially valuable to compare the magnitude of effects of the four principles across different populations. Within this study, the weights of continuity and efficacy were much larger than those of self-esteem and distinctiveness when the effects of these principles were modelled together. It would be interesting to examine the balance between self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy as predictors of identity centrality over a range of populations.

**Conclusion**

This chapter contributes to the existing literature in the development of a new method for evaluating and comparing models of identity motivation and in the use of this paradigm to demonstrate the importance of constructs other than self-esteem in shaping identity. In particular, these results supported the central assertion of identity process theory that principles of distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy should be given equal consideration to self-esteem as motives guiding identity processes.

The remaining chapters of this thesis focus especially on issues related to the distinctiveness principle, describing participants’ representations of personhood and priesthood, exploring their experiences of distinctiveness, modelling sources of distinctiveness and examining expected consequences of the distinctiveness principle among Anglican parish priests.
Chapter 7
PERSONHOOD AND PRIESTHOOD

Though we are many, we are one body,
because we all share in one bread.
THE ORDER FOR HOLY COMMUNION (Alternative Service Book)

Within this thesis, it is argued that distinctiveness is a necessary property of both meaning and value within identity. However, this is qualified with the suggestion that distinctiveness has different meanings, is achieved in different ways and has different implications for identity and behaviour according to individualistic or relationally oriented representations of the person. These representations are understood to vary across cultures, between individuals and within individuals across situations.

An additional area of interest specific to members of the clergy, which has been mentioned in chapter four, is the issue of representations of priesthood and the related theological labels of ‘churchmanship’. It appears that different churchmanships may have different implications for Anglican parish priests’ feelings of distinctiveness in relation to parishioners and in relation to other members of the clergy.

In this chapter, I describe patterns of similarity and difference in these representations among participants in the two studies. This provides a contextual frame within which to understand aspects of the distinctiveness principle discussed within subsequent chapters. The analyses are in three parts. The first two parts explore concepts of personhood using an interpretative phenomenological analysis of the interview data and quantitative analyses of questionnaire data. The third part explores concepts of priesthood and related categories of ‘churchmanship’ using further data from the questionnaire study.
Representations of Personhood I

In chapter three, the case was presented for a broad definition of distinctiveness, and for a distinction between sources of distinctiveness. It was suggested that distinctiveness takes different forms according to individualistic or relational concepts of personhood: distinctiveness in individualistic terms is about being separate and different from others, but in relational terms it is about one's position within social networks.

Much of the evidence for this argument came from cross-cultural and indigenous psychological studies of relationally oriented cultures (Ho, 1993; U. Kim, 1994). However, it was stressed that individualistic and relational orientations should not simply be equated with cross-cultural differences. It was suggested that these orientations coexist and vary considerably within cultures. Hence, the account of sources of distinctiveness is not solely relevant to cross-cultural perspectives.

In studying distinctiveness among the Anglican clergy, an important aim was therefore to describe systematically this aspect of the cultural meaning system within which processes of identity construction and maintenance occur. Understanding the cultural background would enrich subsequent interpretations related to distinctiveness among these people.

The second interpretative phenomenological analysis (after J. A. Smith, 1996a) was intended to describe participants' concepts of personhood. The aim was to identify areas of consensus and difference, using the whole interview and not just the explicit questions about "the individual in society", although most of the data reported here originates from this section, in which participants were questioned in abstract terms about the meaning of "being an individual" and of "a person's identity".
Analytic procedure

The 21 interview transcripts were scanned for all potentially relevant material, paying special attention to incidences before this issue was introduced by the interviewer and erring on the side of over- rather than under-inclusion. This resulted in a focused body of data comprising 45 pages of printed text (cf. Smith et al., 1999, p. 231). Treatment of this data followed a similar strategy to that used in the previous analysis.

The material extracted from each transcript was read several times. Passages were underlined and notes were jotted in the margins. The notes were summaries of the material, references to other passages or preliminary interpretations. For each participant in turn, a small number of themes was identified, which appeared to summarise or explain a large part of the data, or were especially strongly represented in particular passages, or tied together material from different parts of the interview.

For each participant, the themes were summarised on a separate sheet of paper with notes on the content of the themes and references to relevant quotations. The summaries were then compared and themes were grouped together, resulting in two superordinate clusters, the individual and relatedness, and a third cluster consisting of participants' constructions of the interrelationship between aspects of the first two clusters.

The resulting provisional structure appeared to represent very well the perspectives of the remaining participants. Hence, further modifications were judged to be superfluous. The analysis is reported below.
The individual

The first cluster of themes was labelled the individual. This cluster included themes of 'the individual in relation to God', 'the individual as unique' and 'individualistic values'.

The individual in relation to God

Central to participants' descriptions of the individual was a belief that every person has an individual relationship with God. Christine and Charles, asked to describe their beliefs about 'what it means to be an individual', responded in almost identical language, answering simply:

Individually created and loved by God. (Christine)

It means to be created by God, it means to be loved by God, it means to be valued by God for all one's life and eternity. (Charles)

Both participants described 'what it means to be an individual' in terms of the person's relationship with God, involving the dual elements of 'creation' and 'love'. Christine noted that the relationship was itself on an "individual" level. Charles added a strong statement of the temporal continuity of this relationship "for all one's life and eternity".

Richard expanded on the concept of creation, stating that "we are made in God's image" and "that that is good":

Well I think as a Christian that we get our identity strongly from the fact that we are made in God's image, and this is very important. And you know an individual will grow, should grow primarily from that fact that you are made in God's image, that that is good.
According to Richard, being made in God's image was a source of "identity". Foreshadowing the later discussion of individualistic values, Richard also suggested that "an individual [...] should grow primarily from that fact that you are made in God's image, that that is good".

Michael expanded on the concept of God's love:

As I see it as a Christian, it is the fact that God accepts us and loves us as children whoever we are, whatever we've done, that actually is the sort of, the spring of all our completeness as people and so forth. I suppose grace is the word for it.

According to Michael, God's love is both unconditional ("whoever we are, whatever we've done") and essential ("the spring of all our completeness as people and so forth"). Michael provided rhetorical support for these assertions with references to the standard expression 'child of God' ("loves us as children") and to the theological concept of God's "grace".

Jenny also used the expression, 'child of God', when asked to describe her concept of 'a person's identity', illustrating the concepts of creation and love, but also introducing the concept of individual distinctiveness:

He did create each one of us, and we're all created in His image, but that doesn't mean we're all alike, and the very fact that we're all so different, I mean if you look at a crowd of us, is proof of this. I mean we are very much people with individual ways of looking and acting and thinking, and God wanted us to be that way. And yet every one of us is as precious to Him as if we were an only child. So we're part of a huge community and yet we have individual aspects which are special to us, and God treats us as though we were not part of that community but as His one single precious child.
According to Jenny, the distinctiveness of the individual ("the very fact that we're all so different") comes directly from God, who has created each person individually ("each one of us"), intended each person to be distinctive ("wanted us to be [all so different]"), and loves each person as an individual ("treats us ... as His one single precious child").

The belief that distinctiveness is derived from an individual relationship with God was echoed by John, who had been asked to elaborate on his earlier statement that "each person is a distinct, individual person":

I think that each person is loved by God as an individual and in that respect, God doesn't sort of merge the whole lot together and say I've got so many in IQ 169 and so many in IQ 20 or something like that. I think God loves each person as an individual and I think from that point of view there's a distinctness.

For John, the distinctiveness of the individual apparently came from his belief that "each person is loved by God as an individual", and that "God doesn't sort of merge the whole lot together".

Jenny described what she saw as "evidence" for this belief:

I think one of the most amazing things about the Lord is [...] the fact that He has hands on involvement in our individual lives, and I'm talking about detail, the most minute detail. I see evidence of it so often, answers to prayer and just an awareness of God's guiding hand. Now that doesn't happen with a mass, you know if God saw us as a mass it wouldn't happen that way. But it doesn't and the Bible says He knows every hair of our head.

Evidence for her belief that God loves each person as an individual took the form of His "hands on involvement in our individual lives", including
“answers to prayer” and “an awareness of God’s guiding hand”, as well as the authority of the Bible that “He knows every hair of our head”.

The individual as unique

Participants’ beliefs about the uniqueness of each individual in relation to God appeared to be complemented with an understanding that every person was thus intrinsically unique: both objectively and subjectively bounded, different from other people and with a unique purpose in life.

Michael introduced the concept of boundedness, while describing his concept of “a person’s identity”:

We are physically distinct from one another, I mean we are separate entities. And I think that sort of physical fact is a sort of external marker of a psychological or almost a spiritual reality really, that we are actually discrete, I mean e-t-e on the end of that, individuals. That’s the way that the universe has been made.

According to Michael “we are separate entities” or “discrete [...] individuals”. This applies to both external (“physical”) and internal (“psychological or [...] spiritual”) dimensions of personhood, and is related to the concept of creation (“the way that the universe has been made”). Michael suggested that these ‘objective’ forms of boundedness were also reflected “at a subjective level” in that “we feel unique”:

Along with that is our own personal sense of distinctiveness, that I think we feel at a subjective level that we are unique. [...] For most people there’s quite a clear sense of boundedness, that we are, I am me and I am unique and I am distinct from everything else. So I think what I observe and believe to be the way it’s been set up, so to speak, that you can see by seeing
individual human beings wandering around, is actually how it feels as well, that we feel unique.

Michael described "our own personal sense of distinctiveness" as comprising "quite a clear sense of boundedness, that we are, I am me and I am unique and I am distinct from everything else". Thus, he argued, the objective reality is reflected in subjective experience.

According to Michael's account, every person is distinctive in the sense of being "discrete" or "separate" from other people. Another shade of distinctiveness was in terms of difference. This was seen earlier in Jenny's statement that "we are very much people with individual ways of looking and acting and thinking". James began his description of "what it means to be an individual":

You are a unique personality, with particular skills and gifts and temperament.

Simon developed the concept of "gifts", answering the same question as follows:

Somebody who's created uniquely by God, and given certain gifts as a steward.

A steward?

A steward, given them by God for use, I mean for accountable use.

Simon's answer captured what appear to be two important shades of the meaning of the term "gifts". Firstly, consistent with the earlier discussion of creation, gifts were 'given' to individuals by God. Secondly, gifts were supposed to be 'used' with accountability for a purpose.
For Martha, people were distinguished from each other also by virtue of each having a particular God-given purpose in life, although she acknowledged that this might be specific to her "Liberal" theology:

I believe, as a kind of Liberal Anglican or a Liberal Christian of any kind I suppose, that God meant us to be something particular and individual. We each have a particular and individual role to fulfil and it is our life's task to understand it and to do it, and it is different for all of us.

For Martha, understanding one's "particular and individual" purpose is extremely important: "it is our life's task to understand it and to do it". This was reflected in practice in the previous analysis, in which Martha was shown re-evaluating her personal quality of 'irritability' as she came to relate this to her individual purpose of 'moving people on a bit'.

**Individualistic values**

Connected with the preceding themes of 'the individual in relation to God' and 'the individual as unique' was a cluster of values associated with the value of the individual, including respect for individuals, knowing oneself, being true to oneself and autonomy.

Michael suggested that the value of the individual, which "derives from our importance to God", should be "reflected in the way that we structure society", introducing the theme of individualistic values:

Each human being is uniquely important. I think that derives from our importance to God probably, we're as it were handmade by him. And we're not just like an ant in an anthill, that we have quite significant individual worth because, I mean I believe that theologically, so I think that needs to be reflected in the way that we structure society, and so forth.
Michael implied that society should not undermine the distinctiveness of each individual, but should reflect the fact that “we're not just like an ant in an anthill, that we have quite significant individual worth”.

This was developed by David, who had been asked to discuss the implications for “how people behave within society” of his belief that “each individual has value in the sight of God”:

The implications should be that you should have total respect for the other person's dignity. There should be something inviolable about the otherness of each person. Love your neighbour as yourself.

David suggested that the implications should (he emphasised the 'should') be the enactment of values of 'respect for persons' (“total respect for the other person's dignity”) and human rights (“something inviolable about the otherness of each person”). He then translated this into more familiar terms as the commandment by Jesus to “love your neighbour as yourself”.

Joanna put forward a similar point of view in more concrete terms, voicing her objection to two aspects of “the society that we're in” which appeared to conflict with the values described by David:

So much of the society that we're in you are a number, you know, it's a postcode or something. And I want to say, no, they're a person, for goodness sake. This morning I've been to a business breakfast where the guy was talking about employees, personnel and human resources, and he was making the point that so often in our society people are seen as resources in organisations. They are a resource to ensure maximum output. But where's the value of the individual in that?
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The first aspect to which Joanna objected was the deindividuation entailed by treating people as "a number" or "a postcode or something". The second aspect was the treatment of people as a means to an end, "a resource to ensure maximum output", rather than treating people as ends in themselves: "where's the value of the individual in that?"

An important line of thought running through the preceding themes was that every person is created by God (Christine, Charles) in God's image (Richard, Jenny) for a specific purpose (Simon, Martha). In particular, Martha stated that "we each have a particular and individual role to fulfil and it is our life's task to understand it and to do it". Stemming from this, an important value for many participants was self-knowledge.

Christine referred to the importance of people "discovering who they are" in order to "really fulfil their identity":

I don't think people actually in my beliefs really fulfil their identity, work out what their identity is all about, without the spiritual process of discovering who they are in the eyes of God, and each other.

Could you say a bit more about that?

Well it's that I suppose from cradle to grave and beyond we're in the process of learning about who we are and what we are. So in the end it's a mystery. Each person is a mystery that we're in the process of finding out ourselves. And probably you know when we relate with each other we're discovering what each other's mystery as well a bit. But we never, we don't get to the bottom of it.

Implicit in this account is an essentialist assumption that "who we are and what we are" is a given property, a "mystery" about which people can "learn", although "we never [...] get to the bottom of it". Thus the purpose of life is for people to "work out what their identity is all about".
The goal of self-knowledge was echoed by Simon, who linked the values of "development and exploration and your understanding of yourself" to the conventional image of the "journey":

The great concept is one of journey and development and exploration and your understanding of yourself apart from anything else.

Complementing the value accorded to 'discovering oneself', William discussed the importance of being 'true to oneself' as an individual:

Everybody's got to be themselves and be true to themselves, so the most important thing to me is to be true to one's real self and not to play a part, not to be a role. It's more important that I'm William Porter than that I'm a vicar, by a long way.

Echoing Christine's account of self-knowledge, William here used the essentialist notion of "real self", noting that "the most important thing to me is to be true to one's real self and not to play a part". This had some resonance with the existentialist value of authenticity (Bugental, 1965), which was discussed in the previous analysis.

Similarly, Timothy described the detrimental nature of "conforming":

Being an individual is the first and foremost thing about our existence. And people have probably lost an understanding of what it is to be an individual or to gain individuality that that is, you know, we spend a lot of time conforming and being led by others. And so being an individual, it's important to remember that and recognise it and to value it.
According to Timothy, "conforming and being led by others" represented the loss of "an understanding of what it is to be an individual", which was "the first and foremost thing about our existence". Thus, he argued, it was important to "remember", "recognise" and "value" one's individuality.

Neil expanded on this point, stressing the importance of judging others "by what they do and what they say" and not on the basis of "labels":

I don't think you can identify people by labels, I think you just have to go by what they do and what they say. I've known an awful lot of people who've called themselves really, 'really good Christians', you know, and they do the most horrendous things. So no I don't think, I think it's just a matter of what they do and how they communicate with other people.

Central to his argument was the example of people whose actions are inconsistent with their self-categorisation, labelling themselves as "really good Christians", but who "do the most horrendous things".

An additional corollary of the importance of knowing oneself and being oneself was the value of autonomy. When asked to describe his beliefs about "what it means to be an individual", Richard initially responded:

It means an ability to determine the course of your life according to your desires and purposes I think. So, you know, there's a degree of personal freedom to follow your own interests and, within the boundaries and the limits which are necessary you know, to be free to follow your individual careers, interests and family life.

Central to Richard's account was the notion of "personal freedom". Being an individual meant "to be free to follow your individual careers, interests and family life" following "your desires and purposes", although accepting the necessity of certain unspecified "boundaries" and "limits".
Ian gave a similar answer to the same question, but with an additional focus on the socio-political dimension of the concept of freedom:

I think to be an individual is being able to accept the freedom to do and to believe and to say what you actually do believe; that in other words you're, within the law, within certain boundaries, you are able to act and be what you would want to be, without people either trying to stop you or deriding you or generally looking down on you for what you are; that expressing your own individuality in whatever way you want to, whether it be political or artistic or any other way, religious, is important; and you can't have individuals unless society allows the sort of freedoms that generally speaking we are allowed in society in England, as an example.

Echoing Richard's account, Ian describes being an individual in terms of "the freedom to do and to believe and to say what you actually do believe" and "expressing your own individuality in whatever way you want to". Ian also acknowledges the importance of "certain boundaries", which may be equated with "the law". But Ian stresses that freedom is socially conferred, dependent on people not "trying to stop you or deriding you or generally looking down on you for what you are" and on "society allow[ing] the sort of freedoms that generally speaking we are allowed in society in England".

*Discussion*

The themes described above have centred on the value of the individual and the importance of individual distinctiveness. Participants described individuality as proceeding from the individual's creation by God and subsequent relationship with God. Thus individuality should be valued and preserved. Important goals were self-knowledge and autonomy, which would allow the individual to fulfil his or her God-given purpose.
These ideas can be understood as core themes of individualism (Durkheim, 1898/1969; Lukes, 1973; Marková et al., 1998; Triandis, 1995). It should be acknowledged, however, that the concept of individualism has many elements, not all of which are consistent with each other (Lukes, 1973). Here, participants expressed especially ethical, religious and humanistic aspects of individualism (see Lukes, 1973; Marková et al., 1998).

**Relatedness**

However, coexisting with the preceding individualistic themes was a set of themes labelled *relatedness*, which included themes of ‘creation for relationships’, ‘identity through relationships, and ‘relational values’.

**Creation for relationships**

As with individualism, the importance of relationships was perceived to arise initially from the individual’s relationship with God. Participants asserted that God created people for the purpose of relationships. Thus David described his concept of “a person’s identity” as follows:

I don't know fully who I am, but God knows fully who I am, and that identity is a reality which He bestows on me, which makes me me, and which He guards and promises to safeguard for all time. The identity is a reflection of Himself, a dim reflection, and is something which is essentially relational, it is to do with other, with everybody else.

*In what sense?*

In the sense that no man is an island. We are bound up with each other more deeply than we can get to the bottom of, I mean essentially communal.
Echoing the previous theme of ‘the individual in relation to God’, David described identity as a property which is created by God (“a reality which He bestows on me”) and is in the image of God (“a reflection of Himself”). But where John and Jenny had stressed the uniqueness of each individual in relation to God, David stressed the importance of human relationships, describing identity as “relational” and “to do with other” and stressing that people are “bound up with each other” and “communal”. The strength of this understanding was underpinned by David’s description of the relational nature of people as ‘essential’ and as ‘more deep than we can get to the bottom of’, and by his use of the often repeated quotation of John Donne that “no man is an island”.

Peter also portrayed the concept of creation in God’s image as a statement about the relational nature of human beings, discussing his self-description as “a being capable of spiritual and intimate relationships”:

What does it mean to be in God’s image? It doesn't mean that we are man, male or female. It doesn't mean that we have hands and feet. It means that we are spiritual beings, and that God created humanity for the purpose of relationship.

Peter’s message here was a pervasive theme throughout his interview, that “God created humanity for the purpose of relationship”.

Identity through relationships

In connection with the previous theme, participants often described identity as something which is achieved or defined through relationships with God and with other people, echoing the theme of ‘belonging’ within the previous analysis. James introduced this theme:
I think a person's identity is to a degree defined by their relationship with God and the people you are closest to, actually. That makes them the people they are. So although you're trying to concentrate on the individual not on other people, I don't think there is such a thing as a totally isolated person. We were made for relationship full stop. That's why the worst thing you can do to a person is put them in solitary confinement I think.

Echoing the previous theme, James asserted here that people were created for the purpose of relationships: “we were made for relationship full stop”. Thus, relationships were a primary source of identity: it was a person's “relationship with God and the people you are closest to” which “makes them the people they are”. According to James this explained the pain of being without relationships: “that's why the worst thing you can do to a person is put them in solitary confinement”.

Richard summarised his concept of “a person's identity” as follows:

So it's a whole network of things that give a person identity, relationship with God, relationship to the world, relationship to each other, all those things tie in together. It's complicated.

According to Richard, identity is given to a person by a “whole network” of relationships - “relationship with God, relationship to the world, relationship to each other” - which “tie in together”. Richard's description of identity in terms of a 'network of relationships' has considerable resonance with the discussion of relational orientation and relational forms of distinctiveness within the theoretical development of the distinctiveness principle (Gao, 1996; U. Kim, 1994; Yuki & Brewer, 1999).
Paul provided a similar perspective, describing his beliefs about 'what it means to be an individual':

In the broadest terms what does it mean to be an individual? A moral being, who has a developing sense of responsibility, who is in relationship with others, and who necessarily - keyword - necessarily inhabits roles that are provided by society and culture.

Paul's definition of an individual incorporated three main elements: 'morality', 'relationships' and the 'inhabitation of roles'. Paul's use of the term 'inhabit' was reminiscent of Geertz' (1975) description of the Balinese concept of the person as the “temporary occupant [italics added] of a particular, quite untemporary, cultural locus” (p. 50). Paul stressed that this latter feature was a 'necessary' aspect of being an individual, an issue which he later developed while discussing his rejection of existentialism:

These roles are necessary to us, we cannot escape them. And I'm partly alluding here to the idea that I was more familiar with and quite entranced by in my late teens, the sort of existentialist 'an individual can make him or herself'. Complete baloney. We are who we are in relation to others, and there's the constant striving to create, but to create the self in relation to others. We live various roles.

According to Paul, the individualistic notion of existentialism that "an individual can make him or herself" was "complete baloney". Against this point of view, Paul advanced the strongly relational statements that "we are who we are in relation to others" and that "we live various roles".

Relational values

The relational perspective advanced by participants also encompassed expressions of relational values. Participants expressed the importance of
relationships in giving value to individuals and the importance of fellowship within the Church as a means to salvation as a Christian.

Peter outlined the former value early in his interview:

It doesn't matter that you can't play the piano, that you can't run races, that you can't pass your exams. It doesn't matter that you haven't got material possessions, you're a beggar in Africa or in India, what matters is that you are a person capable of relationships.

Peter contrasted the importance of relationships with two alternative dimensions of value, efficacy ("that you can't play the piano, that you can't run races, that you can't pass your exams") and socio-economic status ("that you haven't got material possessions, you're a beggar in Africa or in India"), which he regarded as irrelevant for determining the value of an individual. He supported this argument with reference to the Gospel:

The first commandment is to love the Lord your God with all your heart all your soul all your strength, and the second is this, said Jesus, love your neighbour as yourself. Those are relational statements. It's nothing about what you can do, it's about who you are, and who you are is I think about relationships.

Within this argument, Peter rejected the concept of 'efficacy' as a dimension of value ("it's nothing about what you can do") and repeated his previous message that identity comes from relationships ("it's about who you are, and who you are is I think about relationships").

Joanna described putting this value into practice within her ministry:

One of the things we place high emphasis on here at St. Nicholas' is encouraging the congregation to be part of small groups, because we believe that their value, their
worth, their identity, their support comes in relationship from other people, that they can't necessarily find it totally on their own.

Underlying this policy, Joanna believed, like Peter, that people's "value", "worth", "identity" and "support" come from relationships with others and that "they can't necessarily find it totally on their own".

A second value expressed by participants, which was also associated with a relational orientation was that of fellowship within the church:

The whole thing about the Christian faith is - well, what distinguishes it from other faiths is that there is generally speaking not a lot of individualism. In other words, we're not like Hindus looking for Nirvana, going to make our own way to the top. [...] The essence of the Christian faith is that we meet together as a body, and we do not try and achieve our Nirvana by individual efforts. [...] We're members of one body, the body of Christ, so that the concept of individualism doesn't apply in the Christian faith, I don't think. (John)

According to John, it is the "essence of the Christian faith" that "we meet together as a body, and we do not try and achieve our Nirvana by individual efforts". John supports this argument though his use of the conventional metaphor of the church as "body of Christ", and through an interesting comparison with Hinduism, which John implicitly describes as 'individualistic' with members "going to make our own way to the top".

James made a similar point discussing the importance of "worship":

You can be a Christian without attending church functions in the same way I think that you could be a married person if you were cast on a desert island away from your wife. You're still married but what sort of life is it? People who would say I can be a Christian without going
to church, for example, I think have totally misunderstood what Christianity is all about. I mean Jesus came to build a church. Everyone who ever believed in him was launched feet first into the life of the church. That's not saying that the church is perfect or anything like that, it most emphatically isn't. But you can't have one without the other frankly.

James used two arguments for the importance of the church within the Christian faith, referring to the purpose of Christianity ("Jesus came to build a church") and to historical precedence ("Everyone who ever believed in him was launched feet first into the life of the church"). Thus he suggests that to be a Christian without going to church is a meaningless gesture "in the same way [...] that you could be a married person if you were cast on a desert island away from your wife" and that this position represents a total misunderstanding of "what Christianity is all about".

Discussion

The themes described above have centred on the importance and value of human relationships. Participants described the individual as created by God for the purpose of relating with other individuals. Thus relationships with others were a primary source of identity and should be valued. An important goal of the Christian faith was to encourage fellowship.

These themes resonated with the Eastern concepts of relational orientation (Hamaguchi, 1985; Ho, 1993; U. Kim, 1994). A particular parallel was with the Confucian understanding that identity is defined through relationships (cf. Ho, 1995; Gao, 1996) and the value of 'harmony' in relationally oriented cultures (Triandis, 1995; Triandis et al., 1995).
Individuality and relatedness

Although the theme clusters of the individual and relationships have been presented separately within this analysis, most participants' responses involved a combination of aspects of the two. However, there were differences in the way the relationship between them was constructed, which might be in terms of opposition, balance or integration.

Opposition

Comparatively rarely, participants constructed these themes in terms of a simple opposition. A few participants clearly positioned themselves on one side or the other of a conceptual divide between individualism and relational orientation. For example, Neil advocated individualism:

I think it's easy to be pressured and not become an individual and become part of a mob, if you're not careful, listening to everybody else and saying oh yes I've got to join that, because this is the way they're all going this must be right. The individual I think is somebody who's going to sit down and think, well that's not necessarily right, it might be right but I need to think about it a bit first, you know, so somebody who'll make their own minds up.

For Neil, it was important to preserve a sense of being an individual or "somebody who'll make their own minds up" and to avoid becoming "part of a mob", or conforming to peer pressure, "saying [...] because this is the way they're all going this must be right". Neil's dislike of conformity was reflected elsewhere in his interview in his avoidance of churchmanship labels and in his deconstructive stance towards the category of priesthood, discussed in the analysis focusing on distinctiveness (see chap. 8).
Timothy also stressed the importance of individuality, which was again constructed in opposition to 'conformity'. This was seen earlier in Timothy's assertion that "conforming and being led by others" entailed losing "an understanding of what it is to be an individual". Timothy later related this argument to the theological doctrine of "original sin":

God [...] creates perfectly, but that creation is imperfect, somehow, which is put down to original sin. [...] How we behave on the whole is a result of how we interact with everyone and everything around us, and so therefore not a reflection of the uniqueness of me or you as a person, as we are as perfect creations of God. Because we sort of lose that innocence as soon as we are born into this world, in religious terms.

Timothy appeared to associate the "uniqueness of me or you as a person" with a sense of purity as "perfect creations of God", and to see "everyone and everything around us" as a source of contamination "because we sort of lose that innocence as soon as we are born into this world". The implication is that moral behaviour resides in being true to one's "uniqueness" rather than "conforming or being led by others".

Interestingly, James made the opposite argument, understanding the doctrine of "original sin" as a description of excessive individualism:

One of the clear evidences of the whole sort of doctrine of original sin is precisely that, that things are not, this world is not as God intended it to be. [...] If you think of human beings made in the image of God, it's as if someone's lobbed a brick at the mirror, really, shattered. And okay you can still make out the shape of what it was intended to be like and basically what it still can be like, but you know there are myriad cracks in front of you, you know the whole thing is shattered. Or I don't know if you think of it as an orchestra it's as if everybody is playing their own tune and doing it
their own way and, you know, there's no harmony it's a total cacophony or whatever.

Like Timothy, James described the doctrine of original sin in terms of a corruption by “the world” of the pure essence of humanity, using the metaphor of a ‘shattering’ of “the image of God” in which people were made, “as if someone's lobbed a brick at the mirror”. But James' second metaphor made it clear that he saw individualism and not conformity as the manifestation of original sin: “if you think of it as an orchestra it's as if everybody is playing their own tune and doing it their own way”. The implication of this metaphor was that the independence of people “playing their own tune” was contrary to the interdependence of “an orchestra”.

Gerry voiced a similar critique of excessive individualism:

There is a sense in which there is a complete antithesis between the individual and society. We've all become much more individualistic, there's an encouragement, everybody does their own thing. Amusing Mrs Thatcher herself dared to say it, didn't she, that society doesn't exist any more, sort of thing. I don't know where or what in she said it. But there is a huge problem that society's a mass of individuals, rather than a common belonging.

Gerry described it as a “huge problem” that “society doesn't exist any more”, having become “a mass of individuals, rather than a common belonging”. Echoing James' description of everybody “playing their own tune”, Gerry referred to everybody ‘doing their own thing' as the reason for this problem of “complete antithesis between the individual and society”. However, unlike James, Gerry appeared implicitly within this extract to be blaming the situation on “Mrs Thatcher” rather than “original sin”.
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Balance

More commonly, participants described either the presence of or the need for a balance between individualistic and relational elements. For example, William described his concept of "an individual":

> Everybody is individual in that respect. We're all different. At the same time, we are individuals in society, and we hold a basic loyalty and commitment to that society, and the society in general and the particular society of the church. The two things always have to be held in tension, I think. Maybe these days, my own personal opinion would be that we're tending much too much towards individuality and perhaps excessive individuality. We only become fully ourselves in relationship to others, and so, you know, it's a balance, it has to be.

Echoing the previous theme, William here constructs the relationship between individualistic and relational elements as an opposition, noting that "the two things always have to be held in tension". But, rather than take sides within this opposition, William stresses the importance of achieving an equilibrium: "it's a balance, it has to be".

David and Peter, gave similar answers to the same question, describing "what it means to be an individual" as follows:

> It means to be autonomous. It means to have a distinctive personality and intellect and emotional reference point. And it also means to be essentially a member of humanity, so the individuality is not absolute. (David)

> To be unique and special, to have freedom tempered by responsibility and accountability in our relationships. (Peter)
The construction of a balance between individualistic and relational elements is implicit in both of these answers. According to David, being "essentially a member of humanity" means that "the individuality is not absolute". According to Peter, the individualistic elements of being 'unique', 'special' and 'free' are "tempered by" the relational orientation of showing "responsibility and accountability in our relationships".

Mark's answer to the same question also involved an explicit balance between individualistic and relational elements:

To be a child of God, created in the image and likeness of God, with distinct gifts, and that is what it means to be an individual. And to exercise those gifts and that being in relation to others, and in relation to God, that's what it means for me.

Do you want to unpack that a bit?

It would mean sharing in the fact that there is a creation and that one has responsibilities within that. To seek relationships, to build relationships, and to repair relationships. And so that means not seeing yourself as an individual exclusively, nor does it mean seeing yourself as just one of a many exclusively. So being able to see yourself in that way, knowing that God sees oneself in the same bipolar way.

Mark began his answer with a statement of the individualistic themes of 'the individual in relation to God' ("a child of God, created in the image and likeness of God") and 'the individual as unique' ("with distinct gifts"). He then moved to a discussion of relational elements, referring to "responsibilities ... to seek ... to build ... and to repair relationships". Finally, he referred to the importance of balancing these "bipolar" elements, "not seeing yourself as an individual exclusively, nor ... seeing yourself as just one of a many exclusively".
Integration

Participants did not always construct the relationship between individualistic and relational elements as an "antithesis" or a "tension". The two could also be integrated within accounts of "what it means to be an individual" and descriptions of "the concept of a person's identity".

Despite the concerns he later expressed about society having become "a mass of individuals, rather than a common belonging", Gerry initially described his beliefs about "what it means to be an individual" as follows:

To be an individual, to be an I. Well that I actually matter as me, hence having put 'me' at the top of the list. And I cannot get away from being me, but by being me, I can contribute to the whole as having a distinctive element within the whole.

Within this passage, there is no "antithesis between the individual and society". On the other hand, the two appear to be complementary: "by being me, I can contribute to the whole". Furthermore, membership of society does not involve a negation of distinctiveness: Gerry describes his contribution to society as "a distinctive element within the whole".

Paul, who had "spent three years trying to answer this" while studying maths and philosophy, described his concept of "a person's identity":

We are given, we inherit tradition, family traditions, cultural traditions, societal traditions. And our task throughout our life is to engage with those, internalise and make our own mark, and that's what we are doing all the time.
Again, rather than constructing a straightforward opposition between ‘individual’ and ‘society’, Paul describes a dynamic model of the interaction between the two, in which the individual “inherits” society in the form of “family traditions, cultural traditions, societal traditions” and through a process of “engagement” with these traditions may also “make [his/her] own mark” (for a similar theoretical model, see Nedelmann, 1991).

Matthew emphasised the importance of the environment of relationships in determining both the ‘existence’ and the ‘ideas’ of the individual:

I don't exist at all unless it were by the consent and active determination of other people that I should be, i.e. my mother and father. I don't exist at all except by reference to the people amongst whom I live and work, my peers. I have no ideas at all except for those that I have learnt from others and have begun to share with them. Therefore, to be an individual is to realise that one has a voice which is unique and a view which is unique, but which is shared, which is not isolated. So it's not about solitariness, it's about having a place amongst others and recognising it.

At the beginning of this excerpt, Matthew makes some very strong statements of the extent to which his identity is shaped by others, noting that he only exists “by the consent and active determination of […] my parents” and “by reference to […] my peers” and that his only ideas are “those that I have learnt from others and have begun to share with them”. However, this is not seen as a negation of ‘uniqueness’. On the other hand, it could be argued in terms of the distinction developed here between sources of distinctiveness (chap. 3), that Matthew is negating separateness - “it's not about solitariness” - and emphasising position - “it's about having a place amongst others and recognising it”.
William reflected this using the metaphor of "bricks in the wall":

We're meant to be bricks in the wall. That's how we're made. But each brick is different.

William integrated his belief that people were created for the purpose of relationships, "we're meant to be bricks in the wall", with an appreciation of individual uniqueness, "each brick is different".

This was developed by Jenny within her account of the conventional metaphor of the Church as the "body of Christ":

Have you heard about the body of Christ with the different members of the Church being different members of Christ's body? It's a way of describing the Church which is, which recognises that we all have individual gifts and abilities but that, I mean in the Bible it says, what good is an eye if it's only an eye, or what good is a hand if it isn't attached to a body, or to an arm, that kind of thing. So an individual in Christian terms would be someone who is created unique and has unique gifts and abilities and personality traits, but who in conjunction with other Christians uses those to their fullest advantage, because we're all working together towards a common goal.

Within this metaphor, membership of the "body of Christ" is a function of interdependence rather than homogeneity. The body has 'eyes', 'hands', 'arms', and so on, reflecting the assumption that "we all have individual gifts and abilities", but functions as a whole, using the gifts of each individual "to their fullest advantage, because we're all working together towards a common goal". Similarly James described "different parts of the body with their own functions" while elaborating on the same metaphor:

One of the illustrations that the Bible uses is of the human body, and the Church is meant to be like that
certainly, but to an extent the way the world was made I think is intended to be like that as well, where there's a sort of co-ordination and a harmony about everything but, you know, everything's unique whether it's the finger print or different parts of the body with their own functions or whatever. And that's how everything was intended to be, a harmonious co-ordinated whole, with difference and uniqueness in a sort of kaleidoscopic pattern right the way through it all.

James also portrayed the “body of Christ” in terms of an interdependence of parts, as an “harmonious co-ordinated whole”, incorporating notions of individual distinctiveness within the whole, “with difference and uniqueness in a sort of kaleidoscopic pattern right the way through it all”. Additionally, he applied this understanding not only to the Church but also to “the way the world was made”. But this was a description of what was “intended”. James suggested that reality fell short of the ideal:

But that is not how it is. So something has gone seriously awry, and that's what the Christian Gospel is all about, needless to say, doing something about that and getting it put right.

This echoed James' previous description of “original sin” in terms of “an orchestra” with everybody “playing their own tune”. Thus, James argued, “what the Christian Gospel is all about” was to realise this model of the “body of Christ”, integrating individualistic and relational elements.

Discussion

Many participants portrayed a tension between individualistic and relational beliefs and values, either constructing these as firmly opposed, or stressing the need for a balance. However, these elements were also portrayed as closely interconnected in many of the accounts.
The tension between individuality and relatedness has been described as a 'fundamental dialectic' (Guisinger & Blatt, 1994), which differentiates West from East, as well as separating theoretical traditions within the social sciences. It was interesting to note that many participants appeared implicitly to be resolving this tension through a communitarian model of society, based on the interdependence of different parts (Marková, 1997), which was exemplified especially by the 'body of Christ' metaphor.

An additional parallel is with the 'coexistence' mode of Asian collectivism, described by U. Kim (1994), characterised by the coexistence of publicly collectivist and privately individualist and relational selves, although the public-private split described by Kim was not emphasised here.

Representations of Personhood II

Interpretative phenomenological analysis of the interview data suggested that participants' concepts of the abstract "individual" were characterised by a mixture of individualistic and relational elements. However it was not possible from these data to quantify the distribution of individualistic and relational concepts of personhood among the population.

The questionnaire included two complementary sections designed to address this issue, one examining priests' concepts of the person 'in their own terms' paraphrased from the interview data, the other being a measure of the related constructs of independent and interdependent self-construals developed within the cross-cultural literature (Gudykunst et al., 1996; after Markus & Kitayama, 1991).
The first section was based on a series of eight statements about personhood paraphrased from the interview data. These statements included items referring to distinctiveness ("Every person is unique"), as well as positional distinctiveness ("place amongst other people"), difference ("particular set of gifts") and separateness ("separate, bounded individual"). The remaining items referred to the person's relationship with God ("made in the image of God"; "loved by God"), relationship with others ("roles and responsibilities in life") and purpose ("has a purpose"). Respondents were asked to indicate their disagreement with any of the statements as a measure of consensus and to choose the four most important in order to assess individual differences in priority.

With these data it would be possible to map the distribution of beliefs about personhood within the sample, describing both consensus and difference within this area of the priests' cultural meaning system.

It was considered desirable to complement this section with a standard measure from the cross-cultural literature. This would contribute to the theoretical interpretation of the personhood data and would also make it possible to compare the priests' data with those of other populations, and thus to quantify one of the assumptions of this thesis that members of the clergy would be on average less individualistic and more relationally oriented than more commonly studied 'western' populations.

Unfortunately, no standard method could be found explicitly measuring individualistic and relational orientations as theorised (chap. 3; after U. Kim, 1994). Given the reservations expressed earlier about the construct of collectivism, none of the usual measures of individualism-collectivism or idiocentrism-allocentrism (e.g., Hui, 1988; Triandis, Chan et al., 1995; Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990) was considered to be appropriate.
However, as an alternative, the conceptualisation of independent and interdependent self-construals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) had some advantages over Triandis’ (1993) concept of collectivism. Firstly, these constructs are explicitly focused on concepts of the self, and might therefore be closely related to both identity and concepts of the person. Secondly, the construct of interdependent self-construal is not tied to the negation of individual distinctiveness, but focuses primarily on the individual's relationships with others, in keeping with the relational rather than the undifferentiated mode of collectivism (U. Kim, 1994).

The instrument most commonly used to measure these constructs is the Self-Construal Scale of Singelis (1994). An important feature of Singelis’ approach is that he theorises self-construals as separate dimensions coexisting within individuals rather than as opposite ends of a single bipolar dimension. However, Singelis' scale was developed for use with student samples, and includes items such as “I would offer my seat on a bus to my professor” and “Speaking up during a class is not a problem for me”, which would not be generalisable to members of the clergy.

An alternative measure, developed by Gudykunst et al. (1996), is related theoretically to Singelis (1994) scale, but the items are not tied to a student context. The authors report internal reliabilities of between .73 and .83 and between .80 and .85 for the independent and the interdependent sub-scales respectively across student samples drawn from the United States, Japan, Korea and Australia. Although this scale has not been widely used within the cross-cultural literature, the authors report population means and standard deviations for each of their samples which could be compared with population statistics for the clergy.
The aim of the analyses reported here was to explore and to describe participants' concepts of person and self, using the data derived from these two complementary measures. A single hypothesis (H1) was that priests would show less independence and more interdependence in their responses to the self-construal measure than did the US college students in baseline statistics reported by Gudykunst et al. (1996). US college students were of interest as a more typical respondent population within 'western' social psychology, frequently treated as representative of 'western' cultures within cross-cultural research (e.g., Gudykunst et al., 1996; Singelis, 1994; Triandis, McCusker & Hui, 1990; etc.). In all other respects the analyses reported here were purely inductive.

Method

The method is described in full in chapter 4. Participants in the questionnaire study indicated their agreement or disagreement with eight statements about personhood and marked the four statements which they saw as "most important in understanding what it means to be a person", then responded to the Gudykunst et al. (1996) self-construal scale.

Results

The analyses reported below deal firstly with the self-construal scale, secondly with the representation of personhood task and thirdly with the relationship between the measures derived from the two. Members of the clergy averaged significantly less independent and more interdependent self-construals than did US college students in baseline statistics reported by Gudykunst et al. (1996). Over 76% of participants agreed with all eight statements about personhood. A dimension interpreted as separating abstract from contextualised representations of the person was marginally correlated with independent but not interdependent self-construal.
**The self-construal measure**

The independence and interdependence scales of the Gudykunst et al. (1996) self-construal measure were analysed for statistical reliability. Cronbach's alpha was acceptable for both scales at .745 for the fourteen independence items and .806 for the fifteen interdependence items.

Responses to all items were entered into a principal components analysis. The analysis yielded eight factors with eigenvalue above 1, accounting for 59.1% of the total variance. However, the scree plot suggested a 2-factor solution which was consistent with both the theoretical account of Markus and Kitayama (1991) and the structure reported by Gudykunst et al. (1996). The first two unrotated factors accounted respectively for 17.0% and 11.8% of the total variance. Hence a rotation of the 2-factor solution was sought, using the direct oblimin method.\(^{17}\)

Communalities and structural coefficients for all items are summarised in table 7.1. The rotated Factor I appeared to reflect interdependent self-construals: structural coefficients of all except one of the original 'interdependent' items were above .43, while those of all the 'independent' items were below an absolute value of .33. Factor II appeared to reflect independent self-construals: structural coefficients of all except two of the original 'independent' items were above .39, while those of all the 'interdependent' items were below an absolute value of .32.

\(^{17}\) In their analysis, Gudykunst et al. (1996) used varimax rotation, on the basis that independent and interdependent self-construals were not expected to be correlated (after Markus and Kitayama, 1991). In the current study, direct oblimin rotation was used, which does not constrain the rotated factors to be orthogonal, as it was felt that the relationship between the factors should be an empirical question rather than a methodological constraint. In the oblimin analysis, the two rotated factors of the chosen solution showed a negligible correlation of -.03. As a safeguard, the analysis was repeated using varimax rotation with no substantive difference to the results reported.
Table 7.1  
Item means, standard deviations, communalities and structural coefficients for rotated 2-factor solution from principal components analysis of Gudykunst et al. (1996) independent and interdependent self-construal scale items.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Item Communality</th>
<th>Structural Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I respect decisions made by my group. †</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td>.702 - .194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stick with my group even through difficulties. †</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.415</td>
<td>.640 - .061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consult with others before making important decisions. †</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.633 - .322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I remain in the groups of which I am a member if they need me, even though I am dissatisfied with them. †</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.584 - .177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I maintain harmony in the groups of which I am a member. †</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.569 .187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give special consideration to others' personal situations so I can be efficient at work. †</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.547 .167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I am not happy with the group. †</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.536 - .167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is better to consult with others and get their opinions before doing anything. †</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.512 - .071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respect the majority's wishes in groups of which I am a member. †</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.511 .115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group. †</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.488 - .045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I consult with co-workers on work-related matters. †</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.471 - .165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationships with others are more important than my accomplishments. †</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.465 .229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I help acquaintances, even if it is inconvenient. †</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.455 .187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making a decision. †</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.433 .082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to abide by customs and conventions at work. †</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.287 .161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Scale 1</th>
<th>Scale 2</th>
<th>Scale 3</th>
<th>Scale 4</th>
<th>Scale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to act as an independent person. ‡</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to be self-reliant rather than depend on others. ‡</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should decide my future on my own. ‡</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>-.316</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try not to depend on others. ‡</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a unique person separate from others. ‡</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal identity is very important to me. ‡</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me. ‡</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is a conflict between my values and the values of groups of which I am a member, I follow my values. ‡</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens to me is my own doing. ‡</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy being unique and different from others. ‡</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take responsibility for my own actions. ‡</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't support a group decision when it is wrong. ‡</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should be judged on my own merit. ‡</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable being singled out for praise and rewards. ‡</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Method of rotation: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation.

‡ Interdependent self-construal items from original scale.

‡ Independent self-construal items from original scale.
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The problematic interdependent item was “I try to abide by customs and conventions at work”. Structural coefficients were .29 for Factor I and .16 for Factor II. This item could be understood to be problematic on conceptual grounds. It is assumed that the interdependent self construer behaves appropriately according to the situation in which she or he is placed, in this case ‘at work’. But ‘work’ for the priest involves a multiplicity of contexts and relationships, and the interdependent priest must be flexible and sensitive to these relationships, and hence may be potentially less bound by customs or conventions. Deleting this item also slightly improved the interdependence scale reliability from .806 to .814. The two problematic independent items were “I am comfortable being singled out for praise and rewards”, with coefficients of .07 on Factor II and .01 on Factor I, and “I should be judged on my own merit”, with coefficients of .31 on Factor II and .03 on Factor I. The second of these items appeared to be less problematic than the first, with a higher primary coefficient and a clear separation between primary and secondary coefficients. This was echoed in conceptual interpretations. The former item appeared to conflict with the Christian ideal of humility and the theological understanding of the cleric as servant. The latter item did not appear to be conceptually problematic. Furthermore, deleting the former item slightly improved the reliability of the independence scale from .745 to .765, whereas deleting the latter item slightly reduced the reliability.

Individual scores for independent and interdependent self construals were calculated as the means of the remaining items in each scale after deleting the items “I try to abide by customs and conventions at work” and “I am comfortable being singled out for praise and rewards”. The item, “I should be judged on my own merit”, was retained as it was not greatly undermined by the principal components analysis, and its inclusion was supported both in the reliability analysis and on conceptual grounds. The correlation between the two scales was negligible ($r = -.088$, ns).
Scores were also calculated with all of the original items as used by Gudykunst et al. The original scales were used for the purpose of comparison with the population statistics reported by the authors, while the modified versions were used in subsequent analyses.

*Comparing self-construals among priests and students*

Using the authors' original scoring of the self-construal scales, population means were compared with the baseline statistics reported by Gudykunst et al. (1996) for American, Japanese, Korean and Australian college students. Population means for the independent and interdependent self-construal measures are presented in figures 7.1 and 7.2 respectively.

The priests scored on average substantially lower on the independent self-construal measure and higher on the interdependent self-construal measure. In planned comparisons designed to test H1, the priests averaged significantly less independent and more interdependent self-construal scores than did the American college students (table 7.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>T-tests comparing independent and interdependent self-construal scores among UK Anglican parish priests and US college students</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent self-construals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK priests$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US students$^b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interdependent self-construals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK priests$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US students$^b$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Statistics calculated using original scoring of Gudykunst et al. (1996).

$^b$ Statistics for US college students from Gudykunst et al. (1996).
Figure 7.1. Mean independent self-construal scores (+/- SE) for American (n = 283), Japanese (n = 192), Korean (n = 168) and Australian (n = 110) students, as reported by Gudykunst et al. (1996), and for British priests (n = 149) measured in the current study.

Figure 7.2. Mean interdependent self-construal scores (+/- SE) for American (n = 283), Japanese (n = 192), Korean (n = 168) and Australian (n = 110) students, as reported by Gudykunst et al. (1996), and for British priests (n = 149) measured in the current study.
Representations of personhood

Table 7.3 summarises participants’ responses to the eight statements about personhood. Less than 25% disagreed with any of the statements, with seven statements receiving over 90% agreement. This was interpreted as a very high level of consensus. Three items, referring to “God’s image”, “loved by God” and “unique” received almost unanimous support. These items were also prioritised by a majority of participants’ (all three by over 77%) in choosing the four most important items.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that almost 25% disagreed with the item “Every person is a separate, bounded individual”, and only just over 10% listed this item within the four most important.

Table 7.3

Percentages of respondents (N = 149) agreeing with statements about personhood and including each statement within four most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>% agreement</th>
<th>% important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every person is made in God’s image.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person is loved by God.</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person is unique.</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>82.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person has a particular set of gifts.</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person has a purpose.</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person has a place amongst other people.</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person has a set of roles and responsibilities in life.</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person is a separate, bounded individual.</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to describe individual variations within the sample, the importance data\textsuperscript{18} were analysed using the PRINCALS program for non-linear principal components analysis (see Van de Geer, 1993).

Like traditional principal components analysis, PRINCALS maps items as vectors or factor loadings and respondents as points or factor scores within a multidimensional space (see Meulman, 1999).

However, the size of eigenvalues in PRINCALS is not equivalent to the size of eigenvalues in traditional principal components analysis. As an heuristic, Tagg (1997) recommends that eigenvalues in PRINCALS should normally be greater than the reciprocal of the number of variables (.1250 for 8 variables), but also stresses the importance of interpretability of the resulting dimensions.

PRINCALS extracted a 2-dimensional solution with both eigenvalues above .1250, but the dimensions could not be interpreted. Hence, for these data, a single dimensional solution with eigenvalue of .1847 was chosen.

The component loadings on this dimension are shown in figure 7.3.

Statements referring to both “gifts” and “uniqueness” loaded below -.4, while only the statement referring to having “a place amongst other people” loaded above +.4 on this dimension. This appeared to support an interpretation of the dimension in terms of independent (negative pole) vs. interdependent (positive pole) representations of personhood.

\textsuperscript{18} The agreement data was judged to be too homogeneous for any systematic analysis of individual differences to be worthwhile.
However, the positive loading of the "separate, bounded individual" item, although only at a level of .266, cast some doubt on this interpretation. Although clearly referring to an independent rather than interdependent concept of personhood, this item could nevertheless be understood in common with its neighbours as a description of the relationship between person and context. On the other hand, the concepts of "gifts" and "uniqueness" were descriptions of the person without reference to context. Hence, the dimension was interpreted as a reflection of abstract (negative pole) vs. contextualised (positive pole) representations of personhood.

**Figure 7.3.** Component loadings of statements about personhood from 1-dimensional PRINCALS analysis of binary importance ratings.

Respondents' factor scores from the PRINCALS analysis were saved and interpreted as a measure of individual variation on this dimension.
Convergence of representations of personhood and self-construals

There appeared to be a theoretical relationship between the single dimension derived from PRINCALS analysis of the personhood items, interpreted as opposing abstract and contextualised concepts of personhood, and the self-construal dimensions. The abstract concept was understood to be more individualistic and hence potentially more in keeping with an independent self-construal, although not necessarily incompatible with an interdependent self-construal, while the contextualised concept was not necessarily more compatible with an interdependent self-construal given the loading of the separateness item on this pole. So it appeared that the PRINCALS dimension might be negatively related to independent self-construal, but not necessarily related at all to interdependent self-construal. Furthermore the effect, if present, was expected to be reduced by the fact that the target of judgement is different for the two measures: oneself for the self-construal scales, the abstract 'person' for the representation of personhood section.

This expectation was supported. The abstract-contextualised dimension was slightly correlated with independent self-construals in the predicted direction ($r = -.196$, $n = 149$, $p < .05$), but was completely unrelated to interdependent self-construals ($r = .000$).

Discussion

Responding to the self-construal scale of Gudykunst et al. (1996), members of the Anglican clergy averaged significantly less independent and more interdependent self-construals than did US college students in baseline statistics reported by the authors. Each of these differences was not only significant but substantial, corresponding to a mean difference in the predicted direction of approximately one scale point across all items.
Over 90% of participants agreed with seven of the eight statements about personhood. The one exception was the statement, "Every person is a separate, bounded individual", which received only 76.5% agreement and was prioritised within the four most important statements by only 10.3% of respondents. It is interesting to note that this was the only statement which could be seen as directly contradicting a relational concept of personhood. Although the concepts of 'uniqueness' and 'gifts' also clearly had an individualistic emphasis, only 'separateness' could be taken to imply a direct negation of relatedness to others.

Taken together, these results clearly support the expectation that members of the Anglican clergy would show a strong relational orientation in their representations of both personhood and self.

But this is not to say that individualistic elements were absent. On the contrary, the individualistic statements "Every person is unique" and "Every person has a particular set of gifts" received 99.3% and 98.0% agreement and were counted among the four most important statements by 82.2% and 56.8% of respondents respectively.

Thus the data supported a view of individualistic and relational elements as coexistent within the priests' concepts of person and self, rather than suggesting an opposition between them. This echoed the findings of the interpretative phenomenological analysis reported earlier.

The notion of coexistence was also consistent with the conceptualisation of independent and interdependent self-construals as separate dimensions rather than as opposite ends of a single bipolar dimension (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Singelis, 1994), which was supported here by the negligible correlation between the two sub-scales of the self-construal measure, and
between the two extracted factors despite the use of oblique rather than orthogonal rotation in the principal components analysis.

It should also be noted that, despite the high levels of consensus in agreement with the 'personhood' items, the clergy were not entirely homogeneous with respect to these constructs. The replication of the original factor structure of the self-construal scale implies the existence of systematic variation between individuals within the sample in independent and interdependent self-construals.

Within the 'personhood' task, it appeared that individual differences were primarily in terms of the relative priority of abstract or contextualised elements rather than in terms of agreement with the items.

The failure of the PRINCALS analysis to separate individualistic from relational concepts of the person, marked by the loading of the individualistic statement, "Every person is a separate, bounded individual", together with the relational items, may have reflected a conscious desire for balance in responding to the task. This interpretation would be consistent with the interview data, where participants often mentioned individualistic and relational constructs together and explicitly referred to the necessity of striking a balance between them.

To summarise, it can be suggested from these data that the priests' concepts of personhood and self-construals were generally characterised by the coexistence of individualistic and relational elements and by what may have been a conscious effort to balance these elements. Compared with a population more commonly studied within 'western' social psychology, and often treated as representative of 'western' cultures within cross-cultural research, the priests displayed on average significantly and substantially less independent and more interdependent self-construals.
Churchmanship and Representations of Priesthood

The final part of this chapter is focused on the description of participants' endorsement of different 'churchmanships' (cf. chap. 4) and the competing representations of priesthood to which they are tied.

Within the interviews, it appeared that participants describing themselves as Catholic or Anglo-Catholic were more likely to view their distinctiveness from parishioners as ontologically true and functionally useful, whereas those describing themselves as Evangelical were more likely to view their distinctiveness from parishioners as a false separation and as an obstacle to their message. Hence, it seemed likely that Catholics and Evangelicals would address the question of distinctiveness from their parishioners very differently in constructing their identities.

It was therefore considered important to measure participants' endorsement of different churchmanship categories within the questionnaire study and to examine the relationship between these categories and participants' representations of being a priest.

Participants' identification with categories of churchmanship was assessed using a format adapted from that used in the 1989 English Church Census (Brierley, 1991a, 1991b). The census used a list of nine categories, which had been derived from extensive pilot work, with an additional option of "Other: please specify". Respondents were invited to tick up to three of the categories as descriptions of their congregations. In that study, "Other" responses were re-coded into the existing categories and responses were recompiled into a different set of nine categories by the investigators.
Since the aim here was to examine the significance of the categories for participants' identities, rather than for the church as a whole, the instructions were reworded in the questionnaire to address participants' endorsement of these categories as descriptions of themselves rather than as descriptions of their congregations. Additionally, the data were analysed using inductive approaches, rather than imposing the Church Census coding scheme on the data, especially as the rationale for this scheme is not explained in reports of the census (Brierley, 1991a, 1991b).

Participants' representations of priesthood were addressed in an analogue of the section on personhood, this time using nine statements about priesthood paraphrased from the interview data. These statements included items intended to refer to Evangelical (“A priest is someone who proclaims the Gospel”; “A priest is someone who is part of the community”), Catholic (“A priest is someone who administers the sacraments”; “A priest is someone who is set apart from ordinary life”) and Liberal (“A priest is someone with their own unique ministry”) understandings of priesthood, the concept of vocation (“A priest is someone who has been called by God”) and other aspects of being a priest (“A priest is someone who cares for people”; “A priest is someone who leads people in worship”; “A priest is someone who represents people to God”). As with the personhood task, respondents were asked to indicate their disagreement with any of the statements as a measure of consensus and to choose the four most important in order to assess individual differences in priority.

As with the analyses of concepts of personhood and self-construals, the primary aim of the analyses reported here was to describe patterns of similarity and difference in these constructs across the sample, including the derivation of individual difference variables for future analyses and an exploration of the relationships between these variables.
**Method**

The method is described in full in chapter 4. Participants indicated their agreement or disagreement with nine statements about priesthood and marked the four statements which they saw as “most important in understanding what it means to be a priest”. Later, participants read a list of nine categories of churchmanship and an “other” option, derived from the 1989 English Church Census (Brierley, 1991a, 1991b). Following the Church Census, they were invited to tick up to three of the descriptions. However, the criterion for selecting a category was whether it “might be used to describe your own ministry”, rather than whether it described their congregation as in the original instrument.

**Results**

The analyses reported below deal firstly with the churchmanship section, secondly with the representation of priesthood task and thirdly with the relationship between the measures derived from the two. Participants' responses to the churchmanship section were described in a PRINCALS analysis with two dimensions interpreted as opposing evangelical - catholic (Dimension I) and liberal - orthodox (Dimension II) churchmanships. An hierarchical cluster analysis of the same data resulted in three main clusters of respondents, which were labelled Anglo-Catholics (n = 25), Evangelicals (n = 54) and Liberal Catholics (n = 64). Over 80% of participants agreed with eight of the nine statements about priesthood. Individual differences in the choice of most important items were described in a PRINCALS analysis using a single dimension interpreted as separating God-focused from people-focused representations of priesthood. This dimension was significantly correlated with Dimension I of the PRINCALS analysis of churchmanship categories.
Churchmanship

Of those who responded to the churchmanship section (98.0% of all respondents), 50.7% ticked three categories, 38.4% ticked two and 11.0% ticked just one. Frequencies are summarised in table 7.4.

Contrary to the approach used in the 1989 Church Census (cf. Brierley, 1991b), responses given in the 'other' category were not re-coded into the existing categories, on the assumption that participants' had not selected these categories because they did not wish to do so. To some extent, this approach was felt to be dictated by the nature of the responses given. Several of these responses, "ecumenical", "middle of road", "roadhog" and the contradiction "conservative liberal" gave the impression of reactions against categorisation. Others, such as "pioneer" and "open, political", appeared to refer to more idiosyncratic approaches to ministry.

Table 7.4
Percentages of respondents (n = 146) selecting each churchmanship category as descriptive of their ministry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Catholic</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Church</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Binary data for the nine fixed categories (excluding the 'other' category) were analysed using PRINCALS and a 2-dimensional solution was chosen. The dimensions had eigenvalues of .2964 and .1790 respectively, both of which were comfortably above the minimum recommended eigenvalue of .1111 for an analysis of nine variables (cf. Tagg, 1997).

Component loadings for the categories are reproduced in figure 7.4. Dimension I (represented horizontally) clearly reflected an opposition between evangelical and catholic churchmanships, with 'low church', 'evangelical' and 'charismatic' towards the negative pole and 'catholic' towards the positive pole. Dimension II (represented vertically) appeared to reflect an opposition between liberal and orthodox orientations occurring towards the catholic end of the first dimension.

*Figure 7.4.* Component loadings of churchmanship categories from 2-dimensional PRINCALS analysis of binary selection data.
Respondents' factor scores were saved and were interpreted respectively as individual difference measures of evangelical-catholic and liberal-orthodox dimensions of churchmanship.

Additionally, the binary data for the nine fixed categories (again excluding the 'other' category) were used to group the respondents in an hierarchical cluster analysis (HCA) using the average linkage between groups method. From an inspection of the dendrogram, a 4 cluster solution was chosen as the most appropriate reflection of the data.

Cluster I included 25 respondents, of whom 96% described themselves as Anglo-Catholic, 52% as Catholic and 40% as Orthodox. Cluster II included 54 respondents, of whom 89% described themselves as Evangelical, 50% as Charismatic and 39% as Low Church. Cluster III included 64 respondents, of whom 78% described themselves as Catholic, 73% as Liberal and 41% as Broad. Cluster IV included just 3 respondents, who had described themselves as both Broad and Orthodox.

Participants grouped within the first three clusters were respectively named Anglo-Catholics, Evangelicals and Liberal Catholics.

Figure 7.5 shows a projection of participants' HCA cluster memberships onto their factor scores for the two dimensions of the PRINCALS analysis. Interpretations of the two analyses appeared to be substantively convergent, with Anglo-Catholics mostly in the orthodox catholic quadrant, Liberal Catholics mostly in the liberal catholic quadrant and Evangelicals mostly within the evangelical region of the plot.
Figure 7.5. Churchmanship clusters (HCA) as a function of evangelical vs. catholic and liberal vs. orthodox dimensions (PRINCALS).

Representations of priesthood

Table 7.5 summarises participants' responses to the statements about priesthood. Consensus was slightly lower than for the personhood items. Nevertheless, eight of the nine items received over 80% agreement, and one item, “A priest is someone who has been called by God”, both received 98.0% agreement and was prioritised by 84.9% of respondents. However, almost 45% disagreed with the item, “A priest is someone who is set apart from ordinary life” and only just over 10% listed this item as important.
Table 7.5

Percentages of respondents (N = 149) agreeing with statements about priesthood and including each statement within four most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% agreement</th>
<th>% important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who proclaims the Gospel.</td>
<td>99.3%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who administers the sacraments.</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who has been called by God.</td>
<td>98.0%</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who cares for people.</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who is part of the community.</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who leads people in worship.</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who represents people to God.</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone with their own unique ministry.</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who is set apart from ordinary life.</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to describe individual variations within the sample, the importance data\(^{19}\) were analysed using PRINCALS. As with the 'personhood' data, a 2-dimensional solution was extracted with both eigenvalues above .1111 (minimum value, after Tagg, 1997), but the dimensions could not be interpreted. Hence, for these data, a single

---

\(^{19}\) Again, the agreement data was judged to be too homogeneous for any systematic analysis of individual differences to be worthwhile.
dimensional solution with eigenvalue of .1824 was chosen. The component loadings on this dimension are shown in figure 7.6.

Figure 7.6. Component loadings of statements about priesthood from 1-dimensional PRINCALS analysis of binary importance ratings.

Statements describing the priest as "set apart from ordinary life" and as "someone who represents people to God" loaded below -.4, while statements referring to the priest as "someone who cares for people" and who "proclaims the Gospel" loaded above +.4 on this dimension. The dimension was interpreted as separating God-focused (negative pole) and people-focused (positive pole) representations of priesthood. Further support came from the directions of items loading below an absolute value of .4. Consistent with a God-focused representation of priesthood, "someone who administers the sacraments" loaded negatively, while consistent with a people-focused representation of priesthood, "someone who is part of the community" loaded positively on this dimension.
Convergence of churchmanship and representations of priesthood

There appeared to be a clear theoretical relationship between Dimension I of the PRINCALS analysis of the churchmanship categories and the single dimension of the 'representations of priesthood' analysis: specifically, the God-focused emphasis on sacrament and separation from ordinary life was more consistent with catholic theology, whereas the people-focused emphasis on evangelism ("... proclaims the Gospel") and inclusion in the community were more consistent with evangelical theology (see chap. 4).

Since these dimensions were aligned in opposite directions, a significant negative correlation was predicted between respondents factor scores on these dimensions. This was supported ($r = -0.230, n = 149, p < .01$).

Discussion

Participants' responses to the churchmanship section more or less replicated the tripartite division between Catholics, Evangelicals and Liberals discussed within chapter four. The one substantive difference was that those describing themselves as Liberal or Broad also frequently described themselves as Catholic, but not either as Anglo-Catholic, which was more closely connected to the term Orthodox, or as Evangelical.

This was reflected in both the PRINCALS dimensions and the HCA. In the PRINCALS analysis, rather than a single dimension of evangelical-catholic, with the term liberal occupying a middle position, the outcome was slightly more complex. The first dimension separated evangelical from catholic positions, while the second dimension separated liberal from orthodox (anglo-catholic) positions within the catholic half of the plot.
Similarly, rather than grouping participants into Catholics, Evangelicals and Liberals, the cluster analysis successfully separated Evangelicals as a single group (Cluster II), but divided those describing themselves as “catholic” into Anglo-Catholics (Cluster I) and Liberal Catholics (Cluster III), with no separate group of “liberals” emerging from the analysis.

Within the representation of priesthood section, the statement “A priest is someone who has been called by God” received 98% agreement, and was selected by almost 85% of respondents in their choice of the most important items. This was consistent with the finding of Christopherson (1994) that the concept of ‘calling’ was a defining feature of identity and self worth among members of the clergy of a number of denominations.

However, this homogeneity was not reflected in the priests’ prioritisation of the remaining items. Individual differences were described in terms of a dimension interpreted as separating God-focused from people-focused representations of the priest, which appeared to be conceptually related to catholic and evangelical theologies. Participants’ factor scores on this dimension were correlated with scores on the evangelical-catholic dimension of the churchmanship analysis.

In conclusion, it appeared that the evangelical-catholic dimension might be especially useful in subsequent analyses of the distinctiveness principle. Not only was this dimension a salient feature of participants’ discussions of the importance and the value of distinctiveness in the interview study, but it also appeared to be a robust organising principle of participants’ self-categorisations within the priesthood and of their representations of the superordinate category. Two variables measuring this distinction were available for future use, one in terms of self-categorisation and one in terms of representations of priesthood.
Conclusion

The analyses presented in this chapter have provided advancement both in clarifying aspects of the meaningful context within which identity processes occur among members of the Anglican clergy and in the derivation of variables summarising variation within the population in these constructs which could be used in subsequent analyses.

The first parts of the chapter described the priests' representations of personhood and their self-construals. Responses were characterised by the coexistence of individualistic and relational elements. In comparison with US college students, the priests displayed on average significantly and substantially less independent and more interdependent self-construals. The importance of relationships for members of the clergy is reflected in the next chapter, which shows the sensitivity of their constructions of distinctiveness to concerns about relationships, as well as chapters 9 and 11, which show the importance of distinctiveness in terms of position.

The final part of the chapter described the priests' endorsement of churchmanship categories and their representations of priesthood. Both self-categorisations within the priesthood and representations of the superordinate category appeared to be organised by a robust distinction between evangelical and catholic positions. Within the churchmanship analysis, catholics were further split into liberal and orthodox sub-groups. The importance of churchmanship is shown in the next chapter, where participants' accounts of the distinctiveness of the clergy appeared to be closely tied to their identification with different churchmanships.
Chapter 8
DISTINCTIVENESS AND THE CLERGY

I don't care if I'm distinctive or not. Why the hell should I care?
[...] I don't get my identity from being distinctive.
PETER (Interview participant)

This chapter reports the third interpretative phenomenological analysis (after J. A. Smith, 1996a) of the interview data, which was intended to describe participants' experiences of distinctiveness. While the interview questions focused mainly on participants' understandings of their distinctiveness, an additional aim was to identify feelings about distinctiveness, and related motivations or strategies, using the interview as a whole and not just the section in which distinctiveness was explicitly addressed. By emphasising process as well as structure, this focus was intended to contribute to a more detailed understanding of the ways in which the distinctiveness principle affects identity and behaviour.

Procedure

The interview schedule is described in detail in chapter 4. Treatment of the data followed a similar strategy to that of the previous analyses. Each transcript was read in full several times. Passages were underlined and notes were jotted in the margins. Notes were summaries of the material, references to other passages or preliminary interpretations. For each participant, preliminary themes were identified, which appeared to summarise or explain a large part of the data, were especially strongly represented in particular passages, or tied together material from different parts of the interview. The preliminary themes extracted from each interview were summarised on a separate sheet of paper with notes on the content of the themes and references to relevant quotations.
The summaries were then compared and themes were provisionally grouped into superordinate clusters. Within each cluster, the initial themes originating from each participant were then compared in detail, with reference to both the summaries and the original transcripts, resulting in a fine-grained specification of the contents of each cluster.

Next, an examination was made of the relationships between clusters. A number of new connections were drawn between elements, resulting in a substantial reworking of the themes and clusters into a more coherent framework. At this stage, a provisional report was written.

A final iteration of the analytic process involved examining the remaining 21 interviews, as well as constructing a theoretical account of processes which appeared to be implicated in the themes. This led to some further modifications: one theme was developed in greater detail, two clusters were merged, the internal structure of two clusters was reorganised and several themes and clusters were re-titled. The analysis is reported below.

**Analysis**

Four superordinate clusters were identified, each of which is examined in a separate section below. A first section, "Debating the distinctiveness of the clergy", reports participants' accounts of their distinctiveness as members of the clergy, which were far from consensual. A second section, "Dimensions of distinctiveness within the clergy", looks at participants' constructions of their distinctiveness from each other. A third section, "Evaluating the consequences of distinctiveness", examines participants' feelings about distinctiveness in terms of the multiple positive and negative functions of being distinctive. A final section, "Strategies of
distinctiveness management”, examines participants’ accounts of strategically manipulating their distinctiveness within social settings.

**Debating the distinctiveness of the clergy**

The first cluster of themes encompasses participants' descriptions of how they understood themselves to be distinguished from other people in society by their membership of the clergy. When asked to describe their distinctiveness as members of the clergy, participants typically focused initially on ways in which they were distinctive according to ‘popular perceptions’. Describing their own perceptions, many participants rejected the popular image, making ‘denials and qualifications’, although others in turn rejected the denials, making ‘affirmations of distinctiveness’.

**Popular perceptions of the clergy**

When questioned about their distinctiveness as members of the clergy, many participants began their answers by referring to the extremely distinctive image of the clergy within popular perceptions. For example, when asked to describe how she was distinguished as a member of the clergy from others in society, Christine began as follows:

> When people learn that you’re a member of the clergy, their expectations seem to alter suddenly. Their, what’s the word, their conception of what you are and who you are seems to suddenly change. There’s a vast difference between going out wearing a collar and going out not wearing a collar in the way people perceive you. These perceptions might be right or wrong, but it defines the way they look at you straight away, when they realise, they don’t always notice, but when they realise.

Christine emphasised the distinctiveness of the popular image of the clergy in terms of the “vast difference” in “the way people perceive you”
according to whether or not they realised that she was a member of the clergy. She noted also that “these perceptions might be right or wrong”.

Answering the same question, William began with a similar statement, focusing on the “expectations” referred to by Christine:

People sometimes have certain expectations of you. They expect you to have a higher morality than the average. They expect you to lead in some ways rather a different lifestyle to that of the general population. I don’t know whether we do, to all that extent.

William referred to expectations of “a higher morality” and “rather a different lifestyle” and, like Christine, questioned the validity of these perceptions, “I don’t know whether we do, to all that extent”.

Jenny, responding to the same question, elaborated in greater detail on aspects of people’s “expectations” which she described as “inaccurate”:

Generally speaking the person in the street thinks a clergyperson is very holy, very well behaved, doesn't have any nasty habits, and frowns on people who do, or who don't behave. And I think people also feel that clergy folk have a sort of a direct line with God that they haven't got, and also that they are a bit above the rest of society generally, not simply because they have this connection with God, or this perceived connection with God, but just because they are slightly better people. And now I think all of that is inaccurate.

In this passage, Jenny referred to four basic ‘inaccuracies’ in the popular perception of the clergy. The “person in the street”, she said, perceived members of the clergy to be “above the rest of society” in their behaviour (“doesn’t have any nasty habits”) and in their being (“slightly better
people”), to be judgmental of others (“frowns on people”) and to have
greater access to God (“a sort of a direct line with God”).

Neil referred later in the interview to a connection between attribution to
God and attribution to the clergy in the minds of his parishioners:

And in some ways if something goes wrong or somebody dies
it’s probably the vicar’s fault. You know they never say
that but they feel, or it’s the Boss’s [God’s] fault, you
know, and the vicar’s therefore partly to blame.

Echoing Jenny’s description of the perceived “direct line with God”, Neil
described feeling blamed by his parishioners for bad events, indicating the
extent to which they distinguished him from a normal human being: “it’s
the Boss’s fault, you know, and the vicar’s therefore partly to blame”.

Gerry began his description by referring to “the usual sort of phrases that
people trot out” about members of the clergy:

The usual sort of phrases that people trot out, 'he's
gone into the church', when you get ordained, the old hat
phrase of a 'man of the cloth'. [...] It sort of becomes
evident that when you're in various places they say, 'oh
it's the vicar'. You can't sort of not be the vicar
unless you're deliberately trying not to be.

Gerry inferred his distinctiveness in popular perceptions from the ‘trotting
out’ of phrases which were characterised by a sense of distinctiveness in
terms of separation (“gone into the church”) and in terms of difference
(“man of the cloth”). Additionally, he described his categorisation as “the
vicar” in others’ eyes to be more or less inescapable, noting that “you can't
sort of not be the vicar unless you’re deliberately trying not to be”. 
The participants cited above referred to popular perceptions of the clergy in terms of difference (Jenny: "slightly better people") or separateness (Gerry: "gone into the church"). In all of these accounts, either the validity of these perceptions was questioned (Christine: "might be right or wrong") or the popular image was portrayed as unwelcome in some sense (Neil: "if something goes wrong or somebody dies it's probably the vicar's fault").

However, participants also described being perceived as distinctive in terms of their social position as members of the clergy. James referred to being seen as "someone who's in a role":

How am I distinguished first of all in terms of society generally. I think I would still be seen probably as an authority figure to a degree. Although that is far less so than used to be the case. [...] And quite clearly, you know, people perceive me as someone who's in a role, and that's why they respond to me very much the way that they do. I think they'd see me as someone who is a kind of representative as far as God is concerned for them.

Unlike previous accounts, which referred to popular perceptions of the clergy in terms of difference or separateness, James here portrayed the distinctiveness attributed to him in terms of his relationship with others as an "authority figure" and as "a kind of representative as far as God is concerned for them". There was no sense within this passage that James saw this distinctiveness as either inaccurate or unwelcome.

Meanwhile, Paul described being perceived by others in terms of a "deep-seated understanding of the 'holy one'":

I think there's also still a fairly deep-seated understanding of the 'holy one' [...] and this is a role that I think is distinctive and recognised even by non-believers. And so people who have no particular belief will ask me to pray for them, will be very pleased when I
visit them or see them in times of need, will not take it as at all odd that I can be quite intimate with them when the situation is right. And when the situation is wrong, they'll slam the door in my face.

Paul portrayed the concept of the “holy one” as a “role”, rather than a source of difference or separation, and described the consequences of this role for his relationships with others. The role was generally restricted to “times of need”, and might involve being asked to pray for people, even for “non-believers”, as well as visiting people and being “quite intimate” with them. At other times, the relationship was a negative one: “when the situation is wrong, they'll slam the door in my face”.

In summary, participants described being seen as extremely distinctive in the eyes of others. Distinctiveness was attributed to them in terms of difference, separateness and position. In many cases, these perceptions of distinctiveness were portrayed as inaccurate or unwelcome.

Denials and qualifications of distinctiveness

In fact, a striking feature of the interviews was the extent to which participants avoided describing themselves as distinctive, especially in terms of difference or separateness. For example, early in the section on distinctiveness, John reacted against the whole line of questioning:

This distinction, this distinguishing, I have great difficulty with this word, 'distinguished'. To me there's an implication that somehow one is a 'distinguished person', whereas all that lot, they're all down there, they're not distinguished at all, and I don't have that concept at all. Do you see my problem? [...] That is not as I see it at all, it's the complete reverse.
John appeared to associate the whole concept of distinctiveness with a sense of self-aggrandisement, referring to "an implication that somehow one is a 'distinguished person', whereas all that lot, they're all down there", which also conveyed a sense of separateness. John had earlier associated members of the clergy with the quality of "humility", which perhaps explained his reluctance to describe himself as "distinguished" here: "that is not as I see it at all, it's the complete reverse".

The inaccuracy of others' perceptions of the clergy was taken up by Peter, who argued that he was "different" only in "other people's expectations":

Other people's expectations are based on the fact that because I represent church, the church community or even God - heaven forbid - then I am different. And that's the problem, you see, because actually I'm no different, I just happen to be representing. So I've not set myself apart, people have set me apart by their expectations.

According to Peter, expectations that he was "different" came from his representative role as a member of the clergy, and should be contrasted with the 'reality' that "actually I'm no different". Thus it was "people", and not Peter himself, who 'set him apart' as a member of the clergy.

Simon elaborated on being "no different", against the background of a "mythology about the office of clergy" in others' expectations:

You are just as pathetically weak in some areas and possibly gifted in other areas as any other human being. You are no different. You're as likely to have divorce, family problems, illness, mental breakdown, probably more likely in fact, than any person. So you know it's like that there is still a mythology about the office of clergy, which I think people who are members of a congregation like to foster. There's a slight mythology
about being a Christian as well but it's kind of magnified when you become a professional Christian.

Like John, Simon appeared here to be concerned with preserving a sense of humility. Although his account of the similarity of the clergy to "any other human being" balanced negative and positive personal qualities of 'weakness' and 'gifts', the negative side was reinforced ("pathetically weak") while the positive side was qualified ("possibly gifted"). An additional equivalence was drawn in terms of common fate, with shared outcomes of "divorce, family problems, illness, mental breakdown".

While Peter and Simon denied that they were 'different' as members of the clergy, reactions were also strong against the use of 'separateness' as a source of distinctiveness. James, asked to describe ways in which he was 'set apart' from others in society, responded as follows:

You know I don't naturally think in terms of boundaries because I'm not someone who likes, I'm in the business of breaking down boundaries, doing everything I can.

Echoing John's assertion that "I don't have that concept at all", James denied that the concept was meaningful to him, "I don't naturally think in terms of boundaries", and added that he was opposed to separateness by the nature of his job: "I'm in the business of breaking down boundaries".

In addition to outright denials of distinctiveness, participants often qualified their distinctiveness as members of the clergy. One form of qualification involved denying that particular characteristics or roles were exclusive to the clergy. For example, John described his pastoral role:

I visit them. I go and see them in hospital when they're sick. I'm concerned about them. I do what I can to help them, if they're having difficulties. All those things are being done quietly by other members of society and
you don't hear about them. The clergy are noted for it because they wear dog collars, but there are quite a lot of people doing that sort of thing without recognition.

Having described his pastoral activities, John qualified his distinctiveness, asserting that “all those things are being done quietly by other members of society” and that the apparent distinctiveness of the clergy in this respect was illusory: “the clergy are noted for it because they wear dog collars”.

Paul made a similar point about theological knowledge:

To take this as a sort of symbol for other things, there are something like fifteen theology graduates in my congregation, of whom I am not one. There are many people who are highly intelligent, and actually expert in my field, and they are all running banks or businesses, or teachers or whatever, and I love that, that there are those sorts of people, and I use that. I don’t want to be over academic, but I mean there are those folk around.

Following John’s account of the illusory distinctiveness of his pastoral role, Paul stressed that theological training also was not exclusive to the clergy, noting that there were “something like fifteen theology graduates in my congregation”, and furthermore that he was not one of them. Paul appeared to see his lack of distinctiveness in this respect in positive terms: “I love that, that there are those sorts of people, and I use that”.

Another way in which participants qualified their distinctiveness was to portray sources of distinctiveness as functional, traditional or accidental rather than fundamental or essential. For example Peter, when first asked to describe ways in which he was distinguished as a member of the clergy from other members of society, gave the following answer:
Right. Job function. Exclusively job function. The things that I do and am expected to do. Let me just be clear about that. My being is not distinctive. So the skills that I bring may be shaped, need to be shaped by the functions that I perform. But there is an argument that ordained people are different in their being, and I completely reject that. So I'm making a very powerful statement by simply saying function. My difference is functional. I am different to the church cleaners not in the fact that I have been ordained by the bishop, but simply that my function is different in the church.

Peter described his answer as a "very powerful statement" that his distinctiveness was in "function" and not in "being". This was expressed as an explicit rebuttal of an alternative argument "that ordained people are different in their being". A particular concern appeared to be to avoid perceptions of an evaluative difference--thus Peter compared himself with the church cleaners, stating simply that "my function is different".

In a similar vein, Neil acknowledged his distinctiveness only in terms of the "particular role" given to him by the church:

I suppose really, I don't feel any different to everybody else and I don't do a lot of things terribly differently to anybody else. I don't feel necessarily changed by God to be a priest, but I feel that the church has given me a particular role to play. But it could be, anybody could have been chosen to play that role.

In all other respects, Neil asserted, he was not distinctive. He stressed that he did not "feel any different", nor did he "do a lot of things terribly differently". Furthermore, he did not see himself as special in having been chosen to be a priest, "anybody could have been chosen to play that role", nor had he been "changed by God" in becoming a priest.
Finally, James made a similar point, describing his membership of the clergy as "a distinction without a difference":

There is a specific calling. But you see I think in so many of these areas we're talking about a distinction without a difference. Because there is no qualitative difference between a lay person and a clergyman at all. There is nothing which even suggests in the Bible that there is a kind of hierarchy and that the 'ordained priest' in inverted commas is a special person at a higher level than anybody else at all. Now I think tradition has loaded some of those associations on to the clergy, but I don't think they're actually there at all. It's ordinary people who are called to be clergymen.

While acknowledging the distinctiveness of a "specific calling", James stressed that there was "no qualitative difference between a lay person and a clergyman at all" and that the understanding of the "ordained priest" as "a special person at a higher level than anybody else" was purely 'traditional' and neither supported in the Bible nor "actually there".

In sum, contrary to the extremely distinctive image of the clergy within popular perceptions, most participants sought to deny, or at least to qualify, their distinctiveness from other members of society. Most of the quotations reproduced above were implicit or explicit rebuttals of alternative viewpoints from "other people's expectations", "mythology" or "tradition". Although some distinctiveness was acknowledged in terms of "job function" "particular role" or "specific calling", a particular concern was to deny constructions of distinctiveness implying that members of the clergy were intrinsically 'different' or 'separate' from others in society.
Affirmations of distinctiveness

Although most participants denied or qualified their distinctiveness as members of the clergy, a few participants showed the opposite tendency. In this respect, Mark's initial description of ways in which he was distinctive as a member of the clergy is worth quoting at length:

One's different in so many ways that I don't understand people who want constantly not to be thought of as being so different. [...] We wear funny clothes. We say funny things. We go to odd places to learn odd things. For example, Greek, there's absolutely no commercial or classical reason why learning Greek of the first century is sensible. You can't read the Odyssey or anything, any good literature, knowing it, and you can't speak to anyone in Greece as a banker with it. It's a completely useless language to know. We are given invitations to things that no-one else gets invited to, the private grief, the private joy, the private failure and the private sins of people. We're different because we're under oaths of obedience to people, who outside the armed forces no-one actually is. We're under an oath of obedience to the bishop, to Her Majesty the Queen, to God himself, and therefore that obedience informs the freedom that one has in a way that's very different from other people. We are different in our working patterns. Sunday is a very public and insane day, and Monday can be as quiet or as raucous as one wants to make it. The way we relate to the seasons of the year, indeed we have seasons of the year that nobody else has. How we're paid is different from how other people are paid. Everyone else gets advancements and bonuses and sackings - it almost doesn't matter whether you're good bad or indifferent at your job, you'll still get paid the same amount of money, and the differentials of pay are infinitesimal by comparison to other things economically. So for all those reasons I'd say we're very different.
Mark's response was a catalogue of distinctive features of the clergy, which encompassed differences in behaviour ("we wear funny clothes", "we say funny things"), in knowledge ("learning Greek of the first century"), in relationships with others ("invitations to [...] the private grief, the private joy, the private failure and the private sins of people"), in conditions of employment ("oaths of obedience", "different in our working patterns", "how we're paid is different") and even in calendrical time ("we have seasons of the year that nobody else has"). These differences led him to reject explicitly the perspectives, described in the previous section, of "people who want constantly not to be thought of as being so different".

According to David, the category of priesthood was intrinsically distinctive because of its "sacramental" nature:

Sacrament involves something tangible which comes to have, something this-worldly which comes to have an other-worldly significance. [...] Being a priest is actually a sacrament, it's sacramental. So many of the actual mundane, functional things that we do [...] they're more significant in the meaning they come to have, they point beyond themselves.

An implication of the "sacramental" nature of priesthood was that actions he performed as a priest had a qualitatively different meaning to the same actions performed by a layperson: "many of the mundane, functional things that we do [...] point beyond themselves", coming to have an "other-worldly significance". David gave the example of visiting a parishioner:

So, I mean, if this afternoon I go and visit an elderly lady, Alice, up the road, which I probably will, and sit and listen to her and drink a cup of tea with her, the significance - I mean she will probably enjoy having someone to talk to, and I'll enjoy having a cup of tea, I'll probably feel refreshed afterwards - but the meaning of the visit will not be that I've gone to be a good
listener or to slake my thirst, the meaning of it is that actually, well it's not easy to put into words but it's to do with God and the beyond, a bigger, a different, more of a context, and it'll be communicative of her status with God, not just with me.

David explained his understanding of the sacramental nature of having a cup of tea with Alice, suggesting that “the meaning of the visit” was not in his “this-worldly” or “mundane, functional” intention “to be a good listener or to slake my thirst”, but in the “other-worldly significance” that “it'll be communicative of her status with God, not just with me”.

Timothy reflected similarly that he was “a priest in every context”:

I'm a priest in every context whether, you know, it's in bed with your wife or whether it's getting drunk in a pub with friends or whatever, you're still a priest.

Thus, according to Timothy, the distinctiveness of being a priest was not limited even to public and priestly activities such the pastoral visit described by David, but extended to the privacy of being “in bed with your wife” and the profane context of “getting drunk in a pub with friends”.

Timothy also referred to the distinctiveness of being paid a “stipend”:

You're paid not to work. That's actually what you get paid for. It's so that you are free, available in a parish. That's why we get paid a stipend rather than a wage.

Timothy explained the conceptual difference between a “stipend”, which is paid “so that you are free, available in a parish”, and a “wage”. Thus he noted the distinctiveness of being “paid not to work”.
David noted that the clergy were also distinguished from others in society in terms of a substantially higher level of material security:

One way is that I live in a house that's provided for me and that I'm freed from some of the practical worries that other people have, certainly connected with employment. [...] And I don't need to worry about my job security too much. Many people worry about that. And I know that while the world is changing in lots of respects the fact that I am the whatever it is twenty something rector of my parish in a line that goes back to the twelfth century gives me a sort of sense of security.

David described himself as “freed from some of the practical worries that other people have” in terms of housing and “job security”. In particular, he derived a sense of security from the historical continuity of his current position “in a line that goes back to the twelfth century”.

Michael referred to a “very conscious and deliberate setting apart of clergy” through the use of distinctive symbols:

I mean I think the whole dog collar sort of routine really, and things like that, is a very conscious and deliberate setting apart of clergy. [...] We're given this title 'Reverend'. I mean in a sense society does that but I think clergy collude with it. And the dog collar bit, and we're put in a special house, often physically separate or different from other houses, usually called 'The Vicarage' or something. So I think yes we're quite different in a whole variety of ways.

This process of “setting apart” made use of symbols of distinctiveness including “the whole dog collar routine”, the title “Reverend” and living in a “special house, often physically separate or different from other houses, usually called ‘The Vicarage’ or something”.
According to Michael, the clergy were also distinguished from “the general public” in terms of values:

I guess clergy are immersed in a counterculture which values certain things more highly than the general public do. I mean it's not sort of very visibly or explicitly success orientated. [...] A lot of what clergy are set apart for is to do with things that can't be measured in that way, to do with availability, to do with having time for people who are hurting, things like that. And so I think we probably have quite a different set of markers for sort of how well we feel we're doing or whether we go to bed at night feeling we've had a good day's work, so to speak. I think we measure ourselves or we are measured on a different scale or graph from many people.

The values of the clergy appeared to be distinctive in two senses according to this quotation. Firstly, in contrast with the “success oriented” values of the “general public”, members of the clergy endorsed a different set of values as part of a Christian “counterculture”. Secondly, members of the clergy were evaluated according to a different set of criteria, or “measured on a different scale or graph”, which was “to do with availability, to do with having time for people who are hurting, things like that”.

Michael concluded that he did not accept the ‘denials and qualifications’ made by others of the popular image of the clergy as “being very different”, but suggested that “the world around is correct in some ways”:

I think most clergy feel [...] that we're just like everybody else but happen to be a clergyman. So I think there's a big disparity between how the world sees us and how we see ourselves. In terms of the things I just mentioned I think we are actually quite different in terms of motivations and so forth, we're part of quite a different structure. So yes, the world around is correct in some ways. I think we are actually quite different in practical ways, because of the way it's structured.
Michael acknowledged the "big disparity between how the world sees us and how we see ourselves", but concluded that the clergy were different from other members of society both in "motivations" and in "the way it's structured", which undermined the perspective of "most clergy" that "we're just like everybody else but happen to be a clergyman".

Finally, Paul's account of how the clergy were distinguished according to Anglican doctrine from other people in society involved an interesting negotiation between distinctiveness and "indistinguishing":

The great thing in Anglican doctrine is the phrase 'the parson'. Not priest, not minister and other things, but really, you know, in brief, at the heart of Anglican doctrine on the priesthood is 'the parson'. And [...] the origin of that word is 'the person', and therefore deep in the Anglican self-understanding of priesthood is that the parson is the person who lives in the parish, who is known and knows people, who lives amongst them. All of which sounds quite indistinguishing, and there is that side, that the person, we are all people. But the fact that his, heavy inverted commas, "job" is to be the person who is the person, is part of what distinguishes him, so he is not the farm labourer, the Lord of the Manor, the whatever, he is the person.

Paul's description of the concept of "the parson" was especially interesting in terms of the distinction between sources of distinctiveness proposed within this thesis. Paul appeared to be stressing that the "parson" was not different from others ("we are all people"), nor was he (sic) separate from others ("the parson is the person who lives in the parish, who is known and knows people, who lives amongst them"). However, the parson was distinguished by his social role or position within the parish: "he is not the farm labourer, the Lord of the Manor, the whatever, he is the person".
An additional implicit feature of this definition was the historical continuity of the role of "parson", which was underlined by Paul's interest in the etymological roots of the word and by his grounding of the social position of the parson in relation to the "Lord of the Manor".

In summary, contrary to the perspectives of those who denied or qualified their distinctiveness as members of the clergy, these participants emphasised a range of distinctive features of the clergy, including the sacramental nature of priesthood, the symbolic setting apart of the clergy, the values of the clergy and their levels of material security. Several of the quotations were explicit rebuttals of the views of "people who want constantly not to be thought of as being so different" or who feel "that we're just like everybody else but happen to be a clergyman".

Discussion

Participants' accounts of their distinctiveness as members of the clergy were far from consensual. There was agreement among participants that the clergy were perceived by others to be extremely distinctive. However, there was considerable variation in how participants described their own perceptions. Many sought to deny or to qualify their distinctiveness as members of the clergy, but others affirmed their distinctiveness.

An important feature of the analysis is that the quotations cited were often phrased as explicit contradictions of either the popular image of the clergy or the views of other members of the clergy. Participants appeared to be implicitly involved in a debate over the meaning of the category in which they shared membership. Hence these accounts did not appear to be value-free descriptions of participants' experiences; rather, they had the character of purposive, motivated arguments within this debate.
According to Marková (1987), self-understandings develop at least partly through the individual's active engagement in social interaction with other people. Similarly, according to Reicher (1996), group identities are formed and reformed at least partly through processes of intergroup interaction. It is also an assumption of this thesis that identity is shaped by processes of communication as well as cognition (chap. 1). It seemed here that participants were defining the meaning of their group through their active engagement in intragroup and intergroup interaction.

In emphasising the importance of communication processes for identity definition, it is not intended to imply that self-definition simply reflects the perspectives of others (cf. Cooley, 1902/1964). On the contrary, it is stressed that the individual is an active agent in the process of identity construction (Marková, 1987). Thus participants here seemed to construct their accounts in explicit opposition with alternative perspectives. Indeed, Reicher (1995) notes that assertions about the meaning of categories, rather than reflecting social reality, are often best understood as purposive attempts to construct social reality in a particular form.

It should be noted that position, difference and separateness were not represented uniformly across participants' accounts as sources of distinctiveness. While all three sources were present within the descriptions of others' perceptions, participants negated or qualified especially their separateness or difference from others, but affirmed distinctiveness especially in terms of aspects of their position. This implied that distinguishing between sources of distinctiveness might be a means of negotiating between the arguments of those who denied and those who affirmed their distinctiveness in more general terms. This possibility is developed in greater detail later in the analysis.
Dimensions of distinctiveness within the clergy

The second cluster of themes encompasses participants' descriptions of how they understood themselves to be distinguished from other members of the clergy. Participants constructed their distinctiveness especially in terms of 'churchmanship and approaches to ministry', through 'social comparisons' and in terms of their 'locations within the parish system'.

Churchmanship and approaches to ministry

When asked to describe ways in which they were distinguished from other members of the clergy within the church, many participants referred initially to the breadth of theological perspectives within the Church of England (cf. Nichols, 1993). Some of their responses began as follows:

Obviously there's a tremendous cross-section of theological views within the Church, the Church of England itself. (James)

I mean the clergy come in all shapes and sizes and in all kinds of approaches. (Grace)

The big division thing, yeah. (Gerry)

James and Grace emphasised the heterogeneity of theologies and approaches to ministry, referring respectively to the "tremendous cross-section of theological views" and the presence of "all shapes and sizes and [...] all kinds of approaches" within the Church of England. Meanwhile Gerry's response appeared simultaneously to reflect both the notoriety and the divisive potential of this issue: "the big division thing".

Within the range of available churchmanships, Richard located himself as "an Evangelical", while Matthew located himself "on the Catholic wing":

---

Obviously there's a tremendous cross-section of theological views within the Church, the Church of England itself. (James)

I mean the clergy come in all shapes and sizes and in all kinds of approaches. (Grace)

The big division thing, yeah. (Gerry)
I am distinguished by my theology, which is a commitment to the scriptures as primary, so I am there as an Evangelical, and that distinguishes me from a clergyman who has a very high view of the church, and they would be on the Catholic wing of the church. And they would have much more regard for the office of a priest, and the administration of the sacraments and the rituals of worship, Catholic style. [...] And then you've also got the more Liberal guys in the middle, the ones who are not particularly Catholic, but want to be modern, rational, you know, believing in the Gospel but applying, you know, everything you believe has to be tested by reason. And so they, and the trouble is in the process of doing that, they sort of empty the faith entirely of any content that could be called, anything significant at all. (Richard)

I'm on the Catholic wing of the Church of England. Therefore I have a distinctive spirituality, which would be quite different, for example, from a Conservative Evangelical, who wouldn't even call himself a priest incidentally, he might actually want to use a different term about what we both are, if you see what I mean. (Matthew)

According to Richard, the label “Evangelical” referred to “a commitment to the scriptures as primary”, while Matthew described his “Catholic” identification as referring to a “distinctive spirituality”. However, the main effort within both of their accounts went into differentiating their respective churchmanships from alternative possibilities. Thus Richard described “Catholic” and “Liberal” alternatives in much greater detail than his own orientation, while Matthew defined his churchmanship in opposition to that of a “Conservative Evangelical”. This was consistent with the assumption underlying social identity and self-categorisation theories that ingroups are generally defined in relationship to outgroups on the same level of abstraction (Tajfel, 1978; J. C. Turner, 1987).
Gerry, describing himself as a "middle of the roader", also constructed this category in contrast with alternative possibilities:

I, as far as my own ministry is concerned, am a sort of middle of the roader, right? And therefore I would be distinguished from my High Church friends I suppose, certainly I suppose in worship in as much as I wouldn't go for some of the ritual ceremonial that some of my more High Church friends would do. And as far as dress is concerned, I wear a grey shirt, some of the time I wear a black shirt, but you know you see me in sort of a fairly sort of average sort of clergy garb at the minute, whereas again some of my more High Church friends would probably always wear black and perhaps a more catholic sort of collar, say. As far as being distinguished from some of one's in inverted commas 'Low Church' friends, I mean they're more likely perhaps to wear a collar and tie and not wear a clerical collar at all. You know, as far as worship's concerned, probably their services would be a bit more informal than mine, I should say ours.

Gerry distinguished his 'middle of the road' churchmanship from 'higher' and 'lower' alternatives in terms of "worship" and "dress". Again, more effort went into describing these alternatives than his own category.

The distinction between Catholic and Evangelical churchmanships, as well as being a source of differentiation within the clergy, also appeared to be quite strongly related to the differences in the perceived distinctiveness of the clergy which were discussed within the previous section. This could be seen in Gerry's description of the Catholic emphasis on visual symbols of distinctiveness, "wear[ing] black and perhaps a more catholic sort of collar", as opposed to the Evangelical practice "perhaps to wear a collar and tie and not wear a clerical collar at all", as well as Matthew's reflection, cited earlier, that a Conservative Evangelical "might actually want to use a different term about what we both are".
It should be noted that participants did not always fully endorse the churchmanship labels which they applied to themselves. Grace qualified her identification with the Catholic orientation:

I'm what you would call Catholic, Liberal Catholic in my views, I'm a traditionalist in the church, I'm not in the Happy Clappy group, I'm in the much more traditional type of churchmanship. But I'm open to the sort of worship that young people like and I'm not one who wants us to go on forever with the King James Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. But on the other hand I feel that the values and the traditions of the church are very important, even as I feel they're important in all walks of life, to a certain extent. Our background, even our Christian background in the general, you know, life of our nation is important I think.

Initially, Grace described herself as a “Catholic”, immediately qualifying her churchmanship as “Liberal Catholic”, but differentiating herself explicitly from the alternative “Happy Clappy group” (an informal term referring to the Evangelical style of worship). However the remainder of this passage was dedicated to differentiating herself from the stereotype of a Catholic, “I'm not one who wants us to go on forever with the King James Bible and the Book of Common Prayer” and linking her churchmanship to a more general endorsement of “the values and traditions of the church” and “our Christian background”.

Participants also differed in the extent to which they portrayed churchmanship as an important issue. Richard portrayed churchmanship as largely irrelevant, whereas Timothy stressed its importance:

I've got no objection to different styles of worship, they're neither right nor wrong, that's a cultural matter. If you try and make styles of worship, if you try and pin great significance on whether you wear red or green and whether you swing incense or you don't swing
incense or, you know. I mean all that is nonsense, it's cultural stuff, has no relevance to us at all. (Richard)

In fact my sense of priesthood is exactly the one that the Church of England has always taught, and it's enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer. You know, we have a priesthood in the Church and it's a sacrificing ministry that celebrates the Eucharist, the Holy Communion or the Mass or whatever you like. You know, it's not just a bunch of sort of elders who have a position in the hierarchical structure, which is the Non-Conformist Free Church. So basically I live in a, I work in a church that has lost its sense of what the priesthood is as a distinctive ministry. (Timothy)

According to Richard, differences in "styles of worship", such as "whether you wear red or green and whether you swing incense or you don't swing incense", were "neither right nor wrong", but were "nonsense" or "cultural stuff" which "has no relevance to us at all". On the other hand, Timothy stressed that his understanding of priesthood was supported both by tradition ("exactly the one that the Church of England has always taught") and by scripture ("enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer"), suggesting that alternative understandings were wrong and that they represented a loss of distinctiveness for the clergy: "I work in a church that has lost its sense of what the priesthood is as a distinctive ministry".

In addition to explicit references to churchmanship categories, these constructs appeared to underlie other distinctions such as whether participants emphasised "tradition" or "change" in their approaches to ministry. Timothy described his confidence in "tradition":

I still believe that a traditional parochial pastoral ministry is as relevant now as it ever was, and still have confidence in that ministry. Which I feel that many of my fellow clergy have lost - that what we're actually doing, is probably viewed in some way as being irrelevant, you know, it's not where things are happening
any more, we should be involved in other things and going out and trying to make the church relevant wherever we feel it might be appropriate. Whereas, as far as I'm concerned, you can't do better than fulfilling the traditional parochial ministry which is living and working amongst people, and being their friend and loving them and caring for them and doing all the things that they've always thought a priest would do, without counting the cost, and not defining it into compartments and saying, you know, this is my time off, so I'm not a priest now, I'm someone else, and so on.

Timothy contrasted his own approach, “living and working amongst people [...] and doing all the things that they've always thought a priest would do”, with the approach of “fellow clergy” who, he suggested, had “lost” their confidence in this form of ministry. This loss of confidence entailed a view that the traditional ministry was “irrelevant” and therefore needed to be adapted, “trying to make the church relevant”. A particular change with which Timothy took issue was the concept of “time off”, which contradicted both his belief in altruism, “without counting the cost”, and his belief in being “a priest in every context” (discussed in the previous section), as opposed to saying “I’m not a priest now, I’m someone else”.

On the other hand, Peter was willing to “let some tradition go”:

I am comfortable with change, and the process of managing change. I think we all react against models of anything that we have decided are not working. [...] I think the church needs to be in growth mode rather than maintenance mode. What I mean by that is, if we carry on doing what we're doing because we were doing it twenty years ago and they were doing it twenty years ago, the church is dead in the water as far as organisation is concerned. So that we need to adapt our ministry to be culturally relevant, and I think that I'm willing to pay the price for that, which I think is distinctive. So I'm willing to let some tradition go in order to be relevant. Hopefully not throwing the baby out with the bath water.
Peter's position was diametrically opposed to that of Timothy. Where Timothy argued that "you can't do better than fulfilling the traditional parochial ministry", Peter implied that this traditional model was "not working" and needed to be adapted to be "culturally relevant". Although he acknowledged the risk of "throwing the baby out with the bath water", Peter suggested that he was distinctive in being "comfortable with change" and "willing to pay the price" of "let[ting] some tradition go".

In summary, although some participants underplayed the importance of churchmanship distinctions, these categorisations appeared to represent a significant area of differentiation within the clergy. Additionally, churchmanship categories were intimately tied to positions within the debate about group distinctiveness described within the previous section.

Social comparisons

In addition to endorsing categories of churchmanship, participants often distinguished themselves from each other through social comparisons in terms of specific aspects of their ministries. It should be noted that the outcome of these social comparisons was generally positive.

Jenny described herself as "unusual" in being "truly pastoral":

I'm also unusual in just being truly pastoral, going back to the feeling for other people. And I'm known to be somebody who really does love other people, which shouldn't be so unusual but it is. And so if other clergy were describing me they would probably say things like 'oh she's a softie' or 'she's very good with people who are bereaved' or that kind of thing. So I know that's something that others are aware of and I'm certainly aware that it's more unusual than I think it should be.
Jenny clearly saw her pastoral quality as both distinctive and positive, stating twice that it “shouldn’t be so unusual but it is”. She emphasised the objectivity of her self-evaluation on this dimension, both in her language, that she was “truly pastoral” and that she “really does love other people”, and by citing the perspective of “other clergy” that this was “something that others are aware of”.

Paul described himself as distinctive in terms of his academic ability:

I think I’m distinguished by, this is the positive side, by being academically able and valuing that tradition, distinguishing me very much from the anti-intellectual strand within the church, but even outside that I’m, I am intelligent, and bring that intelligence into my reflectiveness on both church and society, and that’s not that common.

According to Paul, his academic ability distinguished him, firstly, from “the anti-intellectual strand within the church” in terms of “valuing that tradition” and, secondly, more generally in terms of “bring[ing] that intelligence into my reflectiveness on both church and society”. Thus his academic ability was “positive” and “not that common”.

James distinguished himself as “a good inspirer and leader of other people”, putting him “at the top end of ability in terms of clergy”:

I believe I’m a good clergyman. And that doesn’t, it’s not the same thing as saying I’m a saintly person. I think I’m good at my job. I think I’m a good inspirer and leader of other people. So I think that puts me at the top end of ability in terms of clergy. So, you know, I don’t say that with arrogance and pride, but in terms of honest evaluation of effectiveness, I’d be very high up the list. So it would mark me off from a lot of others.
James appeared to acknowledge the negative implications of describing himself as a "good clergyman" for preserving a sense of humility. Thus he asserted that "it's not the same thing as saying I'm a saintly person" and that "I don't say that with arrogance and pride". However, he portrayed the description "good at my job" as an "honest evaluation of effectiveness".

Meanwhile, Mark suggested that he "preach[ed] better than most people":

I would say I preach better than most people, because I have more time and I put more time into my sermons. And I've read more recently. And because of all the different experiences I've had, I'm more effective at communicating what I want to say in terms that they can hear than I think I probably will be when I'm fifty, and have got out of the habit of trying to think the way other people think, and instead carry on talking about concepts that other people don't really know anything about at all, but I've forgotten a long time ago that they don't.

Mark appeared to be negotiating a balance between humility and positive distinctiveness within this passage. He attributed his better preaching in part to his circumstances, which meant that he had "more time". Moreover, although he distinguished himself in terms of an implicit social comparison with older members of the clergy who "have got out of the habit of trying to think the way other people think", he explicitly included himself within this comparison group, referring not to other members of the clergy but to how "I think I probably will be when I'm fifty".

Michael described himself as more "achievement orientated or ambitious" than "the typical clergyperson":

I think I am slightly more achievement orientated or ambitious than some are. Some clergy seem very relaxed and comfortable just, they're in a job which is unlikely
to change shape for the rest of their lives and, although some find that a frustration, others welcome it. I like to have a sense of progress. I don't really think I necessarily need more power or more money, but I like to stay stretched, and I do get restless. I think perhaps I am more restless than some clergy. So I like to have a sort of visible path, making progress. And I think that's more true of me than probably the typical clergyperson, though it's by no means entirely untypical.

Again this was portrayed as a positive form of distinctiveness. Michael differentiated his sense of ambition from the negative connotation of a need for "more power or more money", focusing instead on the positive values of needing to "stay stretched" and to "have a sense of progress". However, Michael qualified the strength of this social comparison, noting that these characteristics were "by no means entirely untypical".

Although participants showed some sensitivity towards maintaining a sense of humility, a general pattern over the social comparisons cited above is that they all served to enhance the positive distinctiveness of the participant on a valued dimension. This was consistent with previous research into the role of social comparisons in enhancing self-esteem (e.g., Gruder, 1977; Wills, 1991). Given the plurality of comparison dimensions and the uniformity of comparison outcomes described here, it seemed likely that participants were selectively choosing favourable dimensions on which to compare themselves (cf. Lemaine, 1974; Rosenberg, 1986).

Locations within the parish system

Participants also distinguished themselves in terms of their particular locations within the clergy. For example, William described his position as "vicar of a suburban parish" as distinguishing him from someone who was in "an urban parish" or someone who was in "a deeply rural village parish", in terms of "where you are and the job that you're doing":
I'm the vicar of a suburban parish, reasonably settled, traditional suburban parish. In that case, that particular calling sets me apart from somebody who's in an urban parish, or somebody who's in a deeply rural village parish. You're set apart by where you are and the job that you're doing.

Similarly, David described working in a “country parish”:

I think experience, just plain work experience is in it. I've, I don't feel I have an awful lot in common with somebody who has worked say all their life in an inner city parish. But if I meet someone who's worked for many years in a country parish then I feel I have more in common because I've had that kind of experience myself.

Like William, David distinguished himself from members of the clergy who worked in very different circumstances to his own, since he would not have "an awful lot in common" with them in terms of “experience”.

Meanwhile, Grace distinguished herself from other members of the clergy in terms of her particular role as a local non-stipendiary minister:

Well by virtue of the kind of ministry which I do, which I have said which is non-stipendiary - unpaid - and it's this particular local kind of ministry, where you are drawn out of the particular church in which you work, rather than coming into it from the outer church, the wider church and coming into it.

Grace described two distinguishing aspects of her ministry: firstly, she was “unpaid” and, secondly, rather than being sent to a parish from outside, she had been “drawn out of” the church in which now worked. Like William and David, Grace described herself as distinguished from others in terms of her relationship with the geography of her parish.
For Paul, a positively distinctive aspect of his current position within a town centre parish was the opportunity for “making links between society at large and the church”:

This particular post gives me an awful lot of time and opportunity to do what I wanted to do before, [...] I now can give a lot more time to making links between society at large and the church, something that a number of clergy pay lip service to, a number of clergy do a bit of, a number of clergy are able to do a bit, but actually I have the opportunity and ability to do that a lot here. And that's partly because that's the person I am and partly because that's the particular role I have as rector of [this particular parish], and those two are actually linked, because I wouldn't have got to this post without having the gifts, so to speak.

In terms of this “particular role”, Paul compared himself favourably to other members of the clergy who “pay lip service” or “do a bit”. This role also tied together his distinctive position as “rector of [this particular parish]” and his personal qualities of being “the person I am” who “wanted to do [this] before”: “those two are actually linked, because I wouldn't have got to this post without having the gifts”. Thus Paul's current role was characterised by an integration of geographical position, social position and difference as sources of distinctiveness within his identity.

On the other hand, Robin described the parish system of the Church of England as a source of “separateness” or “isolation”:

For all that there is within, by definition, a parish structure which would suggest a high degree of commonality of purpose, within each parish there can be a very great deal of isolation. Whatever the size of the parish in terms of geography and population, it becomes all consuming. And for that reason one can be, one can
have a separateness forced upon one from other clergy whether or not one wants it. So distinctiveness is often is often an inevitable spin-off from the absorbing nature of the work. Frequently it's not sought, it's a by product of the parish system, you could almost say, because whilst there is in theory a collegiality of the district, in practice parish boundaries means you operate within them. And that can therefore enforce a distinctiveness almost whether you like it or not.

Central to Robin's account was that the geographical separation of the clergy into parishes led to a social separateness from each other, because "in practice parish boundaries means you operate within them". Thus, separateness could be "forced upon one [...] whether or not one wants it".

However, William stressed that the separation of members of the clergy from each other was "accidental" and their togetherness "fundamental":

We all belong to the church, we all have a loyalty to God, to our bishop, to the traditions and customs and forms of worship, et cetera, of the Church of England. We're bound together in that respect, and that really is sort of fundamental. Where the difference comes is in the fact that we're in different places and we have different jobs to do with different people. It isn't intrinsic, you might say it's accidental.

Reflecting Robin's description of the separation of the clergy into parishes as a "by product of the parish system", William contrasted the "accidental" separation of "the fact that we're in different places and we have different jobs to do with different people" with the "fundamental" state of being "bound together" through "belong[ing] to the church" and "loyalty to God, to our bishop, to the traditions and customs and forms of worship, et cetera, of the Church of England".

Various ways have been shown in which participants' locations within particular parishes could become a source of distinctiveness. Because of the different character of different geographical areas ("suburban" vs. "country" vs. "town centre") and because of their different positions within their parishes ("Rector" vs. "local non-stipendiary minister"), participants described different experiences of ministry and different opportunities. Furthermore, members of the clergy might be separated from each other both physically and psychologically by parish boundaries.

Discussion

Participants' accounts of their distinctiveness within the clergy had a very different flavour to their accounts of the distinctiveness of the clergy from others. Where the previous section was marked by a considerable level of apparent sensitivity about the construct of distinctiveness, with many participants apparently seeking to deny their distinctiveness entirely, this was much less the case in the themes reported here.

Generally participants appeared to be comfortable describing themselves as distinctive in relation to their peers. Many of these distinctions took the form of self-enhancing social comparisons, in keeping with accounts of the importance of positive distinctiveness as a means of achieving self-esteem through social comparison processes (reviewed in chap. 3).

An interesting aspect arising from the discussion of the 'parish system' is that members of the clergy may often be relatively isolated within their parishes, having little contact with each other. Hence, where the previous section was concerned implicitly with participants' distinctiveness in relation to people with whom they interacted on a day to day basis – their parishioners – the current section focused on distinctiveness in relation to people with whom they may have had little regular contact.
In this respect, it is notable that participants' constructions of their distinctiveness from other members of the clergy referred almost exclusively to their relationships with parishioners, rather than with each other: categories of churchmanship referred to different ways of constructing the relationship between clergy and lay people; social comparisons were on dimensions which were relevant to participants' ministry to parishioners; and locations within the parish system referred explicitly to participants' embeddedness within particular parishes.

The theme of 'churchmanship' was of additional interest in relation to debates about the distinctiveness of the clergy discussed earlier. Those describing themselves as Catholics within the clergy appeared to be more comfortable with distinguishing the clergy from others, whereas those who identified themselves as Evangelicals appeared to be more concerned to remove the symbolic boundaries distinguishing them from 'normal people'. In terms of social representation theory, it might be understood that participants' representations of the superordinate category of clergy were anchored to their positions in subgroups within the superordinate field (see Breakwell, 1993; Doise, Clémence & Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1993).

**Evaluations of distinctiveness**

Participants displayed ambivalence and disagreement over the importance of distinctiveness for defining their identities. Some distinctiveness was felt to be useful or necessary for the enactment of identity as a priest, but distinctiveness was also associated with considerable pressures, leading to misunderstandings and undermining relationships, and some forms of distinctiveness were portrayed as contrary to core values. Ultimately, evaluations seemed to depend on how distinctiveness was constructed.
Ambivalence about distinctiveness

When asked for quantitative ratings of the subjective importance of being distinguished from others as members of the clergy, participants often reported considerable difficulties in answering the question.

For example, James described his reactions to this question:

The simple sounding questions are the most difficult, actually. I don't think it is [important], I mean, for example I don't wear a dog collar. The only time I ever wear a dog collar is when I'm at a funeral or doing something in church, and not even then always. So it's not important to me, really. And yet the whole of the job that I do revolves around it.

James described the apparent contradiction that "it's not important to me, really, and yet the whole of the job that I do revolves around it", hence his comment that "the simple sounding questions are the most difficult".

In response to the same question, Grace showed a similar ambivalence:

There are ways in which you don't want to be distinguished, but there are ways in which the role isn't a role if you're not distinguished at all, really, so I would say, it has a certain importance.

Grace's response highlighted the contradiction between her negative feelings about distinctiveness, "ways in which you don't want to be distinguished", and the importance of distinctiveness in defining her role as a priest, "ways in which the role isn't a role if you're not distinguished".
A number of responses appeared to centre on the relationship between distinctiveness and self-esteem. Defining this relationship also seemed to involve contradictory elements. For example, Matthew answered:

I don't think I go around through the world thinking to myself, gosh it's wonderful, I'm different, I'm not like the rest. On the other hand I believe that the calling to be a priest in the church is quite a distinctive calling. So I'm not ashamed of it, in fact I'm very proud of it. So where does that put me? It means that the question isn't really what I want to answer.

Matthew described the paradox that, on the one hand, he did not think "gosh it's wonderful, I'm different" but, on the other hand, he was "very proud" of his "distinctive calling". Thus he could only conclude that "the question isn't really what I want to answer".

William, asked to evaluate the importance of playing a distinctive role as a member of the clergy, gave two different answers, referring to an ambiguity in the notion of "importance" within the question:

What do you mean by 'how important is it'? I mean, is it important for my self-esteem? No. Is it important that I should do the job that I've been trained for? Yes. Those are two different questions. Very different questions. [...] That's why I'm here. I mean, if you ask the same question of the butcher, what would he say? He doesn't want everybody to go around saying, 'oh, coo, look, there's the butcher', you know. But on the other hand, if he wants to be a good butcher, then that's his job.

William's response appeared to centre on a distinction between possible dimensions of value within identity. In distancing the role from his "self-esteem", William appeared to be rejecting social status ("oh, coo, look, there's the butcher") and endorsing efficacy ("he wants to be a good butcher") as a dimension of value within identity. A similar distinction
between social structure and efficacy-based forms of self-esteem has been
made within social psychological literature on the self-concept (Gecas &
Schwalbe, 1983).

Paul, evaluating the importance of playing a distinctive role within the
clergy, referred to a further ambiguity, concluding that "what
distinguishes me I value, but not because it distinguishes me":

I don't like being distinctive for the sake of being
distinctive, but those things that do distinguish me,
inasmuch as they do distinguish me, are really pretty
important to me. And that's because the things I said
that were important to me, the intellectual side, the
avidly greeting the links between society and church,
those are a pretty important part of my ministry and I
highly value them. So in that sense what distinguishes me
I value, but not because it distinguishes me.

As discussed earlier, Paul had described himself as distinctive within the
clergy in terms of his emphasis on "the intellectual side" and on making
"links between society and church". Paul stated here that these areas were
"really pretty important to me". However, the relationship between
distinctiveness and value rested on a very fine conceptual distinction:
according to Paul, he valued these elements of his identity "inasmuch as
they do distinguish me [...] but not because it distinguishes me". It is not
entirely clear what Paul meant by this distinction. However, it seemed
that he was rejecting the adoption of distinctiveness as a value in itself
but acknowledging the importance of dimensions of positive
distinctiveness, thus negotiating between two accounts of the role of
distinctiveness in self-esteem maintenance, as discussed in chapter 3.

Meanwhile Jenny and Peter, evaluating the importance of aspects of
distinctiveness from other members of the clergy, gave answers which
contradicted each other entirely:
We all like to be, to have an identity. I mean I wouldn't want to just become a name that people couldn't conjure up a person to when they saw the name written down. So, you know, yes, I want some distinctiveness in my character. (Jenny)

I don't care if I'm distinctive or not. Why the hell should I care? [....] I don't get my identity from being distinctive. (Peter)

Jenny implied that being distinctive was an integral part of "having an identity", rather than being "a name that people couldn't conjure up a person to". On the other hand, Peter argued, "I don't get my identity from being distinctive" and asked "why the hell should I care [if I'm distinctive or not]?". It should be noted that Peter's strong reactions against the concept of distinctiveness may have been related to his equally strong theological emphasis on the value of relationships (see chap. 7).

In summary, participants displayed considerable ambivalence as well as disagreement over the importance of distinctiveness for defining their identities within the above quotations. The themes which follow examine some positive and negative functions of distinctiveness which seemed to have an impact on how these people constructed their distinctiveness.

Benefits of distinctiveness for identity enactment

Some participants described valuing distinctiveness as a means to an end, but not as an end in itself. For example, when asked the importance of her distinctiveness as a member of the clergy, Christine began her answer:

It's only important inasmuch as it allows me to perform the ministry to which I feel I was called.
Christine appeared to see distinctiveness as a necessary precondition for the enactment of her identity as a priest, “to perform the ministry to which I feel I was called”, reflecting Grace’s observation that “the role isn’t a role if you’re not distinguished”. The importance of distinctiveness in identity enactment was illustrated by Martha, who referred to distinctiveness as a “useful tool of my position”, and by Neil, who described the benefits of “wearing a collar the wrong way round”:

It is a useful tool of my position, my vocation, my role to be distinguished. Like the fact that we do have entry to people’s homes at times of bereavement and so on, which ordinary people don’t, or other people, not ordinary people, other people don’t, and that’s very valuable. There are some questions that you can ask people that probably would be seen as intrusive if you were anybody else. (Martha)

By wearing a collar the wrong way round you get an entrée into all sorts of places that you wouldn't get into if you were an ordinary person. If you were not a member of the clergy, you wouldn't get into houses as you do now and you wouldn't get to see people and they wouldn't tell you the things that they tell you. (Neil)

Both participants observed here that it was through being distinguished as members of the clergy that they were able to enact pastoral aspects of their ministry, involving access to people’s lives both physically, gaining “entry to people’s homes at times of bereavement”, and symbolically, being able to ask questions “that would probably be seen as intrusive”.

Simon referred to a “residual respect”, which could be observed when he was visually distinguished as a clergyman by wearing a clerical collar:

Despite the fact that we are a post-Christian society really, there is a residual respect for 'the clergy'. So that if you wear a dog collar it's relatively rare that
somebody spits at you, or slams the door in your face, though it has happened to me a couple of times in five years. I mean more often than not people will let you into their homes, sit you down, make you a cup of tea, even if you've never seen them before, or at least they will talk to you on the doorstep, and not be rude to you. They will do things like, you know, be nicer to you really generally speaking than they probably would if you didn't wear a dog collar. I mean I know this because I don't wear my dog collar very often and when I do people's reactions are noticeable in being different.

According to Simon, people were "nicer" to those they identified as members of the clergy. This took the form of less unfriendly behaviour ("it's relatively rare that somebody spits at you, or slams the door in your face") and more friendly behaviour ("people will let you into their homes, sit you down, make you a cup of tea") if he distinguished himself as a member of the clergy by wearing his clerical collar.

Christine also observed the value of being visually distinctive in opening up pastoral relationships:

I have been collared in Sainsbury's and held to long conversations about very intimate matters simply because they've seen the collar on, from people I don't even know, which is quite interesting.

Where Martha and Simon described people's acceptance of their behaviour, knocking on people's doors and asking "intrusive" questions, Christine referred here to the spontaneous behaviour of "people I don't even know" who identified her as a member of the clergy, resulting in "long conversations about very intimate matters".

Martha also observed that her distinctiveness as a member of the clergy was functionally important for her role in worship:
When it comes down to it, the central thing we do I think is standing at the altar and celebrating and, in whatever form one believes it, representing Christ at the altar or reminding people, so that's important.

In particular, Martha referred to her role in the Eucharist, “standing at the altar and celebrating”, in which her distinctiveness as a member of the clergy was important whether she was understood in theological terms to be “representing Christ at the altar or reminding people”.

Thus, in a number of ways, distinctiveness as a member of the clergy appeared to be useful or necessary for the enactment of participants’ identities as priests. Participants focused especially on the value of being distinguished in opening up pastoral relationships with parishioners, although distinctiveness was also functionally important for worship.

*Pressures of distinctiveness*

Despite the role of distinctiveness in opening up pastoral relationships, participants described more commonly ways in which the perceived distinctiveness of the clergy became a source of misunderstanding, undermining their relationships with parishioners and other people.

Simon described the demands of being seen as “superhuman”:

I think you are perceived as being different and sort of sometimes superhuman, which is obviously not valid. And I think people treat you differently, so that they tend to assume that you have an infinite resource of compassion and care and time, which in practice you don't, at some point it will all run out. And people are quite, can be quite demanding, from that point of view.
Simon noted that people “can be quite demanding” as a result of the false assumption “that you have an infinite resource of compassion and care and time”, with the result that “at some point it will all run out”.

Martha described a similar experience:

I'm sure sometimes they think that our own concerns are not so, are not at all important to us, and that's not true, certainly not true of me. [...] I think it centres a lot on that, that we aren't subject to human frailties.

Like Simon, Martha traced the insensitivity of her parishioners in thinking “that our own concerns are [...] not at all important to us” to a misperception of the clergy as superhuman, “that we aren't subject to human frailties”. But elsewhere in the interview, Martha described the effect of this insensitivity as “almost as if they are dehumanising us”.

Grace described people behaving as if they “owned” her:

It is nevertheless a role which for one thing makes many people think you are sort of slightly owned by them, slightly accessible at all times and in all places.

Mark expressed his anger at not being treated with “the same sense of courtesy with which actually people often treat other people”:

My grief and my feelings are as sensitive as anyone else's. [...] And so, a wish to be not so distinguishable would be to be treated with in a sense the same sense of courtesy with which actually people often treat other people with, which they don't with clergy. For example they always ring me up at dinner time, because they know I'll be home, and I think, you know, really I think, fuck you, I wouldn't ring you up at dinner time, because I know you're home, I would wait until you were in the office again tomorrow. [...] People ring me at 8 and 7
o'clock in the morning, 'just wanted to say before you went out', and I think, bloody hell, who else are you going to ring today just before they go out?

Mark's outburst summarised the concerns expressed by Simon, Grace and Martha. According to Mark, people failed to understand that "my grief and my feelings are as sensitive as anyone else's" with the result that they disturbed him at unsociable times for trivial matters, "just wanted to say before you went out". Later, Mark stressed that "I do want people to ring me up at 2 o'clock in the morning and say, you know, their wife has just died" and that "I don't ever say 'fuck you', for precisely that reason, because I don't want to cut off all of those other potential relationships".

Participants also described perceived distinctiveness as leading to false behaviour towards the clergy. Martha described this as "hurtful":

Well I think I'm conscious of perceptions of us. People almost invariably apologise to me if they swear in front of me, which actually I find quite hurtful as if we're somehow a kind of children who've never heard these words, and [...] people are surprised if we can be seen to enjoy things that are not obviously church based.

Echoing her experience of the misunderstanding "that our own concerns are [...] not at all important to us" as "dehumanising", Martha described as "hurtful" the implication that "we're somehow a kind of children who've never heard these words". She related this to another aspect of being stereotyped as a member of the clergy: "people are surprised if we can be seen to enjoy things that are not obviously church based".

Richard described a similar obstacle to open communication in the form of people's unsolicited "excuses why they don't go to church":
The first thing some people say to you is they start coming out with excuses why they don't go to church and I haven't said anything. You know, you just say, well I'm a vicar, and then it's, oh well, I used to go to church but you know I can't go any more because you know and - and you think, well I haven't said anything.

Richard appeared to be frustrated by people's failure to relate to him as an individual and their misunderstandings of the category in which they placed him: “and you think, well I haven't said anything”.

Echoing Richard's account, Jenny described the impossibility of relating to people 'out of role' unless she lied about her occupation:

I was on holiday once and the other people at the hotel, I made the mistake of telling the truth when they asked me what I did for a living, and it was like a PCC meeting from then on, you know it was all, 'oh well you know at our church they keep playing new hymns and I wish we could have the old hymns' and I thought this is what I get back in my job and I just want to be on holiday now. So, yes, plenty of times I'd like to just be Jenny.

Jenny described “telling the truth” about her occupation as a “mistake” which led to people categorising her as a priest and behaving “like a PCC meeting”\(^{20}\) when she would have preferred to be seen as an individual rather than a category, “plenty of times I'd like to just be Jenny”.

Distinctiveness as a member of the clergy was also associated with reactions of antagonism or resentment. As John noted:

The rest of society are sometimes antagonistic towards the clergy. When they see a dog collar, they bristle.

---

\(^{20}\) PCC is an abbreviation for Parochial Church Council.
Matthew described getting “some very odd responses” when he told former business contacts of his intention to become a priest:

One of them which I still remember very sharply to this day was a man whose response was one of great anger, and who said 'What makes you think you’re so much better than I am?' [...] Many people would say that they’d had responses of that sort to their business of being a priest. So in other words, there’s the assumption of a ‘holier than thou’ attitude to life, I think, in the view of some people at least.

Matthew’s description of “the assumption of a ‘holier than thou’ attitude to life” was reminiscent of Jenny’s reference to the popular misconception that a member of the clergy “doesn’t have any nasty habits, and frowns on people who do”. Matthew suggested that the effect of this misconception was to undermine the possibility of relating to those who believed it, because of the “great anger” which this assumption could provoke.

Participants also described feeling marginalised as a consequence of their distinctiveness within others’ perceptions:

I think increasingly in some areas of society nowadays the clergy would be marginalised and seen as not terribly relevant to the mainstream of life and thought, representatives of a diminishing minority. (James)

And you’re the sort of holy man, the religious witch doctor. And maybe you would be a sort of quaint anachronism. It makes life more colourful to have clergy around, it's a little thing. (David)

James described the clergy as “marginalised and seen as not terribly relevant to the mainstream of life and thought” while David described the role of the clergy as a “religious witch doctor” or a “quaint anachronism”, which “makes life more colourful” but is “a little thing”.

Some participants also described their distinctiveness within the clergy as a source of marginalisation. Christine described the practical difficulties of being in a double minority as a female non-stipendiary minister:

The traditional role of the clergy has been stipendiary male. I am now non-stipendiary female, both of which have been in recent years innovative themes within the ministry. So I do feel that in many ways I have been and still am treading new ground, which isn't easy. In amongst clergy chapter, everything is designed towards the full-time vicar, or whatever, and I am continually reminding people that I am not in that situation.

Christine noted that her profession was geared towards the “traditional role” of “stipendiary male” clergy, and that she had to be “continually reminding people that I am not in that situation” as she was “treading new ground”. Joanna described an experience of marginalisation, which she also attributed to her distinctiveness in “breaking new ground” as one of the “new breed” of “female priests”:

I'm not the only one who has had this experience, I've been talking to a male colleague from another church, and another male has come over and started talking to the man, without actually even acknowledging the fact that I'm there. I mean I feel like saying 'Hi', you know, 'I'm here! Come in!'. But I suppose all that is about breaking new ground really, and female priests are a new breed.

Where Christine had described being marginalised as a consequence of church structures (“everything is designed towards the full-time vicar”), Joanna's experience of marginalisation was in face to face interaction.

Meanwhile, Timothy described a similar experience of marginalisation within the clergy for his opposition to the ordination of women:
I don't go along with the ordination of women to the priesthood, and that distinguishes me quite a lot from the other two hundred clergy in the diocese because there's only about four or five of us left. [...] And that actually distinguishes us quite a lot because it puts a label on me. Regardless of how I might be as a person or a priest, it actually turns a lot of people against you within the actual framework, if you like, and fellow clergypersons, because you already have a distinctive label on you, and so you are treated as being hostile to everything. So in fact I'm a marginalised member of the clergy, if you want to think of it like that, and the aim of the establishment is to wipe us out.

Timothy felt that his "distinctive label" as an opponent of the ordination of women led to him being "treated as being hostile to everything", and described himself as a "marginalised member of the clergy".

Meanwhile, building on Robin's account of the separation of members of the clergy from each other within the parish system, Geoffrey described the structure of the role as intrinsically isolating:

I've worked in an office and I've worked in a factory in that sort of where you get a lot of, every day you're having interchange with the people round you. The clergy can become very isolated and this can be a problem. The isolation of the clergy. I mean the church tries to get over it by having deaneries and chapters and everything else. But it can be a very lonely. You've got nobody to turn to quite often, you can't go trotting off to the bishop every time you've got a problem, nobody to discuss a problem with because lots of them are confidential.

Geoffrey described "the isolation of the clergy" as a source of loneliness, resulting from the lack of "interchange" within their working patterns and the nature of the role, which meant problems were often "confidential".
The quotations reproduced above highlight the pressures of excessive distinctiveness, which undermined participants' relationships with lay people and at times with other members of the clergy. Participants' distinctiveness as members of the clergy was perceived as the cause of unrealistic expectations, thoughtlessness, deception and marginalisation of the clergy on the part of lay people, while distinctiveness within the clergy could also be a source of marginalisation and loneliness.

**Distinctiveness and core values**

A further issue within some participants' evaluations of distinctiveness was the relationship between distinctiveness and core values such as the message of the clergy, authenticity and the cohesion of the church.

Joanna described the issue of distinctiveness of the clergy as one of her "pet hobby horses":

It is one of my pet hobby horses, because one of the things I feel quite passionately about is what I would call 'dechurchifying' the church, in that I think things like dress within church services, things like robes, things like processions, things like sitting clergy separately in church services have given out an extremely unhelpful, hierarchical message to people within society. [...] I think also the hierarchical side has given a message to people in church congregations, 'here is the expert who can do everything', and it's had a deskilling effect on people. Therefore if the expert is the one who can do it I can't do anything.

Joanna suggested that distinguishing the clergy from others communicated "an extremely unhelpful, hierarchical message". This message, she asserted, had a "deskilling effect" on other people.
Michael elaborated on what was wrong with an "hierarchical message":

I think there is, it's important to maintain a certain level of difference. I'm just a bit sorry that the ways in which we happen to do it are often I think slightly inappropriate ways. They often look as though they're to do with status, our house is often bigger than other people's, that sort of thing. [...] And that's unfortunate because that can actually cut against some of what our message is, to do with humble service or non-materialism.

Although Michael acknowledged that "a certain level of difference" was necessary for the role, he observed that the typical ways of distinguishing the clergy were "slightly inappropriate", since "they often look as though they're to do with status". Michael suggested that this could unfortunately "cut against some of what our message is", which was "to do with humble service or non-materialism".

Neil argued forcefully against the value of being distinguished as a priest, and expressed his hope for the future that "the priesthood will go":

Just being set apart as a priest is against what it says in the Bible isn't it. It's like the Pharisee up at the altar and praying, thank you God for not making me like this poor man next to me. [...] There should be no distinction, and there is, and it's, you know I do believe in this concept of the priesthood of all believers. [...] That's why I think that hopefully the priesthood will go. Jesus wasn't a vicar, was he. I mean it's a ridiculous idea actually, I mean there were priests set aside but they were for sacrificing things and it all changed when Jesus came along, and there were just little groups of Christians, and the one in charge happened to be the one whose house it was in usually. And they worked out a church, for goodness sake. What a terrible thing to do. If we can think of another way of
Neil portrayed "being set apart as a priest" as directly contrary to the message of the New Testament, comparing the contemporary priest to "the Pharisee up at the altar", who defined himself by his status, "thank you God for not making me like this poor man next to me". Neil specifically rejected the Catholic notion of the priest as an image of Jesus, "Jesus wasn't a vicar, was he", arguing on the contrary that the previous understanding of priesthood "all changed when Jesus came along" and asserting his belief in the doctrine of the "priesthood of all believers".

Meanwhile, Peter described distinctiveness as an obstacle to authenticity:

I think clergymen are far too pompous for their own good, and therefore being real is important, and not giving a stuff about robes and image, you know rejecting image and just being real with people is important.

Echoing the previous accounts, Peter associated "robes and image" with an absence of humility, suggesting that "clergymen are far too pompous for their own good". But "image" was also an obstacle to "being real with people", which reflected the value of authenticity, or being 'true to oneself', which was discussed previously in chapters 5 and 7.

Timothy described the importance of his distinctiveness as a traditionalist within the clergy in terms of being true to his purpose in life:

In one sense it's important for me to be liked and loved like anyone else, but the other side of that is that, you know, what the hell and that there are certain things that need to be stood up for, and that I have been chosen to do that, I must do that whether I like it or not, and even if it means my wife has to give me the encouragement or someone else, you know, spurs me on and, you know, I
think I must - this is what I'm here for, this is what I must do, this is what God wants me to do, however weak I am as a person, however much I like to be loved and considered to be a nice person and so on, I must maintain these things for the sake of Holy Church, if you like, you know, to put it like that.

Central to Timothy's account was that, despite the costs of distinctiveness in terms of not being "liked and loved like anyone else" (cf. his previous comments on 'marginalisation'), he must be true to "what I'm here for" which was "what God wants me to do". Thus his distinctiveness, although costly in terms of relationships, was positive and authentic, in terms of his defence of "certain things that need to be stood up for".

On the other hand, Paul referred to the possibility of "los[ing] your individuality" in the context of "a fairly tightly constrained role":

There is the difficulty of being an individual within a fairly tightly constrained role, both in terms of preaching and in terms of my pastoral work. But I suppose here above all in the role of chaplaincy, where you have to come alongside people, minister to them, even if you dislike them, dislike what they stand for, dislike the organisation they work for. It is a tricky role, and the difficulty is sometimes that if that goes on for a long time you could start to feel you lose your individuality. The saving grace for me is my belief in, that my own humanity and my individuality is an essential part of my priesthood.

Paul mentioned the potential negation of authenticity in ministering to people "even if you dislike them, dislike what they stand for, dislike the organisation they work for", but cited the "saving grace" of his belief that "my own humanity and my individuality is an essential part of my priesthood". This was illustrated earlier in the interview in Paul's description of his approach to Remembrance Sunday:
I don't like Remembrance Sunday, I think, you know, it if I could speak freely, individually, my reaction would be different, but actually I don't speak freely and individually, Remembrance Sunday is big in this town. In my opinion there's only one way of doing it and that's stepping into that role, making the best of it, and in a subliminal way getting across my personal - but there is no way that you could do it apart from enjoying it, inviting the regiment and inviting the MP, doing it with all pomp and ceremony.

Within this extract, Paul demonstrated his resolution of the apparent conflict between his individual dislike of Remembrance Sunday and his role, through "stepping into that role, making the best of it, and in a subliminal way getting across my personal [message]". Thus Paul resolved the opposition between individual authenticity and conformity to role prescriptions through a process of authentic engagement as an individual with the role. This appeared to be closely related to his account elsewhere of identity in terms of the 'inhabitation' of social roles (chap. 7).

David, answering the same question, did not see any conflict between authenticity and distinctiveness as a member of the clergy:

I think the distinctiveness of the role, objectively, is absolutely important, and if that goes, if you lose that then you lose almost everything. I just don't feel particularly oppressed by it, dominated by it. It's important, but you know I don't think my self is subsumed or lost in it.

David suggested that "the distinctiveness of the role", far from leading to any loss of individuality, was "absolutely important", to the extent that "if you lose that then you lose almost everything". David did not see any obstacle to authenticity or self realisation in this distinctiveness, noting that he felt neither "oppressed by it" nor "dominated by it", nor did he "think my self is subsumed or lost in it".
On another note, William described distinctiveness within the clergy in terms of styles of worship as potentially “very, very dangerous” for the internal cohesion of the Church of England:

It's fairly common I'm told for people to go to a church which is supposed to be Church of England, and recognise nothing that is sort of shared by any of the Anglicans whatsoever in the service except possibly the Lord's Prayer if you're lucky, you know? Maybe I'm exaggerating but why not. And I think that there are, there's a tendency to get very individualistic, you do your own thing, this is the St Bloggs' way of doing things, and never mind what they're doing in any of the other parishes around. I think it could be very, very dangerous. It could, at its extreme, it could lead to the break-up of the Church of England as a unity.

William suggested that individualism within the clergy, or “do[ing] your own thing” could “at its extreme [...] lead to the break-up of the Church of England as a unity”. Richard suggested a similar danger posed by theological differences over the ordination of practising homosexuals:

Well of course there's been a huge bust-up, you know, with the ordination of women. And if the ordination of practising homosexuals becomes an issue which if decisions are taken upon, then there's going to be even bigger bust-ups I suspect, so I mean there could be massive problems ahead. The ordination of practising homosexuals would split the church into fragments, I think, it would be devastating, unless something pretty dramatic happens. So that's a very difficult issue, and a very important one, a very current issue that is a tough one. But clergy, you see because they have strong convictions and strong principles and are very dedicated and committed, you know, fundamental matters of faith are important and do cause problems when things go awry.
Richard believed that the ordination of practising homosexuals would "split the church into fragments". However, there was a tension between the value of church cohesion and that of individual authenticity discussed earlier, because members of the clergy "have strong convictions", recalling Timothy's statement that "certain things [...] need to be stood up for".

The accounts and arguments described above show the complex relationships between distinctiveness and values of the Christian message, individual authenticity and church cohesion. Often these relationships appeared to be contingent on particular constructions of distinctiveness. The distinctiveness of the clergy was especially inconsistent with the Christian message if it was associated with elevated social status; distinctiveness achieved through conforming to role prescriptions might be an obstacle to authenticity, but this depended on the construction of authenticity; distinctiveness achieved through non-conformity was threatening to the internal cohesion of the church.

_Evaluating constructions of distinctiveness_

The final theme within this section examines the contingency of participants' evaluations of distinctiveness on particular ways in which distinctiveness could be constructed. Often, rather than evaluating distinctiveness as a global construct, participants described which constructions of distinctiveness they valued and which they did not.

Charles, speaking before the three hypothesised sources of distinctiveness had been introduced by the interviewer, apparently attributed his ambivalence about the importance of distinctiveness to contradictory evaluations of the functions of two sources, position and difference:

I'm not quite sure how to take that question in terms of the way that I would want to answer it. I want to be
According to Charles, it was important “that people know who I am, what I am, so that they can access me or call on me accordingly”, which appeared to be a reference to his position as a member of the clergy. However, he did not want to be seen as different from others, “being considered something or someone who isn’t an ordinary human”.

Grace made a similar distinction, and illustrated its practical significance with the example of seeing a parishioner about a funeral:

There are ways in which it's useful to be set apart obviously, in order to do the job and to play the role. But basically it's a role which says that you are human the same as everybody else is human, and you have all the same problems and limitations as everybody else. So no, it's only useful to be set apart just from its functional point of view, where it's useful to be able to be accepted. I mean, like a funeral, if I go along to see somebody about a funeral, as I've just done about this one I'm going to take shortly, it's nice that I go along and he knows, the man I go to see knows who I am and what I represent. Then it's useful to be set apart. But equally I'd like him to know that I'm just the same as him in losing somebody who's dear to me. Do you see?

Grace's quotation showed the different implications for enacting her ministry of constructing distinctiveness in terms of position or difference. Like Charles, Grace expressed the functional value of being distinctive “in order to do the job and to play the role”, but balanced this with the stipulation “that you are human the same as everybody else is human”. Thus, within her example of seeing a parishioner about a funeral, Grace
suggested that it was "useful" that the man should recognise her position as a member of the clergy, "who I am and what I represent", but that he should not see her as different in terms of her humanity, "that I'm just the same as him in losing somebody who's dear to me".

Richard and Jenny suggested that some distinctiveness was necessary for identity enactment among the clergy, but that distinctiveness should not be constructed in terms of status:

I don't think it's helpful to be put on a pedestal, and I don't think it's helpful for people [...] to have people highly distinguished. But, having said that, you can't just not distinguish people because human society wouldn't work. (Richard)

There does have to be some distinction that people are aware of, so that they feel safe with you. But on the other hand, it shouldn't be a distinction that says, you know, I'm different in a better kind of way, just different in a way that they can trust. (Jenny)

Again, distinctiveness was evaluated here in terms of its implications for identity enactment. Richard suggested that it was not "helpful to be put on a pedestal", while Jenny argued that there should be no distinction implying that the clergy were "different in a better kind of way". However, both participants referred to a need for distinctiveness, "because human society wouldn't work [without distinguishing people]" (Richard), and more specifically "so that [people] feel safe with you" (Jenny).

Meanwhile, William related his initial evaluation of the importance of distinctiveness as a member of the clergy to the value of authenticity:

There are times, there are certain things where you have to be yourself and stand for what you believe in, but I don't believe in an artificial separation. I think a lot
of the traditional inherited separation of clergy and laity is a false one.

Reflecting his focus elsewhere on being ‘true to oneself’ (chap. 7), William answered that there were “certain things where you have to be yourself and stand for what you believe in”, implying that distinctiveness might be an expression of authenticity. However, he portrayed the “traditional inherited separation of clergy and laity” as inauthentic, describing it as “artificial” and “false”. Again it appeared that the value of distinctiveness was dependent on how distinctiveness was constructed.

Speaking about the importance of being separate from other members of the clergy, Jenny also referred to the importance of being herself:

I don't want my views to just be ignored and put under the carpet, and I don't want my personality to be dampened either. So in a way I need an awareness of both my views and who I am to exist, but not to the extent of exclusion. So I want to be acknowledged but not set apart. Acknowledged in my differences but not ostracised for them.

Where William had focused on the importance of expressing his true self, in the form of “stand[ing] for what you believe in”, Jenny expressed a similar level of concern that her identity should be recognised by others: she did not want her “views to just be ignored” or her “personality to be dampened”, but wanted to be “acknowledged in my differences”. The importance of social recognition in the construction of identity has been stressed elsewhere by Marková (1987; after Hegel, 1807/1949). However, an important feature of Jenny’s account was the tension she identified between recognition and isolation. In this case it appeared to be the extent rather than the particular construction of distinctiveness which was crucial (cf. Brewer, 1991). Jenny wanted her distinctiveness to be “acknowledged”, but “not to the extent of exclusion” or being “ostracised”.

Chapter 8: Distinctiveness and the Clergy

Matthew similarly described a desire not to be isolated, in discussing his 'ambivalence' about being set apart as a member of the clergy:

I think to speak honestly we are all ambivalent about this, being really very human. I think sometimes one trades on it, being different. There's a great tradition in the Church of England of the eccentric clergyman, you know, and in a sense one looks at it rather longingly and wistfully and thinks, you know, I'd like to be the eccentric clergyman. And there's another part which is a part of a sadness because one is aware that, at a certain level, many people don't understand who you are or what you're for. So that can be lonely at times, you know? [...] I don't really want to be set apart, but actually want to be there for people and not an obstruction to people, do you know what I mean? And, like any other person, nobody likes being the butt end of everybody's jokes. But then we don't go around being paranoid about it. Just every now and then you think, oh gosh not another daft vicar on television, or something like that.

Matthew described a number of different functions contributing to his 'ambivalence' about distinctiveness, a reaction which he described as common to all members of the clergy. On the one hand, Matthew described the emotive appeal of the distinctive image of the "eccentric clergyman", which he viewed "rather longingly and wistfully". On the other hand, Matthew referred to his "sadness" that he was marginalised as the "butt end of everybody's jokes" and misunderstood in terms of "who you are or what you're for". Furthermore, this separateness conflicted with his aim as a priest "to be there for people and not an obstruction to people".

Within the quotations above, participants often appeared to be negotiating a route through the positive and negative functions of distinctiveness described earlier by distinguishing between the different implications of different available constructions of distinctiveness. Distinctions were
made between position and difference (Charles, Grace), evaluative and non-evaluative forms of distinctiveness (Richard, Jenny), authentic and false distinctions (William) and between self-defining and isolating forms of distinctiveness (Jenny, Matthew). It appeared that the value of being distinctive depended largely on how distinctiveness was constructed.

Discussion

Participants' evaluations of distinctiveness were marked by considerable ambivalence as well as some disagreement. Distinctiveness appeared to have complex implications for a very wide range of issues. In different contexts, distinctiveness might facilitate or obstruct social relationships. Additionally distinctiveness might support or undermine authenticity, and might in some forms be contrary to the message of the clergy or to the cohesion of the church. All of these implications depended partly on how distinctiveness was constructed. Thus particular constructions might provide a means of negotiating positive and negative implications.

In chapter 3, it was argued that the distinctiveness principle should be understood to shape identity in interaction with other motives—needs for continuity, efficacy and self-esteem (Breakwell, 1986a, 1992) as well as belonging, inclusion within groups and similarity to others (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Brewer, 1991, 1993a; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980). While touching on a number of these motives, the analysis here shows that issues about distinctiveness are embedded in a much broader context.

Reicher (in press) argues for the importance of examining the relationship between processes of identity definition and enactment, rather than focusing on either of these processes in isolation. A particular feature of the themes above is that they show how aspects of identity definition both enable and constrain the enactment of identity in relation to others.
In order to enact the identity of priest, it was necessary that this identity should be seen to be distinctive. This was especially apparent in the case of pastoral ministry, where participants described their distinctive position as giving them both physical and psychological access to people's lives. However, if the distinctiveness of the clergy was constructed as separateness or difference, the opposite effect might be achieved: these forms of distinctiveness were portrayed as a barrier to identity enactment, obstructing relationships with parishioners and potentially contradicting the very message which participants were trying to communicate.

This highlighted the role of perceptions of distinctiveness in shaping social relations. These perceptions did not just affect the salience of individual or group identities (cf. Oakes et al., 1994; J. C. Turner et al., 1987), but actually constituted the social meaning given to these identities and hence to the relationship between those construed in terms of these identities. In connection with this, it was not just the extent of distinctiveness (cf. Brewer, 1991) but the specific form in which distinctiveness was constructed (cf. chap. 3) on which identity enactment depended.

Participants' evaluations of different constructions of distinctiveness also appeared to be closely related to several issues arising from the analyses reported in chapters 5 and 7. One aspect of the theme of internal cohesion (chap. 5) was the value of authenticity, in the sense of a consistency between 'true self' and appearance. Authenticity was also an important value within participants' accounts of the individual (chap. 7). Here, the importance of authenticity was evident as distinctiveness was evaluated by whether it was 'real' or 'artificial', and whether being distinguished as a member of the clergy interfered with authentic self-expression.
An extremely salient theme within both previous analyses was the importance of relationships. The considerable emphasis on relationships within participants' self-definitions (chap. 5) was related to theories of social support (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Duck & Silver, 1990) as well as the 'belongingness hypothesis' of Baumeister and Leary (1995). Participants also strongly emphasised the importance and value of relationships within their discussions of 'what it means to be an individual' (chap. 7). Within this analysis, relationships constituted the arena for identity enactment, but also appeared to be more directly linked to participants' well-being, especially in terms of the pressures of distinctiveness, where possibilities of social support were undermined by popular misunderstandings of the clergy and by the separation of members of the clergy from each other.

**Strategies of distinctiveness management**

A final part of the analysis examines participants' accounts of strategically managing their distinctiveness within social settings. The most common strategy mentioned was the choice of clothing, especially whether or not to wear a clerical collar, both in general and in particular situations. Other strategies included the choice of housing and the management of lay involvement in church, as well as participants' use of language.

**Managing distinctiveness through clothing**

Many participants described consciously deciding whether or not to wear a clerical collar according to whether or not they wished to be distinguished as members of the clergy. As described earlier, the clerical collar, usually referred to by participants as the "dog collar", was understood as a symbol of the distinctiveness of the clergy and was associated with a variety of positive and negative reactions from members of the public.
Charles described choosing to wear the clerical collar as a means of "signalling to people that I have this distinctive calling":

Generally, unless I'm on a rest day, I will be wearing my collar, so I suppose that says that that is very important, the signalling to people that I have this distinctive calling.

Charles' description of the collar as a 'signal' was developed by Mark:

The reason why I wear a dog collar, and the reason why I would always like other people to wear a dog collar, is because there is that indistinguishability. I would hope that, on the one hand, we are visibly different from the rest of the population, in that we wear this bizarre eighteenth century form of dress that has unfortunately fallen from silk and linen to plastic, but nevertheless what we're stuck with. But by virtue of all of us looking alike in some way or another, means that people can relate to us, that I would hope that they would know looking at me or looking at any other clergyman, that they would find someone who was readily compassionate, who was readily caring, and skilled at handling on the one hand emotional grief and joy, and on the other hand answering important questions of faith and doubt.

Mark described the collar as a means of social categorisation. This was achieved by creating an "indistinguishability" within the category "by virtue of all of us looking alike in some way or another", while ensuring that members of the clergy were "visibly different from the rest of the population", thus reducing within-category variability and increasing between-category variability (cf. Oakes et al., 1994; J. C. Turner et al., 1987). Thus the collar would encourage people to "relate to" members of the clergy, expecting to receive both pastoral care and spiritual guidance.
Jenny gave a similar description of wearing a collar to distinguish herself as a member of the clergy "so that they trust you":

I do wear a funny collar, and I, many clergy don't, many clergy decide not to and just go out wearing whatever, but I do wear it, I think partly because of being a woman, people don't always believe or understand that a woman can be a clergyperson and you kind of need it as a key to getting into places like hospital rooms and people's homes. It's just so that they trust you.

Jenny noted that the collar was especially important for her "as a key to getting into places like hospital rooms and people's homes" as a woman, because "people don't always believe or understand that a woman can be a clergyperson". Thus the "indistinguishability" described by Mark was particularly important to enable Jenny to fulfil her ministry.

On the other hand, Simon did not usually wear a clerical collar:

I mean I don't wear my dog collar because I think the distinction that it gives you is often a thing that one, if you're not careful you fall back on, because you feel insecure or fairly powerless like most of us do these days, you know some professional status can kind of boost your ego a bit, and it does slightly frighten me I think that a dog collar can do wonders for your ego. You know, people pander to it and they're deferential to it, and it's not really a very good thing. And for that reason in our church we don't wear our dog collars very often.

Simon appeared to be concerned about the potential conflict between distinctiveness and humility, discussed earlier as a core element of the Christian message. Observing that "people pander to it and they're deferential to it", Simon chose not to wear a collar because he was "slightly frighten[ed]" that "a dog collar can do wonders for your ego".
Richard described choosing not to wear a collar as a conscious attempt to preserve his distinctiveness as an individual:

Some clergy wear it all the time as a matter of principle, and I've toyed with the idea, but on the whole I haven't. [...] I guess being a clergyman does make you lose your individuality which is maybe why I don't always feel comfortable wearing the garb. Because I want to be known as a Christian, for who I am, rather than as a plastic, you know, cut-out of the church.

For Richard, although he had “toyed with the idea” of wearing the collar “as a matter of principle”, not wearing “the garb” was a means of preserving his authenticity as “who I am, rather than as a plastic [...] cut-out of the church”. Thus Richard was explicitly seeking to avoid the “indistinguishability” which had been seen by Mark as an advantage.

Meanwhile, Joanna described the positive effect on her pastoral relationships of avoiding the distinctiveness of a clerical collar:

People have said to me, 'thank God you're not wearing a dog collar, or I'd feel like I have to be religious with you', which is quite interesting something as simple as a bit of plastic washing up liquid bottle or something around your neck can give that impression.

Reflecting accounts described earlier in which distinctiveness could be seen as an obstacle to communication, Joanna described her experience that not wearing the collar allowed people to be more open, rather than feeling that they had to “be religious” with her. She also seemed concerned to demystify the symbolic significance of the collar, comparing it to “a bit of plastic washing up liquid bottle or something around your neck”.
A number of participants also described managing their distinctiveness by changing their clothing according to the situation. Michael described wearing a collar only when "anything productive is achieved by it":

> I go invisible quite often. I don't wear the dog collar all the time. I think if wearing a dog collar and being seen to be a clergyman is helpful to one's situation, yes I'd go for it. It can lead to more productive encounters and so forth. But if I'm going to see a film in town or something I just want to go as me, I don't want to set off a chain of reactions in other people for no particular purpose. So I wouldn't dress visibly as a clergyman in those sort of situations, because I don't see that anything productive is achieved by it.

According to Michael, wearing a dog collar could in some circumstances be "helpful to one's situation" and "lead to more productive encounters", in which case he would "go for it". But, in other situations, the collar could "set off a chain of reactions in other people for no particular purpose", in which case he would "just want to go as me".

Paul similarly described varying his clothing according to the situation:

> Every morning I get up and I decide what to wear, depending on what I'm doing. My only official engagement today was to meet with you, and since I knew you were coming and you knew who I was, I chose not to, and I choose not to wear a dog collar and black shirt when I don't have to. [...] I sometimes change my clothes, sometimes three or four times a day, because I shift, all the time I'm shifting gear. Most often it's the dog collar, sometimes it's the suit, so if I'm being the chairman of governors, which I am as a priest, the chairman of governors suit goes on, etcetera, etcetera. And the dog collar goes on and off intentionally.
Paul described changing his clothes “sometimes three or four times a day”. Like Michael, he decided what to wear “depending on what I’m doing” and noted especially that “the dog collar goes on and off intentionally”. Thus, for both Michael and Paul, their distinctiveness within social settings was very explicitly a tool which could be used selectively for a purpose, rather than being a constant feature of their identity as members of the clergy.

Meanwhile, Neil described varying his clothing for the more general purpose of undermining churchmanship distinctions:

People also decide what you're to do and who you are by the colour of the shirt you wear. I mean it's quite interesting, you know, if you wear a black shirt or a grey shirt or a blue shirt you get labelled in different ways. So I wear different, three different colours, not at the same time of course. Because I think it's wrong for people to make a perception about me that is actually something that I'm not necessarily, and I want to try and throw people's view of the model of the clergy, so we don't sort of get locked in one way of the clergy always.

Neil's aim in varying the colour of his shirts was to avoid being labelled in terms of churchmanship (the relationship between churchmanship and clothing was noted earlier). Neil apparently wanted not only to avoid being categorised himself, “a perception about me that is actually something that I'm not necessarily”, but also to undermine churchmanship distinctions more generally, “so we don't sort of get locked in one way of the clergy always”. Neil later elaborated on the importance of avoiding being distinguished in terms of any particular churchmanship:

I deliberately try and confuse people about where I am [...] because I think, if you're going to be specific about something it means there are some people you can't help at all. So therefore I think you mustn't be too
Neil’s avoidance of churchmanship categories did not imply that “you don’t actually believe something yourself”. Indeed, Neil’s own beliefs have been discussed both in chapter 5 and earlier in this chapter. However, an overarching aim to ‘help people’ appeared to be more important to Neil than expressing his opinions. Thus he was concerned to avoid excluding people by narrowing his ministry: “if you're going to be specific about something it means there are some people you can't help at all”.

Participants chose whether or not to wear a clerical collar according to whether they believed it was productive or not to be distinguished as a member of the clergy. In making this choice, participants were intentionally manipulating their distinctiveness in the eyes of other people and hence constructing the nature of their relationships with others. This was a flexible strategy, in the sense that participants described varying their distinctiveness through their choice of clothing according to the relationships they wanted to emphasise within any given situation. Additionally, a strategy of variation could be used with the specific aim of maintaining a degree of flexibility in constructing these relationships.

*Other strategies*

Although clothing was the main strategy mentioned by participants for managing their distinctiveness, it was not the only one. Michael described himself as “a little bit different” in not living in a “clergy house”:

> In terms of some of the markers that I choose, that might, I'm a little bit different possibly from some, but again many make the same choices as me. I don't often wear a dog collar. My house isn't a clergy house really. OK, the church owns it but it's not very different from
anyone else's. [...] I did choose not to live in a vicarage. I turned down a vicar job so as to live in an ordinary house and be a curate again.

Michael had previously described the distinctiveness in status implied by living in a vicarage as contrary to the Christian message of "humble service or non-materialism". Here, he revealed that he had actually "turned down a vicar job" in order to avoid the status symbol of living in a vicarage and to "live in an ordinary house and be a curate again".

Neil, who had previously described "being set apart as a priest" as "against what it says in the Bible", said that he was "quite happy for lay people to be involved in doing services", although there were some limits to this:

I'm quite happy for lay people to be involved in doing services and they do do them. If you're talking about a communion service it has to be me. [...] And where I don't like necessarily the rules of the church, I would actually obey the rules about Eucharistic services and who takes those services, I would obey that, which is against a lot of other things I would do.

Given his theological opposition to the separation of clergy and lay people, Neil's encouragement of lay involvement in services appeared to be an intentional strategy of undermining this distinction. This was consistent with his aim to enable his parishes to 'run themselves', rather than being an autocratic leader (chap 5). Nevertheless, Neil admitted that he did "obey the rules" about the Eucharist, which was "against a lot of other things I would do". Thus Neil appeared to be selective in his opposition of different aspects of the distinctiveness of the clergy, challenging the idea that members of the clergy are necessary for worship, but upholding the distinctiveness of the clergy in the performance of sacraments.
Finally, Matthew described using language implicitly to undermine the perceived separation between church and society:

I get people coming to me who might live right opposite the road, opposite the church, and say to me 'Can I come and get married in your church?'. And I rather naughtily always say to them, 'Well, it depends on whether it's your church', and they don't understand what you're talking about really. They don't understand that it is their church, that it belongs to them, it's their, you know, they have rights, you know, and they have responsibilities too but it actually does belong to them.

Matthew gave considerable importance to the 'establishment' of the Church of England, which meant that "it is their church, that it belongs to them" and not to him as the vicar. Thus, whenever people referred to the church as his, asking to "come and get married in your church", Matthew raised this issue, asking them "whether it's your church", highlighting the difference between the perceived separation of church and society and the truth, according to Matthew, that "it actually does belong to them".

These accounts show that strategies of distinctiveness management were not restricted to choices of clothing but might extend to choices of housing and position within the clergy, the conduct of church services and the careful use of language in communicating with parishioners. A feature of all three accounts is that participants appeared to be trying to undermine specific aspects of their distinctiveness - social status, the theological separation of the clergy from lay people and the perceived separation of church and society - rather than challenging distinctiveness in general.
Discussion

Participants’ accounts of distinctiveness management complemented their evaluations of distinctiveness discussed earlier. The previous section illustrated one side of the relationship between identity definition and enactment (cf. Reicher, in press) – participants described how their distinctiveness as members of the clergy could enable or constrain the enactment of their ministries. This section seemed to illustrate the other side of this relationship – participants described strategically defining their distinctiveness in the course of enacting their ministries.

Participants’ choices whether or not to wear a clerical collar did not just express but defined their identities, intentionally constructing their interactions with others as interpersonal or intergroup encounters. Other aspects of their behaviour were directed towards undermining specific features of their perceived distinctiveness – especially impressions of elevated social status and of separateness or marginality. This lends weight to the interpretation advanced earlier that participants’ initial accounts of their distinctiveness as members of the clergy may not have reflected their perceptions of the category as much as their competing attempts to construct the meaning of the category in different ways.

General Discussion

As with the interpretative phenomenological analyses presented in chapters 5 and 7, it is acknowledged that the themes presented here represent a selective reading of a selective sample of data consisting of the responses of a small group of people unrepresentative of the Anglican clergy to a particular set of questions. It would not be reasonable to assume that a study of a different group of participants analysed by a different researcher would have led to an identical set of conclusions.
However, the analysis has been discussed with two other researchers (Glynis Breakwell and Xenia Chryssochoou). Both of them agree that the interpretations reported are warranted by the data, providing some support for the reliability and validity of the analysis. Additionally, a comparatively large amount of raw data has been provided here, giving the reader some freedom to evaluate the interpretations offered.

The analysis was largely concerned with the situation in which members of the clergy found themselves and their possible reactions to this. In as much as this situation was defined by widespread popular perceptions of the clergy, that of other members of the clergy can be expected to be similar. Participants' reactions to this situation were characterised by their diversity, rather than conforming to a general pattern. A more diverse group of participants might then have shown even more diversity in their reactions. Nevertheless, care was taken to sample as broadly as possible in selecting interviews for the initial analyses, and to reflect the breadth of diverse perspectives as much as possible in the final report.

Furthermore, it was not intended to draw broad generalisations about the clergy but to provide a detailed understanding of experiences related to distinctiveness among a particular group of men and women. Hence, the interpretation should be judged in terms of its internal coherence, closeness to the data and the development of new theoretical insights (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992; J. A. Smith, 1996b; Stiles, 1993), rather than applying criteria intended for evaluating other forms of research. Readers must judge for themselves the internal coherence of the analysis and its closeness to the data. Meanwhile the analysis certainly brought to the fore a number of issues which would not otherwise have been well developed within this thesis. The interpretation can also be said to have "reflexive validity" in the sense that it changed the researcher's own understanding of the area (Macran, Stiles & Smith, 1999; Stiles, 1993).
Social and individual processes in identity construction

A central aim of this analysis was to examine process as well as structure, with the intention of providing a richer account of how thedistinctiveness principle affects identity and behaviour. An extremely striking feature of the themes presented above was the relationship between identity and processes of social interaction. This relationship had many sides.

In their 'evaluations of distinctiveness', participants described how definitions of their distinctiveness as priests could both enable and constrain social interaction, especially the enactment of their ministries. Discussing their 'strategies of distinctiveness management', participants described manipulating definitions of their distinctiveness within social interaction in order to achieve their interactive purposes.

This helps to explain participants' actions in 'debating the distinctiveness of the clergy'. Despite the lack of consensus between participants in defining their distinctiveness, there was a notable consistency within participants' accounts between how they defined the clergy, how they would prefer to be defined ('evaluations'), and how they tried to be defined ('strategies'). Furthermore, these definitions appeared to be explicitly tied to participants' individual positions within the clergy in subgroups of 'churchmanship'. This lends weight to the interpretation offered earlier that participants' accounts in the first cluster of themes were purposive attempts to construct social reality in a particular form, rather than different perceptions of a given social reality (cf. Reicher, 1995).

It appeared that participants' definitions of their group membership could be understood not just as social products – the outcome of processes – but as social processes in their own right, in which participants were actively and purposively involved in defining their identities (cf. Marková, 1987).
Participants' descriptions of their 'distinctiveness within the clergy' had a very different flavour. In particular, there was a considerable emphasis on self-enhancing self-comparisons, which might be associated to a greater extent with intra-individual processes of assimilation-accommodation and evaluation (cf. Breakwell, 1986a, 1987, 1988). In order to understand the difference between constructions of distinctiveness on these different levels, it may be useful to consider the observation of several participants that members of the clergy have comparatively little day-to-day contact with each other. Thus, where their distinctiveness as members of the clergy was constructed within and for the purpose of everyday social interaction with their parishioners, their distinctiveness within the clergy had comparatively little significance for social interaction and appeared to be constructed to a greater extent through intra-individual processes.

**Contextualising constructions of distinctiveness**

In chapter 3, it was argued that the construction of distinctiveness would be affected by cultural and contextual variations in the availability, accessibility and value of different sources of distinctiveness. Participants' 'evaluations of distinctiveness' uncovered a range of issues which appeared to shape the subjective value of different forms of distinctiveness.

The implications of distinctiveness for the enactment of identity were of crucial importance to participants in defining their identities. Where distinctiveness was seen to facilitate relationships with their parishioners, participants affirmed their distinctiveness and evaluated it positively. On the other hand, where distinctiveness was seen as a barrier, participants denied their distinctiveness and evaluated it negatively.
The value of different constructions of distinctiveness also appeared to be related to their consistency with other priorities for identity, which had been identified in the analysis reported in chapter 5, and were echoed in participants' representations of personhood in chapter 7. Particular concerns were the 'authenticity' of different forms of distinctiveness, and the implications of being distinctive for relationships and social support.

A further concern was the consistency of constructions of distinctiveness with key aspects of the Christian message, such as humility and service, and with the cohesion and future survival of the Christian church.

It should be noted that the theorised sources of distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness, appeared to have different implications for these issues in a number of respects. Some distinctiveness in terms of position was generally considered to be useful and necessary for the enactment of ministry. On the other hand, distinctiveness in terms of difference or separateness was more likely to have negative implications for ministry and for relationships in general, and to be seen as inauthentic and contrary to the Christian message. Furthermore, even position might have negative implications if associated too strongly with social status.

Many participants made these distinctions in their evaluations of distinctiveness before the theoretical constructs of position, difference and separateness had been introduced by the interviewer. It appeared that the distinction between sources of distinctiveness was a means of negotiating between the positive and negative consequences of being distinctive. Other strategies involved affirming or denying distinctiveness as a whole, for example using the clerical collar. However, it should be noted that even those who did not explicitly distinguish between different senses of 'distinctiveness' tended to affirm especially aspects of the position and deny aspects of the difference or separateness of the clergy.
Conclusion

In summary, this chapter has provided a rich account of processes and issues associated with distinctiveness among a small group of men and women of the Anglican clergy. The analysis highlighted the relationship between identity and social interaction, as well as relating different forms of distinctiveness to participants' own phenomenological concerns.

The chapters which follow report a series of quantitative analyses addressing theoretical predictions about the distinctiveness principle. Chapter 9 focuses primarily on measurement issues, as well as testing some initial hypotheses. Chapters 10 and 11 examine predictions about the constitution of distinctiveness from multiple sources, the construction of a distinctive identity and other consequences of the principle.
Chapter 9
MEASURING DISTINCTIVENESS

O mighty Caesar! Dost thou lie so low?
Are all thy conquests, glories, triumphs, spoils,
Shrunk to this little measure?

SHAKESPEARE - Julius Caesar

This chapter reports analyses of the quantitative data collected in the interviews. These analyses contribute to the development of measures of distinctiveness, and include preliminary tests of the hypothesised status of position, difference and separateness as functionally separable sources of distinctiveness, as well as the importance of these constructs in shaping participants' identities and determining their subjective well-being.

Aims and Hypotheses

The first aim of these analyses was to contribute to the development of appropriate measures of distinctiveness for use in the subsequent questionnaire study. The interviews included two measures of inter-group distinctiveness (distinctiveness as a member of the clergy in relation to other people in society) and three measures of intra-group distinctiveness (distinctiveness in relation to other members of the clergy).

Measures of inter-group distinctiveness were a single self-report item and the mean of participants' inter-group distinctiveness ratings of their responses to the Twenty Statements Test (TST). Measures of intra-group distinctiveness were a single self-report item, the mean of participants' intra-group distinctiveness ratings of their responses to the TST and the mean of participants' ratings of the applicability to themselves of constructs they had generated to describe a 'typical member of the clergy', understood as a reversed measure of intra-group distinctiveness.
The first two hypotheses concerned the convergent validity of these measures. It was hypothesised that the two measures of inter-group distinctiveness would be intercorrelated (H1) and that the three measures of intra-group distinctiveness would be intercorrelated (H2).

An additional issue was the robustness of the measures in response to changes in context. While perceived distinctiveness on any given level of categorisation was not expected to be stable across contexts (cf. J. C. Turner et al., 1987), a concern about the measures derived from the TST and the 'typical member' description was that they might be over sensitive to idiosyncratic contextual effects on the constructs initially generated.

Hence, it was also planned to screen these measures for effects of conceptually irrelevant variables which might interfere on a methodological level: the number of responses generated in the TST and in the 'typical member' description, and the order of presentation of these initial tasks, which had been randomised in the interviews.

A second aim of the analyses was to test the theoretical account of position, difference and separateness as sources of distinctiveness. Following the theoretical development of these constructs in chapter 3, it was not expected that participants' ratings of position, difference and separateness would be unrelated to each other within any given context. Nevertheless, it was expected that each source would make an independent contribution to the global concept of distinctiveness.

Hence, it was hypothesised (H3) that participants' ratings of the extent and the importance of positional distinctiveness, difference and separateness would be correlated with corresponding judgements of the extent and the importance of distinctiveness on each level of categorisation, after controlling for effects of the other two sources.
A third aim was to investigate the importance of distinctiveness as a principle underlying identity processes. In chapter 3, it was argued that distinctiveness is necessary for the achievement of a meaningful identity. Following this argument, it was expected that participants would select as important especially those TST responses which provided higher levels of inter-group (H4) and intra-group (H5) distinctiveness.

Additionally, if distinctiveness is understood as a basic human need, then it might be expected that greater satisfaction of this need would be positively associated with subjective well-being. Hence, it seemed that participants' levels of perceived distinctiveness might be positively associated with measures of satisfaction, both in general (life satisfaction) and in the specific context under examination (work satisfaction).

However, given participants' accounts of the costs of distinctiveness and especially difference and separateness (chap. 8), it was expected that these relationships with satisfaction would be present for distinctiveness in terms of position, on both inter- and intra-group levels, but that this would not necessarily be reflected for all forms of distinctiveness (H6).

**Method**

The interview study is described in full in chapter 4. Those parts which are directly relevant to these analyses are briefly summarised here.

Interview participants completed the TST and the 'typical member of the clergy' description in randomised order, ranked up to ten TST responses which were "most important to you as a member of the clergy", rated all of their TST responses for inter- and intra-group distinctiveness, and rated their 'typical member' constructs for applicability to themselves.
In the course of the second section, participants rated themselves for both inter- and intra-group distinctiveness, first in general and then focusing individually on each source, and additionally rated the subjective importance of each of these forms of distinctiveness.

At the end of the interview, participants completed a measure of life satisfaction (Diener et al., 1985), a measure of work satisfaction (adapted from Price & Mueller, 1981) and provided some demographic details.

**Results**

*Measures of distinctiveness*

*Convergent validity*

The two measures of perceived inter-group distinctiveness were correlated at $r = .422$ ($n = 36, p < .01$). This indicated some degree of convergence between the single self-report score and the mean inter-group distinctiveness rating of the TST responses, supporting H1.

Two of the measures of perceived intra-group distinctiveness, the self-report and the mean rating of the TST responses were correlated at $r = .337$ ($n = 36, p < .05$). However, the convergence of these measures with the third measure, derived from the 'typical member of the clergy' description, received only directional support (single self-report: $r = -.158, n = 39, p > .05$; TST mean rating: $r = -.195; n = 39, p > .05$). Thus, H2 received only partial support: two of the measures were convergent, but the 'typical member' measure appeared to be problematic.
Robustness

The measures derived from ratings of the TST and 'typical member' constructs were screened for effects of the number of items generated in the initial tasks. No discernible relationship was found.

These measures were also screened for effects of the order of presentation of the initial description tasks. Neither of the TST measures was discernibly affected. However the 'typical member' measure was significantly affected by the manipulation: if the 'typical member' task was preceded by the TST, then the resulting constructs were seen as less applicable to the self ('typical member' then TST: mean rating = 5.18; TST then 'typical member': mean rating = 3.91; \( t = 2.47, df = 35.51, p < .05 \)).

Thus, in addition to questions about its convergent validity, the intra-group distinctiveness measure derived from the 'typical member of the clergy' description task was not robust in relation to a seemingly irrelevant manipulation of the context of the measure. This measure was not used in any of the subsequent analyses reported here.

Sources of distinctiveness

The next series of analyses were concerned with testing the contributions of position, difference and separateness to ratings of the extent and the importance of inter- and intra-group distinctiveness within the self-report scores. Zero-order correlations were calculated between distinctiveness and the three sources within self-reports of the extent and the importance of inter- and intra-group distinctiveness, and multiple regression analyses were performed assessing the contributions of each source to the global ratings within the extent and the importance scores on each level.
Within participants' self-reports of the extent of inter-group distinctiveness, all three sources were significantly related to the global score (all $p < .05$). Position was significantly related to separateness on this level, and the relationship between position and difference was approaching significance (table 9.1). However, contrary to H3, a multiple regression analysis showed that only position contributed significantly to the global score independent of the other sources (table 9.2). Here, H3 received only partial support, with only position clearly contributing independently to distinctiveness ratings on the inter-group level.

Table 9.1
Zero order correlations between self-reports of the extent of inter-group distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.647***</td>
<td>.370*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.543**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $n = 36$ participants, with listwise omission of missing data.

* $p < .05$ (two-tailed). ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed). *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Table 9.2
Summary of simultaneous regression analysis showing contributions of sources to ratings of the extent of inter-group distinctiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.465</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Listwise $n = 36$. $R^2 = .490$, $F (3, 32) = 10.25$, $p < .001$. 
Within ratings of the importance of inter-group distinctiveness, only the importance of separateness was significantly associated with the global score, with the predicted effects of position and difference receiving only directional support. Intercorrelations between the importance scores for the three individual sources were all nonsignificant (table 9.3). This pattern was also evident in the multiple regression analysis, in which the rated importance of inter-group separateness was the only significant predictor of the rated importance of inter-group distinctiveness (table 9.4). Again, H3 received only partial support, but here it was separateness rather than position which contributed to the global rating.

Table 9.3
Zero order correlations between self-reports of the importance of inter-group distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.645**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. • Position</td>
<td></td>
<td>-. 183</td>
<td></td>
<td>.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. • Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. • Separateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n= 36 participants, with listwise omission of missing data.

** p < .01 (two-tailed).

Table 9.4
Summary of simultaneous regression analysis showing contributions of sources to ratings of the importance of inter-group distinctiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Listwise n = 36. \( R^2 = .452, F (3, 32) = 8.80, p < .001. \)
Within ratings of the extent of intra-group distinctiveness, self-reports of difference and separateness were significantly related to the global score, while the expected correlation with position received only directional support. None of the intercorrelations between position, difference and separateness were significant within these ratings (table 9.5). Within the multiple regression analysis, neither difference nor separateness was a significant individual predictor of perceived intra-group distinctiveness, although both were close to significance and the model as a whole was significant (table 9.6). Again, H3 received partial support with both difference and separateness, but not position, apparently making some contribution to the global ratings of intra-group distinctiveness.

Table 9.5

Zero order correlations between self-reports of the extent of intra-group distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.364*</td>
<td>.440**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 35 participants, with listwise omission of missing data.

* p < .05 (two-tailed). ** p < .01 (two-tailed).

Table 9.6

Summary of simultaneous regression analysis showing contributions of sources to ratings of the extent of intra-group distinctiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( B )</th>
<th>( SE_B )</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>( sig. )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Listwise \( n = 35 \). \( R^2 = .296, F (3, 31) = 4.35, p < .05 \).
Within ratings of the importance of intra-group distinctiveness, all three sources were significantly associated with the global score. Additionally, all intercorrelations between the importance scores for individual sources were significant (table 9.7). However, only the importance of intra-group position made a significant individual contribution to the importance of intra-group distinctiveness as a whole within the multiple regression analysis (table 9.8). Thus H3 again received only partial support.

Table 9.7

Zero order correlations between self-reports of the importance of intra-group distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.741***</td>
<td>.584***</td>
<td>.530**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. * Position</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.580***</td>
<td>.515**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. * Difference</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.344*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. * Separateness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 35 participants, with listwise omission of missing data.

* p < .05 (two-tailed). ** p < .01 (two-tailed). *** p < .001 (two-tailed).

Table 9.8

Summary of simultaneous regression analysis showing contributions of sources to ratings of the importance of intra-group distinctiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Listwise n = 35. R² = .612, F (3, 31) = 16.27, p < .001.

Relating these results back to hypothesis H3, it appeared that the three sources, position, difference and separateness, rather than contributing
additively to the concept of distinctiveness across all contexts, were
variably emphasised within participants’ concepts of distinctiveness
according to the level of categorisation and whether ratings referred to the
extent or to the importance of distinctiveness.

On the inter-group level, the extent of distinctiveness was a significant
function of position ($\beta = .465$) but not difference or separateness, while the
importance of inter-group distinctiveness was a significant function of the
importance of separateness ($\beta = .582$) but not of position or difference.

On the intra-group level, the extent of distinctiveness appeared to be a
function of difference ($\beta = .283$) and separateness ($\beta = .315$) but not
position, while the importance of intra-group distinctiveness was a
significant function of the importance of position ($\beta = .517$) but not of
difference or separateness.

Overall, H3 received qualified support. Different sources had a greater or
a lesser weighting according to the level of categorisation and according to
whether the ratings referred to the extent or to the importance of
distinctiveness on this level, but all three of the sources made significant
independent contributions to the general scores at one time or another.

**Importance of distinctiveness**

**Distinctiveness and importance in the TST responses**

The importance ranks given by participants to their TST responses were
used to create a median split of each participant’s responses. Mean ratings
of inter- and intra-group distinctiveness for the more and less important
responses were calculated for each respondent and compared.
It was hypothesised that those items which distinguished the respondent more from others, either on an inter-group (H4) or an intra-group (H5) level, would be higher in their importance to the participants.

The results showed a significant relationship in the predicted direction between inter-group distinctiveness and importance (high importance: mean distinctiveness rating = 5.18; low importance: mean distinctiveness rating = 3.91; $t = 4.87$, $df = 37$, $p < .001$), providing strong support for H4. However, no relationship was discernible between intra-group distinctiveness and importance (high importance: mean distinctiveness rating = 4.28; low importance: mean distinctiveness rating = 4.37; $t = -.31$, $df = 37$, $p > .05$). Thus H5 was clearly rejected.

**Distinctiveness and satisfaction**

Cronbach’s alpha for both satisfaction scales was barely acceptable at .592 for life satisfaction and .583 for work satisfaction. The correlation between the two measures was .363 ($n = 41$, $p < .05$).

The life satisfaction scale proved resistant to modification. Principal components analysis of the life satisfaction items yielded a single factor with eigenvalue above 1 accounting for 39.0% of the total variance. All 5 items loaded above .49 on this factor. Furthermore, the internal reliability could not be increased by deleting any single item.

Some changes were made to the work satisfaction scale. Item 5, “I definitely dislike my work”, had no variance, with all respondents strongly disagreeing. Principal components analysis of the remaining 6 work satisfaction items yielded 3 factors with eigenvalue above 1. After oblimin rotation, the solution resisted interpretation. However all items except for item 6, “Each day in my work seems like it will never end”, loaded above
.41 on the first unrotated factor, which accounted as it was for 36.6% of the total variance. One of those interviewed had mentioned a potential problem for the construct validity of this item while filling in the scale: part of the nature of the priesthood is that one does not cease to be a priest even when off duty, so there is a sense unrelated to work satisfaction in which the working day never does end. Furthermore omitting this item raised the statistical reliability of the scale to $\alpha = .657$.

However, after modifications to the work satisfaction scale, the correlation between life satisfaction and work satisfaction increased to .427 ($n = 42, p < .01$). A principal components analysis of the life and work satisfaction items together failed to distinguish between the two constructs. All items except work satisfaction item 6 (rejected in the previous analysis) loaded above .4 on the first unrotated factor, which accounted for 28.2% of the total variance. Omitting this item and life satisfaction item 5, “If I could live my life again I would change almost nothing”, in reliability analysis gave a 9-item scale of satisfaction with reliability of $\alpha = .731$.

Since on the whole the same pattern of correlations emerged for the life satisfaction scale, the modified work satisfaction scale and the 9-item scale, the results reported here will be mostly restricted to those for the latter scale, given its greater statistical reliability.

---

20 Since the life satisfaction and work satisfaction items were respectively rated on 7-point and 5-point scales, the work satisfaction items were re-scaled for these analyses such that the transformed $x$ was equal to $(1.5 \times \text{raw } x - .5)$. After this transformation, all items were scored from 1 to 7 and thus would have equal weighting in an additive scale.

21 The omission of life satisfaction item 5 is again supported in terms of construct validity, since agreement could potentially be interpreted as an expression of self satisfaction or pride as opposed to life satisfaction or happiness.
Satisfaction was positively correlated with the self-report measures of distinctiveness ($r = .384, n = 39, p < .05$), position ($r = .480, n = 39, p < .01$) and separateness ($r = .338, n = 38, p < .05$) on the inter-group level and was negatively correlated with the self-report measure of intra-group difference ($r = -.331, n = 36, p < .05$). It should be noted that the latter result appeared to be grounded in a strong negative correlation with life satisfaction ($r = -.407, n = 36, p < .05$) which was not reflected in work satisfaction ($r = -.190, n = 36, p > .05$). None of the other measures of distinctiveness was significantly related to satisfaction.

Since inter-group position and separateness had already been shown to be correlated with each other and with inter-group distinctiveness, the results for these measures were investigated further in order to examine which variable or variables were driving the observed correlations.

Firstly, the correlation between distinctiveness and satisfaction was recalculated controlling for both position and separateness: this partial correlation was negligible at .078. It appeared that the entire relationship between inter-group distinctiveness and satisfaction could be accounted for in terms of position and separateness. Next, the partial correlations between distinctiveness of these two sources and satisfaction were calculated, in each case controlling for the other source: when position was controlled for, the partial correlation between separateness and satisfaction was reduced to a nonsignificant .133, whereas the partial correlation between position and satisfaction while controlling for separateness remained significant at .383 ($n = 35, p < .05$). Thus it seemed plausible that the various relationships observed between measures of inter-group distinctiveness and satisfaction resulted primarily from a mutual relationship with inter-group position. Thus H6 was supported on the inter-group level, although there was no parallel relationship between intra-group position and life or work satisfaction.
The negative correlation between self-reported intra-group difference and satisfaction appeared on careful inspection to be an artefact of the negative effect on satisfaction of being either single or widowed (mean satisfaction for married clergy: 55.0; for single or widowed clergy: 48.8; \( t = 3.45, df = 40, p < .01 \)), which states were also associated with higher scores for self-reported intra-group difference (mean intra-group difference for married clergy: 4.6; for single or widowed clergy: 6.7; \( t = 2.51, df = 9.48, p < .05 \)). Furthermore, both intra-group difference and marital status were related to life satisfaction but not to work satisfaction, the context in which the theoretical construct of intra-group difference would be meaningful. Controlling for marital status, the partial correlation between intra-group difference and satisfaction was negligible (\( r = -.056 \)).

Discussion

**Measuring distinctiveness**

The two measures of inter-group distinctiveness were significantly intercorrelated, as were the parallel scores to these on the intra-group level. However, the expected correlations between the latter two variables and the 'typical member' measure, which was understood to be a reversed measure of intra-group distinctiveness, were both nonsignificant. In both cases, \( r \) was less than .2, indicating less than 4% of shared variance. Moreover this measure, unlike either of the scores derived from the TST responses, was substantially affected by the order in which the initial tasks were administered, showing a lack of robustness in response to this minor and theoretically irrelevant change in context.
One possible reason for the failure of the 'typical member' measure to correlate with the other measures of intra-group distinctiveness is that the constructs accessed are not as similar as initially supposed. The difference lies in the target from which the respondent is distinguishing themselves in the ratings. In both the self-rating and the TST measure, the target is "other members of the clergy"; in this measure, it is a "typical member of the clergy". Furthermore, the distinctiveness here is in terms of constructs describing the clergy, rather than the self as in the TST or differentiating constructs as in the self-report measure.

Moreover, there was a great deal of variation in the way that people approached the 'typical member' description task. This was apparent from the content of responses and from comments made by participants at the time. Some described an 'ideal type', others described a negative stereotype, which may at times have been based on popular external images of the clergy rather than their own perspective. It could be argued that those who chose the latter route were those who saw themselves as more distinctive, identified less strongly with the clergy as a group, and were therefore in a position to list negative qualities without this reflecting on their own self-esteem. But alternatively the differences might be purely down to their understanding of the task.

The manipulation effect lends some credibility to the explanation in terms of task demands. If asked from cold to describe a typical member of the Anglican clergy, participants may have understood the task to involve describing a group to which they belonged, hence the 'ideal type'. If asked to do the same thing after first completing the TST, on the assumption that they were not being asked the same question twice, they may have been more likely to describe a typical 'other' member of the group.
Meanwhile, the validity of the 'typical member' measure as a reversed measure of intra-group distinctiveness must be questioned in view of its failure to correlate with the other measures on this level, and its apparent lack of robustness. It might even be suggested that, for those who described the 'ideal type', the measure may be a better index of domain specific self-esteem than of distinctiveness.\(^{22}\)

The correlations between the remaining inter- and intra-group distinctiveness measures of .422 and .337, although significant, indicated only about 18% and 11% of shared variance respectively between these scores. This suggested that the differences between self-report measures and variables derived from the TST responses might be worth exploring.

Firstly, the TST measures are means of multiple ratings, whereas the self-ratings are single scores. Following from this, the self-ratings are transparent measures of distinctiveness, so that the constructs used to distinguish will be those which are believed to distinguish, whereas the TST measures are couched in content generated for general self-description, not necessarily in terms of distinctiveness.

It was not clear from these results whether either method offered a 'better' approach for measuring distinctiveness, and so it was decided to retain both types of measure for the questionnaire study, with the intention of providing a clearer picture of their different strengths and weaknesses.

On the other hand, given the substantial concerns expressed about the 'typical member' measure, this measure was not used further.

\(^{22}\) In this case modesty also becomes an issue - a number of respondents listed 'humility' as one of the typical characteristics and were then faced with the paradoxical task of giving themselves marks out of 10 for humility.
Chapter 9: Measuring Distinctiveness

Sources of distinctiveness

Contributions to global ratings

Within each level of categorisation, the independent contributions of position, difference and separateness to global ratings of the extent and the importance of distinctiveness were assessed within multiple regression analyses. It appeared that different sources had a greater or a lesser weighting according to the level of categorisation and according to whether the ratings referred to the extent or to the importance of distinctiveness on this level, but all three of the sources made significant independent contributions to the general scores at one time or another.

In the extent scores, inter-group distinctiveness was a function of position, whereas intra-group distinctiveness was a function of difference and separateness. This reflects quite well the observable situation of parish clergy, many of whom are very closely tied to their local communities, hence the relationally oriented focus on position in their inter-group distinctiveness, but who sometimes have very little contact with other members of the clergy, hence the more individualistic focus on difference and separateness in their intra-group distinctiveness (cf. chap. 8).

Indeed, in a number of interviews, the initial question about intra-group position was answered in terms of differences between the interviewee and other members of the clergy in their role in relation to the community (intra-group differences in inter-group position) rather than in terms of their role in relation to other members of the clergy (intra-group position, as intended). This seemed to imply quite strongly that intra-group position was not especially available or salient to these people.
It may be noted here that the importance variables are all problematic because of an ambiguity which became apparent in the course of the interviews: the importance of a given source and level of distinctiveness was variously rephrased in answers to the questions as 'how important is it for me to be distinguished from other people', 'how important to me are the things which I have said also distinguish me from other people' or 'how distinctive do I want to be from other people'. Furthermore, the first sense, which was the intended one, does not allow for the response 'it is important to me not to be distinctive', which was sometimes the case. However, if the importance variables are taken to be generally indicative of the desirability of the various sources and levels of distinctiveness, then some sense can be made of the multiple regression analyses.

Within these ratings, the general score for the importance of inter-group distinctiveness appeared to be largely a function of the importance of separateness. Accepting the interpretation above of the importance scores, this means that desiring separateness contributed to desiring distinctiveness, independently of the desirability of difference or position.

This may reflect the fact that separateness is understood to have costs and benefits to the clergy which are evaluated differently within different sections of the church. This manifests itself in the dialogue between Catholic and Evangelical churchmanships, as discussed in chapters 4, 7 and 8, the former suggesting that the meaning of ordination is to be 'set apart', the latter asserting that to be 'set apart' from one's parishioners is to be out of touch with them. Thus the implications of separateness from one's parishioners are subject to a great deal of explicit debate among the Anglican clergy, and may be especially salient when members of the clergy are asked to evaluate costs and benefits of distinctiveness (cf. chap. 8).
The general score for the importance of intra-group distinctiveness was predicted by position but not difference or separateness in the multiple regression analysis. This suggested that desiring intra-group distinctiveness was primarily the function of a desire for position. It is possible that this may have reflected a desire for status. In particular, it might be that those in lower status positions (e.g. non-stipendiary ministers, curates) would see their distinctiveness as negative, and hence would prefer not to be distinctive. However this interpretation should be treated with caution given the previous points about the lack of salience of position on this level and frequent misinterpretation of this construct.

The four multiple regression analyses using position, difference and separateness to predict the global scores for the extent and importance of distinctiveness on each level, yielded values of adjusted $R^2$ between .228 (extent of intra-group distinctiveness) and .574 (importance of intra-group distinctiveness), indicating between 22.8% and 57.4% of variance in the global scores explained by this combination of sources. Although these values were clearly significant, they left between 42.6% and 77.2% of the variance unexplained by the sources. It was not clear to what extent this unexplained variance was attributable to the existence of further sources of distinctiveness, to inadequacies in the description of the existing sources in the rating tasks or to measurement error. It was therefore considered important to address these issues in the questionnaire study.

It is also worth noting that the failure of some results in this section to reach significance may have been a function of lack of statistical power. The sample size of 42 was rather small to achieve significance in multiple regression weights where effect sizes are by definition often likely to be small. If the effect sizes here were replicated with a larger sample, this would considerably strengthen the argument for the independent
contribution of each source to distinctiveness, and it would be possible to model the size of the contributions with greater accuracy and confidence.

**Ambiguity in measuring the sources**

It should be noted that all of the scores for global distinctiveness, position, difference and separateness contained a certain amount of ambiguity. Apart from some minor differences in how the sources were understood, the main issues were point of view - "The way it distinguishes me, or the way it's perceived as distinguishing me by other people ... because I mean I think they are very different things." (Jenny) - and the nature of the comparison target - "It depends which members of society quite honestly ...I mean, in comparison with what?" (William). These ambiguities were reflected in significant numbers of refusals to answer or multiple answers to different senses of the question. Care was taken to avoid both sources of ambiguity in designing the subsequent questionnaire study.

**Importance of distinctiveness**

**Distinctiveness and importance in the TST responses**

An important objective of this thesis is to demonstrate the importance of distinctiveness in shaping identity. In this connection, it was predicted that both inter- and intra-group forms of distinctiveness would be organising principles of the relative importance of self description items generated in the TST, and that this would be reflected in greater mean scores for both forms of distinctiveness among the more important than among the less important items. This was supported strongly for inter-group distinctiveness but not at all for intra-group distinctiveness.
The complete failure of the intra-group distinctiveness scores to show the expected relation with importance might have been a function of the wording of the importance question. The question was phrased in terms of 'importance to you as a member of the clergy' with the intention that the context should be the same for the importance and the distinctiveness judgements, but this wording may have been understood as asking participants to characterise themselves as group members. With hindsight, a more subtle approach would be to cue the context of the clergy in a preamble and then to ask a straight question about importance.

This also has implications for interpretation of the highly significant effect for inter-group distinctiveness. If the question was understood as asking the participants to characterise themselves as members of the clergy using their TST responses, then it could be argued that the relationship between inter-group distinctiveness and importance is tautological, and that the interviewees simply understood that they were being asked which of the descriptions they had previously generated referred to specific features of the clergy. Nevertheless, if so, then the very fact that the question was interpreted in this way speaks for the importance of distinctiveness, as distinctiveness was not explicitly referred to in the importance question, nor had it been mentioned at any time during the interview until after the importance ranking had been performed and discussed.

*Distinctiveness and satisfaction*

A second way of looking at the importance of distinctiveness was to examine relationships between the various measures of distinctiveness obtained in the interviews and the satisfaction measures. In a series of analyses, satisfaction was found to be correlated positively with inter-group position, which also accounted for the observed correlations with separateness and global distinctiveness on this level.
This result is especially interesting in relation to some of the other results reported in this chapter. Position was shown in the 'sources of distinctiveness' section to be the main component of inter-group distinctiveness. Inter-group distinctiveness was shown in the TST section to be strongly related to the importance ranking of self descriptions. Now position was shown to be strongly related to satisfaction, a result which was stable across both work and life satisfaction measures. Taken together, these results suggested that having a distinctive position as a member of the clergy was extremely important to these people.

However, it should be noted that the measures of satisfaction used here were both problematic in terms of both statistical reliability and construct validity within this population. It would therefore be desirable in future to find an alternative means of assessing subjective well-being.

**Conclusion**

The analyses presented in this chapter provided advancement in three areas. Firstly, they were of methodological relevance, pointing the way to a number of improvements which were subsequently implemented in the questionnaire study. Secondly, they provided initial data on the independent contributions of position, difference and separateness to both the perceived extent and importance of distinctiveness in two different categorical contexts. The size of the contribution of each source depended on the level of categorisation and on whether the extent or the importance of distinctiveness was being measured. Thirdly, these analyses provided initial data on the operation of the distinctiveness principle. Distinctiveness appeared to have a bearing on the perceived importance of items of identity content and on participants' subjective well-being. All of these issues were followed up in more detail within the questionnaire study and are discussed in detail in chapters 10 and 11.
Chapter 10

MODELLING SOURCES OF DISTINCTIVENESS

Individuality [...] does not entail individualism.

ROM HARRÉ - The Singular Self

This chapter reports analyses of data from the questionnaire study, which address the theorised constitution of distinctiveness from separable sources of position, difference and separateness. These analyses show that all three hypothesised sources contribute significantly, uniquely and substantially to ratings of distinctiveness associated with items of identity content, but aspects of distinctiveness have differing implications for the relationship between distinctiveness and feelings of closeness to others.

The main aim of these analyses was to address the theoretical proposition (P2) advanced at the end of chapter three, that *distinctiveness may be achieved in multiple ways, using dimensions of position, difference and separateness, on both interpersonal and intergroup levels.*

In the previous chapter, the constitution of distinctiveness from multiple sources was examined by regressing interviewees' self-ratings for the extent and importance of distinctiveness with respect to interpersonal and intergroup targets ("other members of the clergy" and "other people in society", respectively) on their self-ratings for the extent and importance of distinctiveness in terms of position, difference and separateness with respect to the same targets. However, these preliminary analyses could have been understood to reflect the use of these constructs in different contexts, rather than their *availability* as sources of distinctiveness.

The analyses presented in this chapter involve a more direct test of the assertion that position, difference and separateness are *sources which may be* used in order to construct a sense of distinctiveness. Rather than modelling variations in the distinctiveness attributed by individuals to
themselves, the aim here was to model variations in the distinctiveness attributed to multiple aspects of identity, which might or might not be drawn on in order to construct a sense of individual distinctiveness.

Another important change was in the comparison targets used. Participants in the interview study had commented that the intergroup target “other people in society” was too vague. This was replaced with the specific target “your parishioners”. In connection with this, only priests involved in parochial ministry participated in the questionnaire study.

This also reflected a shift in assumptions about the implicit comparative context. In designing the interviews, it was assumed that membership of the clergy was salient to participants--hence, “other members of the clergy” was understood as an intragroup and “other people in society” an intergroup comparison target. However, it became apparent that the parish, rather than the clergy, could also be constructed as a salient in-group. In this situation, “your parishioners” could also be an intragroup and “other members of the clergy” an intergroup comparison target.

‘Parishioners’ and ‘clergy’ were therefore understood as intersecting groups, the participant being at the point of intersection. The targets were not theorised in terms of a nested categorisation model, but as representing separate ‘parish’ and ‘clergy’ comparative contexts. Thus, the question of whether each target was “intragroup” or “intergroup” was not assumed to be inherent in the target itself, but would depend on the participant’s particular self-categorisation at the time of responding.

---

23 Hypotheses concerned with participants’ use of position, difference and separateness in constructing their identities are addressed in the following chapter.
The central hypothesis tested here (H1) was that position, difference and separateness would each contribute significantly, uniquely and substantially to predictions of the distinctiveness associated with items of identity content within both 'parish' and 'clergy' comparative contexts.

A complementary focus was on the adequacy of position, difference and separateness as a list of sources of distinctiveness. It was not assumed that these three sources necessarily constituted an exhaustive list of the components of distinctiveness, but it seemed reasonable to expect (a) that position, difference and separateness should between them account for a substantial proportion of the variance in distinctiveness within each context (H2), and (b) that models of distinctiveness should not be greatly enhanced by the addition of further predictors (H3).

An additional issue was the point of distinguishing between these sources of distinctiveness. It would not be parsimonious to make such a distinction if the three sources had identical implications for the distinctiveness principle. Analyses modelling relationships between distinctiveness, identity, affect and behaviour are described in the next chapter. However, initial tests are presented here of the different implications of position, difference and separateness for feelings of closeness to others.

Since closeness to others appeared to be an important goal for identity among this population (chap. 6, chap. 7 of this thesis), the relationship between sources of distinctiveness and feelings of closeness had a bearing on the theoretical proposition (P4), advanced at the end of chapter three, that sources of distinctiveness have different implications for the interaction of the distinctiveness principle with other motives in identity.

According to conceptual definitions of the sources developed at the end of chapter three, separateness is opposed to closeness by definition, involving feelings of 'distance from others'; position, on the other hand, is entirely
consistent with feelings of closeness to others, referring explicitly to one's 'place within social relationships'; difference, constructed in terms of perceived 'inner properties' rather than social relations, does not appear to be intrinsically related to closeness in either direction.

Thus it was expected (H4) that ratings of identity content items for separateness, but not position or difference, in relation to "parishioners" and "clergy", would be a significant negative predictor of associations of the items with feelings of closeness to these respective targets.

**Method**

A full account of the method has been given in chapter 4. Participants completed sections of a questionnaire, in which they freely generated items of identity content, then rated these items on a series of scales measuring associations of distinctiveness from parishioners and from other members of the clergy, various sources of distinctiveness (position, difference and separateness, as well as distinctiveness in 'abilities', 'beliefs', 'independence' and 'role' as potential further predictors) from the same two comparison targets and feelings of closeness to these targets.

**Results**

Models of the constitution of distinctiveness from multiple sources and of the relationship between sources of distinctiveness and closeness are described below. An alpha level of .01 was used for all tests of statistical significance. Within both comparative contexts, position, difference and separateness contributed uniquely, significantly and substantially to predictions of the distinctiveness associated with items of identity content. Different aspects of distinctiveness had different implications for the relationship between feelings of distinctiveness and closeness to others.
Contributions of sources to distinctiveness

Table 10.1 shows the zero order correlations between distinctiveness ratings, pooled across all rated identity items, for the two targets, “your parishioners” and “other members of the clergy”. Item ratings on all seven source dimensions were substantially correlated (.34 to .72) with the global ratings of distinctiveness from each target.

Table 10.1
Zero order correlations between ratings of identity items for distinctiveness from parishioners (above diagonal: listwise n = 1565 items) and from other members of the clergy (below diagonal: listwise n = 1536 items) in general and in terms of three hypothesised sources and four additional constructs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Position</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Difference</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Separateness</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Abilities</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Beliefs</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Independence</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Role</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the nested data structure, with identity items clustered within participants, traditional multiple regression would be inappropriate (cf. chap. 6). Therefore contributions of each source construct to the global ratings of distinctiveness from each target were evaluated using a series of multilevel regression models (Hox, 1995; Kreft & de Leeuw, 1998).

Where the multilevel regression analyses presented in chapter 6 were specifically concerned with modelling intra-individual effects, the aim here was to predict absolute ratings of distinctiveness across all items. In keeping with this aim, participant mean centring was not used for these analyses, and modelled variance was defined as “the proportional reduction in mean squared prediction error for predicting individual
values [i.e. individual item ratings]" (Snijders & Bosker, 1994, p. 342), rather than the mean squared error for predicting variance within participants, as in chapter six. Hence, $R^2$ was defined as

$$R^2 = \frac{(\sigma_0^2 + \tau_0^2) - (\sigma_1^2 + \tau_1^2)}{(\sigma_0^2 + \tau_0^2)}$$

where $\sigma_0^2$ and $\tau_0^2$ were respectively the level 1 and level 2 residual variance estimates for a baseline model with random intercept only, and $\sigma_1^2$ and $\tau_1^2$ were respectively the level 1 and level 2 residual variance estimates for the model being evaluated (Snijders & Bosker, 1994, p. 352).

In separate analyses for 'parish' and 'clergy' contexts, item ratings for distinctiveness were regressed on ratings for position, difference and separateness (model 1) and on ratings for all seven source dimensions (model 2) with respect to the same target. The MIXREG software package was used to perform 20 EM iterations followed by a Fisher-scoring solution with convergence criterion of .001 (Hedeker & Gibbons, 1996). Results of these analyses are presented in tables 10.2 and 10.3.

Model 1 was used to estimate the individual contributions of position, difference and separateness to distinctiveness ratings of the identity content items, with respect to each comparison target. For both targets, all three sources made significant ($z = 7.83$ to $18.13$, all $p < .001$) and substantial (parameter estimates: .21 to .42) unique contributions to predictions of the global distinctiveness ratings. For both targets, model 1 represented a very substantial improvement in fit compared to the respective baseline models (parishioners $\chi^2 = 1321.89$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$; clergy $\chi^2 = 1299.57$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$). As a further check on the individual significance of each predictor, model 1 was compared with a series of alternative models omitting each predictor. For both targets, the model with all three sources represented a substantial improvement in fit.
Table 10.2

Summary of multilevel regression models predicting ratings of distinctiveness from parishioners for identity content items (Level 1: n = 1565) nested within individuals (Level 2: n = 138), using random intercept and fixed slopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>$\chi^2 (1df)^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline model:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2 x log likelihood = 6463.98.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 ($r^2$)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 ($\sigma^2$)</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fixed parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>$\chi^2 (3df)^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>294.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>16.13***</td>
<td>294.73***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>7.83***</td>
<td>59.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>9.92***</td>
<td>95.35***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residual variance**

| Level 2 ($r^2$)   | .45      | .07 |        |                  |
| Level 1 ($\sigma^2$)| 1.37    | .05 |        |                  |

**Model 1:** -2 x log likelihood = 5142.09, model $\chi^2 (3df)^b = 1321.89***$.

**Fixed parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>$\chi^2 (3df)^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>246.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>16.60***</td>
<td>246.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>6.49***</td>
<td>41.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>8.59***</td>
<td>71.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abilities</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.07 ns</td>
<td>4.24 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.34 ns</td>
<td>0.12 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.69 ns</td>
<td>2.87 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-1.28 ns</td>
<td>1.60 ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residual variance**

| Level 2 ($r^2$)   | .45      | .07 |        |                  |
| Level 1 ($\sigma^2$)| 1.36    | .05 |        |                  |

**Model 2:** -2 x log likelihood = 5133.71, model $\chi^2 (7df)^c = 1330.27***$.

---

* Parameter $\chi^2$ values are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing models including and omitting the parameter.

* Model $\chi^2$ is derived from a likelihood ratio test comparing with the baseline model.

* Likelihood ratio test comparing models 1 and 2: $\chi^2 (4df) = 8.38$ ns.

***$p < .001$. 
Table 10.3

Summary of multilevel regression models predicting ratings of distinctiveness from other members of the clergy for identity content items (Level 1: \( n = 1536 \)) nested within individuals (Level 2: \( n = 136 \)), using random intercept and fixed slopes.

| Parameter | Estimate | SE | \( z \) | \( \chi^2 (1 df) \)
|-----------|----------|----|--------|----------------|
| **Baseline model: \(-2 \times \log \text{likelihood} = 6049.69.\)**<br>
| Fixed parameter | | | | |
| Intercept | 2.99 | .11 | | |
| Residual variance | | | | |
| Level 2 (\( \tau^2 \)) | 1.29 | .18 | | |
| Level 1 (\( \sigma^2 \)) | 2.54 | .10 | | |
| Model 1: \(-2 \times \log \text{likelihood} = 4750.12, \ model \chi^2 (3 df)^b = 1299.57^{**}.\)**
| Fixed parameters | | | | |
| Intercept | .52 | .09 | | |
| Position | .40 | .03 | | |
| Difference | .23 | .03 | | |
| Separateness | .33 | .03 | | |
| Residual variance | | | | |
| Level 2 (\( \tau^2 \)) | .63 | .09 | | |
| Level 1 (\( \sigma^2 \)) | 1.07 | .04 | | |
| Model 2: \(-2 \times \log \text{likelihood} = 4728.28, \ model \chi^2 (7 df)^c = 1321.41^{**}.\)**
| Fixed parameters | | | | |
| Intercept | .54 | .10 | | |
| Position | .40 | .03 | | |
| Difference | .22 | .03 | | |
| Separateness | .31 | .03 | | |
| Abilities | .07 | .03 | | |
| Beliefs | .00 | .03 | | |
| Independence | .05 | .03 | | |
| Role | -.09 | .02 | | |
| Residual variance | | | | |
| Level 2 (\( \tau^2 \)) | .63 | .09 | | |
| Level 1 (\( \sigma^2 \)) | 1.06 | .04 | | |

\( a \) Parameter \( \chi^2 \) values are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing models including and omitting the parameter.

\( b \) Model \( \chi^2 \) is derived from a likelihood ratio test comparing with the baseline model.

\( c \) Likelihood ratio test comparing models 1 and 2: \( \chi^2 (4 df) = 21.84^{**}.\)

\(***p < .001.\)
compared to models with any two of the three sources only ($\chi^2 = 59.93$ to 294.73, $df = 1$, all $p < .001$). Thus H1 was very clearly supported: position, difference and separateness each contributed significantly, uniquely and substantially to predictions of the distinctiveness associated with items of identity content within both 'parish' and 'clergy' comparative contexts.

Using the formula outlined above, values of $R^2$ were calculated for this model. Model 1 accounted for an estimated 58.2% of the total variance in item ratings for distinctiveness from parishioners, and an estimated 55.3% of the total variance in item ratings for distinctiveness from other members of the clergy. Supporting H2, position, difference and separateness between them accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in distinctiveness with respect to each target.

In order to evaluate H3, models were calculated with four additional predictors: ratings of distinctiveness from each target in terms of abilities, beliefs, independence and role (model 2). Within the 'parish' context, there was no significant improvement of fit from model 1 to model 2 ($\chi^2 = 8.38$, $df = 4$, $p > .01$), none of the additional parameters in model 2 was individually significant ($|z| = 0.34$ to 2.07, all $p > .01$), and $R^2$ for model 2 was estimated at 58.3%, an improvement of just 0.1% over model 1. In the 'clergy' context, there was some improvement in fit from model 1 to model 2 ($\chi^2 = 21.84$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$), and one of the additional parameters was individually significant (role: $z = -4.09$, $p < .001$). However, this result was not in a sensible direction. Furthermore, $R^2$ for model 2 was estimated at 55.9%, an improvement of just 0.6% over model 1. Although the additional dimensions had all been substantially associated with the global distinctiveness ratings for both comparison targets (table 10.1: $r = .36$ to .53), they did not meaningfully enhance predictions of these ratings in either context. This was interpreted as supporting H3: models were not substantially enhanced by the addition of further predictors.
Sources of distinctiveness and closeness to others

Table 10.4 shows the zero order correlations between item ratings for the three sources of distinctiveness and for closeness with respect to the two targets, “your parishioners” and “other members of the clergy”, pooled across all rated identity items. Correlations between distinctiveness and closeness ratings were small and varied in direction ($r = -.08$ to $.21$).

Table 10.4
Zero order correlations between ratings of identity items for sources of distinctiveness from and closeness to parishioners (above diagonal: listwise $n = 1616$ items) and other members of the clergy (below diagonal: listwise $n = 1610$ items).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Position</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Difference</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Separateness</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Closeness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the rationale of the preceding analyses, the MIXREG software package was used to compute multilevel regression models, in which ratings of the identity items for feelings of closeness to “your parishioners” and to “other members of the clergy” were regressed on ratings for position, difference and separateness from these respective targets.

Table 10.5 summarises the model predicting participants’ ratings of identity items for associated feelings of closeness to parishioners. Including the three sources of distinctiveness as predictors resulted in a significant improvement in fit compared to the baseline model ($\chi^2 = 94.81$, $df = 3$, $p < .001$). The model predicted an estimated 6.5% of variance in the closeness ratings. Within the model, position was positively associated with closeness and separateness was negatively associated with closeness (parameter estimates: .26 and -.16, respectively; both $p < .001$). Difference was not significantly related to closeness in either direction.
Table 10.5

Summary of multilevel regression models predicting feelings of closeness to parishioners associated with identity content items (Level 1: \( n = 1616 \)) nested within individuals (Level 2: \( n = 142 \)) using random intercept and fixed slopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>( \chi^2 (1df) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline model: (-2 \times \text{log likelihood} = 6269.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (( \tau^2 ))</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (( \sigma^2 ))</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of distinctiveness model: (-2 \times \text{log likelihood} = 6174.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>8.78***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.43 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-4.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 (( \tau^2 ))</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (( \sigma^2 ))</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Parameter \( \chi^2 \) values are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing models including and omitting the parameter.

*Model \( \chi^2 \) is derived from a likelihood ratio test comparing with the baseline model.

***\( p < .001 \).

Table 10.6 summarises the model predicting participants’ ratings of identity items for associated feelings of closeness to other members of the clergy. Including the three sources of distinctiveness as predictors resulted in a significant improvement in fit compared to the baseline model (\( \chi^2 = 25.34, df = 3, p < .001 \)), but the model predicted only an estimated 1.0% of variance in the closeness ratings. Within the model, separateness was negatively associated with closeness (parameter estimate: -.17; \( p < .001 \)), but neither position nor difference was significantly related to closeness.
Table 10.6

Summary of multilevel regression model predicting feelings of closeness to other members of the clergy associated with identity content items (Level 1: n = 1610) nested within individuals (Level 2: n = 142) using random intercept and fixed slopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ (1df)$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline model</strong></td>
<td>-2 x log likelihood = 6169.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 ($\tau^2$)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 ($\sigma^2$)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources of distinctiveness model</strong></td>
<td>-2 x log likelihood = 6144.37, model $\chi^2$ (3df)$^b$ = 25.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.09 ns</td>
<td>0.01 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.82 ns</td>
<td>3.29 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-4.46***</td>
<td>19.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 ($\tau^2$)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 ($\sigma^2$)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Parameter $\chi^2$ values are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing models including and omitting the parameter.

$^b$ Model $\chi^2$ is derived from a likelihood ratio test comparing with the baseline model.

***$p < .001$

These results were interpreted as providing qualified support for the pattern predicted by H4. As predicted, separateness was a significant negative predictor of closeness ratings within both multilevel regression models, and this negative relationship was not shared by either position or difference--indeed, ratings of distinctiveness from parishioners in terms of position showed a significant positive relationship with ratings of closeness to parishioners. However, these results should be treated with some caution as most effect sizes were quite small. Furthermore, in the 'parish' context, the negative association between separateness and
closeness was not present in the zero order correlations (table 10.4), but only appeared after controlling for effects of the other sources.

Discussion

The analyses reported here were designed to examine three main issues: (a) the availability of position, difference and separateness as sources of distinctiveness, (b) the adequacy of position, difference and separateness as a list of sources of distinctiveness and (c) the value of distinguishing between these three constructs as sources of distinctiveness.

Availability of these sources

In chapter three, it was proposed (P2) that distinctiveness may be achieved in multiple ways, using dimensions of position, difference and separateness, on both interpersonal and intergroup levels. The analyses showed very powerful support for the first part of this proposition. Position, difference and separateness each made significant, substantial and unique predictions of the distinctiveness ratings of identity items. This pattern was stable over both 'parish' and 'clergy' comparative contexts.

However, the second part of the proposition, that this should pertain to both interpersonal and intergroup levels, was not directly addressed in this study. While both comparison targets might have been construed on both interpersonal and intergroup levels, participants' construals of these targets were not measured. It can be suggested that the questions implicitly suggested an interpersonal level, since the object of comparison was the individual participant (e.g. "How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you from your parishioners?") and the rated content came from self-descriptions of "Who am I?". 
These results would be usefully complemented by a further study where participants were explicitly asked to rate group-description items for the extent to which they distinguished groups from other groups (e.g., 'the clergy from other professions', or 'your parish from other parishes').

Given the correlational nature of these data, it would also be valuable to examine the contributions of the sources to feelings of distinctiveness in an experimental paradigm, where the contextual availability of position, difference and separateness was systematically manipulated.

**Adequacy of these sources**

The second issue examined was the adequacy of position, difference and separateness as a list of sources of distinctiveness. For both 'parish' and 'clergy' comparative contexts, these three sources accounted for over 55% of variance in the global ratings of distinctiveness, and predictions were not enhanced by the addition of four further predictors, all of which had been individually correlated with the global distinctiveness ratings.

However, it seemed unlikely that all of the remaining variance (42-45%) which was not modelled could be attributed entirely to measurement error. Had this been the case, some improvement in predictions might have been expected from the additional constructs, which in the 'parish' context added just 0.1% to the predicted variance in distinctiveness.

The theoretical proposition that position, difference and separateness are separable sources of distinctiveness does not require that these constructs are necessarily the only sources of distinctiveness. It would be unwise and unnecessary to rule out the possibility of additional sources. Also, distinctiveness may be constructed by combining comparative contexts: for example, in the interview study, participants sometimes suggested that
they were distinguished from other members of the clergy by the nature of their relationship with their parishioners, implying the construction of 'clergy'-context distinctiveness from 'parish'-context position.

Nevertheless, position, difference and separateness accounted for a substantial proportion of the variance in distinctiveness across both 'parish' and 'clergy' contexts within these analyses. Furthermore these three constructs more or less entirely accounted for the variance in distinctiveness attributable to four other predictors—even the significant negative weight of 'role' in the 'clergy' analysis indicated that the three sources had entirely accounted for the positive relationship of 'role' with distinctiveness which had been observed in the zero order correlations.

**Distinguishing between the sources**

A third issue was the extent to which position, difference and separateness could be distinguished from each other empirically in terms of their implications for feelings of closeness to others. Models predicting closeness to 'parish' and 'clergy' targets successfully differentiated between the sources of distinctiveness: separateness was a significant negative predictor in both models, difference was not a significant predictor in either model, while position was unrelated to closeness in the 'clergy' context, but was a significant positive predictor in the 'parish' model.

However, several aspects of these analyses pointed to a need for caution. Firstly, effect sizes were rather small: the analyses modelled just 6.5% of the variance in ratings for closeness to parishioners and only 1.0% of the variance in ratings for closeness to other members of the clergy. Secondly, the predicted pattern of effects was not apparent from the zero order correlations—where closeness appeared to be a positive function of distinctiveness in the 'parish' context and a negative function of
distinctiveness in the 'clergy' context—but only emerged clearly from the multilevel regression analyses. Given the substantial intercorrelations between position, difference and separateness ratings in both contexts, it might be argued that the multilevel regression analyses offer a more accurate representation of the 'pure' relationships of the sources of distinctiveness with feelings of closeness to others, since effects of the other two sources are partialled out in each case. However, the argument could be strengthened by experimental work in which the availability of position, difference and separateness was manipulated independently.

*Position and closeness*

While accepting the reservations above, it is interesting to note that the most substantial finding from the models predicting feelings of closeness, was the *positive* contribution of position to closeness within the 'parish' context. This indicated that identity items which the priests associated with greater distinctiveness from their parishioners in terms of position were also associated with greater feelings of closeness to parishioners, a result which was also consistent with the zero order correlations.

This result provided post hoc support for an important aspect of the account of the distinctiveness principle developed in this thesis. Theorists of distinctiveness motivation (e.g., Brewer, 1991; Brewer & Gardner, 1996; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980) have often assumed, implicitly or explicitly, that needs for differentiation and assimilation are intrinsically opposed to each other within identity dynamics, in the sense that greater satisfaction of the one will necessarily be associated with greater frustration of the other (see Brewer, 1991, fig. 2). Contrary to that assumption, it has been argued here that the construction of distinctiveness in terms of position may offer a means of satisfying both differentiation and assimilation needs.
simultaneously, which may be especially important among relationally oriented populations, including the Anglican clergy.

Brewer's (1991) model is located on the group level of self-representation, with distinctiveness operationalised as group size. Thus the opposition between differentiation and assimilation motives is enshrined within her conceptualisation of distinctiveness: the larger the group, the more inclusion; the smaller the group, the more differentiation. On the other hand, within this study, identity was not restricted to group memberships and distinctiveness was not equated with group size. Here, within the 'parish' context, where distinctiveness was constructed in terms of position, the opposition between differentiation and assimilation motives was actually reversed: identity items providing greater differentiation (distinctiveness from parishioners in terms of position) were also providing greater assimilation (feelings of closeness to parishioners).

It should be acknowledged that this relationship did not generalise to the 'clergy' context. Even so, there was no evidence for an opposition between position and closeness within this context. The argument here is not that distinctiveness from a given target in terms of position will always be associated with closeness to that target, but rather that the opposition between differentiation and assimilation needs theorised by Brewer (1991), and used by Triandis (1995) to predict cross-cultural variation in the distinctiveness principle, is in fact neither intrinsic nor inevitable, but will depend on how distinctiveness is constructed within a given context.

**Consequences of the design**

A significant feature of the current study was its correlational design. As with the findings reported in chapter seven, this was both a strength and a weakness of the findings discussed here. It has already been noted
where findings might usefully be complemented by experimental work in which the contextual availability of position, difference and separateness was systematically manipulated. On the other hand, as with the findings of chapter seven, the design used here had the advantage of greater ecological validity compared to an experimental study.

The model comparisons in tables 10.2 and 10.3 would have been impossible to conduct within an experimental study. Manipulating distinctiveness in terms of position, difference, separateness, abilities, beliefs, independence and role might have demonstrated that all of these dimensions contribute to global feelings of distinctiveness, but could not have shown, as was demonstrated here, that the contributions of the last four constructs were subsumed within those of the first three.

As with the findings of chapter seven, a further strength was the inclusive treatment of identity. An adapted version of the Twenty Statements Test (after Kuhn & McPartland, 1954) was used in order to minimise the constraint on identity content imposed by the researchers. This was especially important here, given the possibility that other theories of distinctiveness motivation may be specific to particular parts of identity, such as undifferentiated categories (cf. Yuki & Brewer, 1999).

Questions of generality

Within this thesis, position, difference and separateness have been understood to be available as sources of distinctiveness in both individualistic and relationally oriented cultural environments. Thus the contributions of position, difference and separateness to distinctiveness evaluated in this chapter should be expected on theoretical grounds to generalise to other populations and other comparative contexts.
On the other hand, the implications of position, difference and separateness for feelings of closeness to others did not generalise across contexts even within this study, although they remained broadly in keeping with the conceptualisation of these constructs. The strong conclusion from these findings was rather that the opposition between differentiation and assimilation assumed elsewhere (e.g., Brewer, 1991) does not generalise to all sources of distinctiveness and all contexts.

Given that the account of sources of distinctiveness has been developed with the intention that it should generalise across cultures where other theories of distinctiveness have not, it is important that the findings of this initial study, conducted among Anglican parish priests, should be replicated over a range of populations from individualistic and relationally oriented cultures, and using a range of different comparative contexts.

**Conclusion**

The analyses presented here have shown that position, difference and separateness all contributed to distinctiveness among this population. The next chapter examines some of the implications of these sources of distinctiveness for identity, subjective well-being and behaviour.
Analyses reported in the previous chapter showed that position, difference and separateness were available sources of distinctiveness in both ‘parish’ and ‘clergy’ contexts. In this chapter, I report further analyses of data from the questionnaire study, examining expected consequences of the distinctiveness principle among this population. Models are tested predicting the perceived centrality of elements of identity, participants’ levels of subjective well-being and their reported frequency of wearing a clerical collar, an aspect of behaviour related to distinctiveness.

Distinctiveness and the Anglican Clergy

According to previous accounts of distinctiveness motivation, the Anglican clergy might be seen as an unlikely group of people among whom to attempt to observe consequences of a motive for distinctiveness.

Many participants in the interview study described suffering from their excessive distinctiveness within the popular image of the clergy, and associated distinctiveness with negative consequences for relationships with others (chap. 8). Thus, according to optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991), the need for distinctiveness should be maximally satisfied and the need for inclusion maximally aroused among these people.
Moreover, interview participants' beliefs about personhood conveyed a strong sense of relational orientation, while participants in the questionnaire study were strongly characterised by interdependent rather than independent self-construals (chap. 7). According to Triandis (1995), this should further reduce the pressure towards distinctiveness and increase the pressure towards inclusion among these respondents.

Thus, following Brewer (1991) and Triandis (1995), it might be expected that pressures towards distinctiveness within identity would not be apparent among these people and that greater feelings of distinctiveness would be associated with more negative rather than positive affect.

However, the account of the distinctiveness principle developed for this thesis leads to a rather different reading of the situation. Following this account, the availability of distinctiveness in a given context does not entail satisfaction of the distinctiveness principle unless this information is actually used to construct a sense of distinctiveness within identity.

Constructing a sense of distinctiveness in terms of the popular perception that members of the clergy were “superhuman” or had “stepped in off another planet” would be inconsistent with relationally oriented beliefs and values, and would be detrimental to the actual relationships on which both their subjective well-being and their efficacy in ministry depended. Hence it was not at all clear that the distinctiveness principle would be satisfied by the excessive distinctiveness of popular images of the clergy.

Thus it was expected that members of the clergy would be motivated to avoid those forms of distinctiveness which were threatening to other principles and goals, but that they would be motivated to construct a sense of distinctiveness using sources which did not conflict with their relationally oriented beliefs and values or their goals in ministry.
In chapter 3, I suggested that difference and separateness were more compatible with independent self-construals and individualistic beliefs and values, whereas position was more compatible with the interdependent self-construals and relationally oriented beliefs and values which were characteristic of members of the Anglican clergy.

Hence, it was predicted (H1) that participants' constructions of identity would emphasise position rather than difference or separateness as sources of distinctiveness from both 'parish' and 'clergy' targets, and (H2) that, within both 'parish' and 'clergy' contexts, feelings of distinctiveness in terms of position would have positive implications for participants' subjective well-being, whereas feelings of difference or separateness would be irrelevant or have negative implications for subjective well-being.

The Clerical Collar

An important aspect of the understanding of identity within this thesis is that identity is not constructed solely within the individual through processes of cognition but is also 'enacted' within social settings involving communication processes (Marková, 1987; Reicher, 1999).

Within the interview study, participants often described constructing their distinctiveness within social settings through their strategic use of clothing, especially the clerical collar. The collar was described as a deliberate strategy for increasing distinctiveness from parishioners and reducing distinctiveness from other members of the clergy (chap. 8). Thus it seemed likely that the use of this deliberate means of constructing distinctiveness within social settings would also be related to how distinctiveness was constructed within the subjective sense of identity.
As mentioned by a number of interview participants, the clerical collar has been conventionally associated with categories of churchmanship, being worn more by ‘catholics’ and less by ‘evangelicals’. In addition to verifying this association empirically, it was hypothesised (H3) that the collar would be worn more by those who emphasised distinctiveness from their parishioners and less by those who emphasised distinctiveness from other members of the clergy in constructing their subjective identities.

**Added Predictive Value of the ‘Sources’**

In chapter 10, an important issue was the point of distinguishing between position, difference and separateness as sources of distinctiveness. It was shown that these sources had differing implications for the relationship between feelings of distinctiveness and closeness to others. However, a stronger test of the empirical value of the distinction between sources of distinctiveness would be to examine the extent to which separating position, difference and separateness rather than using a global measure of distinctiveness led to improved predictions of relevant outcomes.

Thus it was hypothesised (H4) that including measures of position, difference and separateness would significantly enhance the predictive value of models addressing the outcomes described above, compared to models including global measures of distinctiveness only as predictors.

**Operationalisation**

The analyses reported here examined three hypothesised consequences of the distinctiveness principle, (a) pressures towards distinctiveness within identity, (b) the effect of satisfaction or frustration of the distinctiveness principle on feelings of subjective well-being and (c) the relationship between distinctiveness construction and related behaviour.
The first consequence was examined in a direct analogue of the models of identity motivation tested in chapter 6. It was understood that pressures within identity towards particular forms of distinctiveness could be modelled statistically in terms of the within-participant relationships between ratings of identity content items for these forms of distinctiveness and the perceived centrality of these items within identity.

Examination of the second consequence involved a development of the methodology described in chapter 9 for looking at the relationship between distinctiveness and measures of satisfaction. The measures of life satisfaction and work satisfaction used in the interviews were problematic in terms of both statistical reliability and construct validity within this population. An alternative approach was to look at subjective well-being in affective rather than cognitive terms. Here, subjective well-being was assessed using the Positive And Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988). This instrument has alternative wordings to reflect time periods from “at the present moment” to “during the past year”, with an additional option of “how you generally feel”, which was used here. For the “general” wording, the authors report internal reliabilities of .88 and .87 for the positive and negative items respectively, and test-retest reliabilities of .68 and .71 over 8 weeks.

Examination of the third consequence involved drawing together several sources of data. The analyses involved predicting self-reports of the frequency of wearing a clerical collar using the dimension of evangelical-catholic churchmanship from the PRINCALS analysis in chapter 7, as well as Fisher's $z'$ scores showing intra-individual relationships across identity elements between ratings of distinctiveness and perceived centrality, which were derived here in the course of examining the first consequence.
Chapter 11: Consequences of the Distinctiveness Principle

Method

For a full description of the method, see chapter 4. Those parts which are directly relevant to these analyses are briefly summarised here.

Questionnaire respondents generated items of identity content and rated themselves and their identity content items for distinctiveness and sources of distinctiveness from 'parish' and 'clergy' targets.

Respondents then indicated their 'churchmanship' by selecting from a list of categories, responded to the PANAS affect measure (Watson et al., 1988), and finally rated their frequency of wearing a clerical collar.

Results

Hypotheses H1 to H4 were evaluated in a series of statistical models predicting the perceived centrality of items of identity content, participants' levels of positive and negative affect and their self-reports of the frequency of wearing a clerical collar. H1 and H2 were supported for the 'parish' but not the 'clergy' context, H3 was fully supported and H4 was supported for most but not all of the model comparisons.

Pressures towards distinctiveness within identity

Following the model of the analyses presented in chapter 6, the extent of pressures towards different forms of distinctiveness within identity was evaluated using two stages of analysis, a preliminary stage involving the calculation of within-subject correlations between the distinctiveness and centrality ratings of items of identity content, and a main stage involving the evaluation and comparison of a series of multilevel regression models using the MIXREG software package (Hedeker & Gibbons, 1996).
Preliminary analysis

Correlations were calculated within each individual between the measure of perceived centrality (as reported in chap. 6) and ratings of the identity content items for distinctiveness of each form. The raw correlations were subjected to Fisher's $r$ to $z'$ transformation, and the derived variables were interpreted as measuring the strength of pressures towards each form of distinctiveness within the identity of each individual.

One-sample t tests were used to test null hypotheses stating that item ratings for each form of distinctiveness were unrelated to perceived centrality. The null hypotheses predicted that each of the derived variables would be distributed around a mean of zero. Results of these tests appeared consistent with a general pressure towards distinctiveness within the 'parish' but not the 'clergy' context (table 11.1).

Table 11.1
T-tests of mean $z'$ scores showing intra-individual relationships between ratings of identity items for sources of distinctiveness from parishioners and from other members of the clergy and ratings of perceived centrality of these items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derived Variable</th>
<th>Mean $z'$ (r)*</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$t^b$ (df = 136)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$z'$ distinctiveness/parish</td>
<td>.100 (.099)</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>3.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z'$ position/parish</td>
<td>.164 (.163)</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>3.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z'$ difference/parish</td>
<td>.150 (.149)</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>3.91***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z'$ separateness/parish</td>
<td>.081 (.081)</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>2.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z'$ distinctiveness/clergy</td>
<td>.005 (.005)</td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.15 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z'$ position/clergy</td>
<td>.029 (.029)</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.73 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z'$ difference/clergy</td>
<td>.078 (.078)</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1.88 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z'$ separateness/clergy</td>
<td>.050 (.050)</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>1.28 ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Listwise $n = 137$ participants.

* Figures in brackets after the mean $z'$ scores are the corresponding values of Pearson’s $r$. These had no function in the analyses, but are included here as an aid to interpretation.

b This is the $t$ value for the difference of each mean $z'$ score from a null value of zero.

$p < .05. ** p < .01. *** p < .001.$
**Multilevel regression analyses**

The main part of the analysis involved computing two parallel sets of multilevel regression models in which perceived centrality was predicted using the distinctiveness ratings for the 'parish' and 'clergy' contexts respectively. As with the analyses reported in chapter 6, all predictors were centred within participants, since it would be meaningless within the current theoretical framework to aim to model individual differences in 'perceived centrality'. Zero order correlations between perceived centrality and the various distinctiveness ratings are summarised in table 11.2.

**Table 11.2**

Zero order correlations between ratings of identity items for perceived centrality within subjective identity structure and for associations with distinctiveness and with sources of distinctiveness in parish and clergy contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centrality and 'parish' context distinctiveness (listwise n = 1617 items)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Centrality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Position</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Difference</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Separateness</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centrality and 'clergy' context distinctiveness (listwise n = 1585 items)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Centrality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Position</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Difference</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Separateness</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Values below the diagonals use raw ratings of the association of items with the sources of distinctiveness, values above diagonal use participant mean centred ratings. Scores for perceived centrality were not centred.
In parallel modelling sessions using the ratings of distinctiveness from 'parish' and 'clergy' targets, models were calculated predicting the perceived centrality of identity content items according to ratings of the distinctiveness associated with the items (model 1), ratings of the distinctiveness in terms of position, difference and separateness associated within the items (model 2) and all of these ratings together (model 3).

Results of the modelling sessions for the 'parish' and 'clergy' targets are presented respectively in tables 11.3 and 11.4.

Compared to the baseline model, model 1 represented a significant improvement of fit for the 'parish' context ($\chi^2 = 15.17, df = 1, p < .001$) and a marginally significant improvement of fit for the 'clergy' context ($\chi^2 = 4.24, df = 1, p < .05$). Using the formula from chapter 6, $R^2_w$ was calculated at 1.1% for the 'parish' context and 0.3% for the 'clergy' context.

Model 2 represented a significant improvement of fit over the baseline model for both 'parish' and 'clergy' contexts ($\chi^2 = 54.31$ and 20.92 respectively, $df = 3$, both $p < .001$). $R^2_w$ was calculated at 3.7% for the 'parish' context and 1.4% for the 'clergy' context.

Within model 2, parameter estimates for the 'parish' model were consistent with H1: distinctiveness in terms of position was the best predictor of perceived centrality of the identity elements, while there was also a marginally significant contribution from difference. Parameter estimates for the 'clergy' model did not support H1: the only significant contribution to perceived centrality was that of difference.
Table 11.3

Summary of multilevel regression models predicting perceived centrality of identity content items (Level 1: \( n = 1617 \)) nested within individuals (Level 2: \( n = 143 \)) by ratings of distinctiveness from parishioners using random intercept and fixed slopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( z )</th>
<th>( \chi^2 (1df)^{a} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline model: -2 x log likelihood = 5582.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1: -2 x log likelihood = 5567.25, model ( \chi^2 (1df)^{b} = 15.17^{</strong>*} )**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3.91***</td>
<td>15.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2: -2 x log likelihood = 5528.10, model ( \chi^2 (3df)^{b} = 54.31^{</strong>*} )**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.28***</td>
<td>18.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.99*</td>
<td>3.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.03 ns</td>
<td>1.05 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3: -2 x log likelihood = 5524.91, model ( \chi^2 (4df)^{b,c} = 57.50^{</strong>*} )**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.79 ns</td>
<td>3.19 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.65***</td>
<td>21.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.35*</td>
<td>5.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.58 ns</td>
<td>.34 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.3 (continued).

- Parameter $\chi^2$ values are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing models including and omitting the parameter.
- Model $\chi^2$ is derived from a likelihood ratio test comparing with the baseline model.
- Likelihood ratio test comparing models 1 and 3: $\chi^2 (3df) = 42.34^{***}$. Likelihood ratio test comparing models 2 and 3: $\chi^2 (1df) = 3.19 \text{ ns.}$

For both ‘parish’ and ‘clergy’ contexts, model 3 represented a significant improvement of fit over the baseline model ($\chi^2 = 57.50$ and 23.35 respectively, $df = 4$, both $p < .001$). $R^2_w$ was calculated at 3.9% for the ‘parish’ context and 1.6% for the ‘clergy’ context.

Supporting H4, the inclusion of position, difference and separateness in the model resulted in a significant improvement of fit in both contexts, compared to models using just the general distinctiveness ratings (comparing models 1 and 3, $\chi^2 = 42.34$ and 19.11 respectively for the ‘parish’ and ‘clergy’ contexts, $df = 3$, both $p < .001$).

Furthermore, position, difference and separateness fully accounted for the variance in perceived centrality which had been explained by the general distinctiveness ratings in model 1. The general ratings were no longer significant predictors of centrality in model 3, and model 3 was not a significant improvement over model 2 in either context ($\chi^2 = 3.19$ and 2.43 respectively for the ‘parish’ and ‘clergy’ contexts, $df = 1$, both $p > .05$).
Table 11.4

Summary of multilevel regression models predicting perceived centrality of identity content items (Level 1: n = 1585) nested within individuals (Level 2: n = 140) by ratings of distinctiveness from other members of the clergy using random intercept and fixed slopes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>( \chi^2 (1df) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline model:</strong> -2 x log likelihood = 5461.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1:</strong> -2 x log likelihood = 5457.02, model ( \chi^2 (1df) = 4.24^* )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2:</strong> -2 x log likelihood = 5440.34, model ( \chi^2 (3df) = 20.92^{***} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3:</strong> -2 x log likelihood = 5437.91, model ( \chi^2 (4df) = 23.35^{***} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fixed effect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-1.56 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.05 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.42 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residual variance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.4 (continued).

* Parameter $\chi^2$ values are derived from likelihood ratio tests comparing models including and omitting the parameter.

+ Model $\chi^2$ is derived from a likelihood ratio test comparing with the baseline model.

- Likelihood ratio test comparing models 1 and 3: $\chi^2 (3df) = 19.11^{***}$. Likelihood ratio test comparing models 2 and 3: $\chi^2 (1df) = 2.43_{ns}$.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

**Distinctiveness and affect**

Principal Components Analysis of the PANAS scale replicated the two-factor structure reported by the authors. Separate measures of positive and negative affect were calculated with internal reliabilities of .778 and .850 respectively. Table 11.5 reports the zero order correlations between these measures and participants' self-reports of their distinctiveness.

### Table 11.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect and 'parish' context distinctiveness (listwise $n = 142$ participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect and 'clergy' context distinctiveness (listwise $n = 143$ participants)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Affect</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multiple regression models were calculated predicting positive and negative affect according to participants' self-ratings for distinctiveness and sources of distinctiveness from 'parish' and 'clergy' targets. Reflecting the previous analyses, model 1 used just the self-rating for distinctiveness as a predictor, model 2 used self-ratings for distinctiveness in terms of position, difference and separateness, and model 3 combined the general rating of distinctiveness with the specific ratings for each source.

Results of the modelling sessions for the 'parish' and 'clergy' targets are presented respectively in tables 11.6 and 11.7.

Within the 'parish' context, the self-rating for distinctiveness in general was not significantly associated with either positive or negative affect (table 11.6, model 1). However, this might have been attributable to the combination of differential effects of position, difference and separateness: supporting H2, greater distinctiveness from parishioners in terms of position was associated with more positive and less negative affect, while difference was unrelated to affect and separateness was associated with less positive and marginally more negative affect. These ratings accounted for an estimated 9.2% of the population variance in positive affect and an estimated 9.5% of the variance in negative affect (table 11.6, model 2).

Model 3, including both the general distinctiveness rating and the specific ratings for position, difference and separateness, represented a significant improvement over model 1, but not over model 2. Supporting H4, the distinction between these three sources of distinctiveness enhanced predictions of affect, compared to a model in which they were not distinguished, and there was no contribution of the general distinctiveness rating to affect for which these three sources did not account.
### Table 11.6

*Summary of multiple regression models predicting positive and negative affect among Anglican parish priests (n = 142) using self-ratings of distinctiveness from parishioners in general and in terms of position, difference and separateness.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Positive affect</th>
<th>Negative affect</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>1.36 ns</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 = 1.3% )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( R^2 = 0.5% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjusted ( R^2 = 0.6% )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjusted ( R^2 = 0.0% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F (1, 140) = 1.85 ) ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( F (1, 140) = .75 ) ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>3.52***</td>
<td>-.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>1.62 ns</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.256</td>
<td>-2.79**</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 = 11.2% )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( R^2 = 11.4% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjusted ( R^2 = 9.2% )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjusted ( R^2 = 9.5% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F (3, 138) = 5.79*** )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( F (3, 138) = 5.91*** )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Model 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.182 ns</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>3.28***</td>
<td>-.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>1.52 ns</td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.255</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 = 11.2%^a )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( R^2 = 12.7%^b )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjusted ( R^2 = 8.6% )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adjusted ( R^2 = 10.1% )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( F (4, 137) = 4.32** )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( F (4, 137) = 4.97*** )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

^a Comparing models 1 and 3: \( R^2 \) change = 9.9\%, \( F \) change (3, 137) = 5.09**. Comparing models 2 and 3: \( R^2 \) change = 0.0\%, \( F \) change (1, 137) = .03 ns.

^b Comparing models 1 and 3: \( R^2 \) change = 12.1\%, \( F \) change (3, 137) = 6.35***. Comparing models 2 and 3: \( R^2 \) change = 1.3\%, \( F \) change (1, 137) = 2.02 ns.

*p < .05. **p < .01. ***p < .001.
Table 11.7

Summary of multiple regression models predicting positive and negative affect among Anglican parish priests (n = 143) using self-ratings of distinctiveness from other members of the clergy in general and in terms of position, difference and separateness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Positive affect</th>
<th>Negative affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>1.08 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.8%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjusted $R^2 = 0.1%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F (1, 141) = 1.17 ns$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1.56 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.10 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.35 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = 3.1%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjusted $R^2 = 1.0%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F (3, 139) = 1.47 ns$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctiveness</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.00 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>1.34 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>1.09 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separateness</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.35 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = 3.1%^a$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjusted $R^2 = 0.3%$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$F (4, 138) = 1.09 ns$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Comparing models 1 and 3: $R^2$ change = 2.2%, $F$ change (3, 138) = 1.06 ns. Comparing models 2 and 3: $R^2$ change = 0.0%, $F$ change (1, 138) = .00 ns.

^b Comparing models 1 and 3: $R^2$ change = 5.7%, $F$ change (3, 138) = 2.82*. Comparing models 2 and 3: $R^2$ change = 1.3%, $F$ change (1, 138) = 1.90 ns.

*p < .05.
Within the 'clergy' context (table 11.7), none of the models provided significant predictions of either positive or negative affect. A single point of interest was a marginally significant contribution of the self-rating for difference from other members of the clergy to feelings of negative affect, although a parallel finding within the interview study had been attributed to demographic differences, rather than the distinctiveness itself (chap. 9).

The clerical collar

Table 11.8 summarises the zero order correlations between the self-report measure of clerical collar wearing, the dimension of evangelical-catholic churchmanship derived in chapter 7 and the Fisher's $z'$ scores which were derived earlier in this chapter and used in table 11.1.

Table 11.8

Zero order correlations between self-reports of frequency of wearing a clerical collar, the dimension of low-high churchmanship, and indices of the strength of different components of the distinctiveness principle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Clerical collar wearing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Catholic (vs. evangelical)</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 $z'$ distinctiveness/parish</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 $z'$ position/parish</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 $z'$ difference/parish</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 $z'$ separateness/parish</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 $z'$ distinctiveness/clergy</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 $z'$ position/clergy</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 $z'$ difference/clergy</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 $z'$ separateness/clergy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Listwise n = 136 participants.

As expected, participants towards the catholic pole of the churchmanship dimension reported wearing the clerical collar more frequently than did participants towards the evangelical pole ($r = .40, n = 136, p < .001$).
Additionally, the Fisher's $z'$ scores showed a consistent pattern of correlations with clerical collar wearing. Pressures within identity towards distinctiveness from parishioners were associated with more use of the collar, whereas pressures towards distinctiveness from other members of the clergy were associated with less use of the collar.

In order to establish whether the $z'$ scores were contributing to predictions of reported clerical collar wearing independently of the known factor of churchmanship, a series of multiple regression models was calculated using different combinations of these variables to predict reported use of the clerical collar. Results are summarised in table 11.9.

Model 1 confirmed the significance of the evangelical-catholic dimension of churchmanship, which accounted for an estimated 15.4% of the population variance in reported use of the clerical collar ($\beta = .400, p < .001$).

In model 2, the $z'$ scores measuring pressures towards distinctiveness in general from each target were added, resulting in a slightly improved prediction of an estimated 18.9% of the variance in reported clerical collar use. This improvement was marginally significant ($F = 3.92, df = 2, 132, p < .05$) as were both new predictors ($\beta = .201$ & -.214, both $p < .05$).

In model 3, the $z'$ scores measuring pressures towards distinctiveness from each target in terms of each source were substituted for the general scores. The model accounted for an estimated 26.4% of the variance in reported clerical collar use, a substantial and significant improvement over model 1 ($F = 4.36, df = 6, 128, p < .001$). Significant predictors within this model, in addition to the churchmanship dimension, were the scores measuring pressures towards separateness from parishioners ($\beta = .365, p < .01$) and separateness from other members of the clergy ($\beta = -.317, p < .05$).
Table 11.9

Summary of multiple regression models predicting self-reports of the frequency of wearing a clerical collar according to low-high churchmanship, and indices of the strength of different components of the distinctiveness principle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1: $R^2 = 16.0%$, adjusted $R^2 = 15.4%$, $F (1, 134) = 25.50^{***}$</th>
<th>Model 2: $R^2 = 20.7%^{a}$, adjusted $R^2 = 18.9%$, $F (3, 132) = 11.48^{***}$</th>
<th>Model 3: $R^2 = 30.2%^{b}$, adjusted $R^2 = 26.4%$, $F (7, 128) = 7.93^{***}$</th>
<th>Model 4: $R^2 = 30.6%^{c}$, adjusted $R^2 = 25.7%$, $F (9, 126) = 6.19^{***}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic (vs. evangelical)</td>
<td>.315 .062 .400^{***}</td>
<td>.292 .062 .372^{***}</td>
<td>.261 .060 .331^{***}</td>
<td>.261 .060 .331^{***}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' distinctiveness/parish</td>
<td>.418 .180 .201*</td>
<td>.418 .180 .201*</td>
<td>.418 .180 .201*</td>
<td>.418 .180 .201*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' distinctive/parish</td>
<td>-.423 .173 -.214*</td>
<td>-.423 .173 -.214*</td>
<td>-.423 .173 -.214*</td>
<td>-.423 .173 -.214*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' position/parish</td>
<td>.027 .172 -.018 ns</td>
<td>.027 .172 -.018 ns</td>
<td>.027 .172 -.018 ns</td>
<td>.027 .172 -.018 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' difference/parish</td>
<td>.183 .212 .104 ns</td>
<td>.183 .212 .104 ns</td>
<td>.183 .212 .104 ns</td>
<td>.183 .212 .104 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' separateness/parish</td>
<td>.638 .208 .365**</td>
<td>.638 .208 .365**</td>
<td>.638 .208 .365**</td>
<td>.638 .208 .365**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' position/clergy</td>
<td>.063 .194 .037 ns</td>
<td>.063 .194 .037 ns</td>
<td>.063 .194 .037 ns</td>
<td>.063 .194 .037 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' difference/clergy</td>
<td>-.218 .224 -.135 ns</td>
<td>-.218 .224 -.135 ns</td>
<td>-.218 .224 -.135 ns</td>
<td>-.218 .224 -.135 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' separateness/clergy</td>
<td>-.547 .223 -.317*</td>
<td>-.547 .223 -.317*</td>
<td>-.547 .223 -.317*</td>
<td>-.547 .223 -.317*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' distinctive/parish</td>
<td>-.181 .242 -.087 ns</td>
<td>-.181 .242 -.087 ns</td>
<td>-.181 .242 -.087 ns</td>
<td>-.181 .242 -.087 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' position/parish</td>
<td>.007 .262 .005 ns</td>
<td>.007 .262 .005 ns</td>
<td>.007 .262 .005 ns</td>
<td>.007 .262 .005 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' difference/parish</td>
<td>.225 .178 .128 ns</td>
<td>.225 .178 .128 ns</td>
<td>.225 .178 .128 ns</td>
<td>.225 .178 .128 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' separateness/parish</td>
<td>.695 .221 .398**</td>
<td>.695 .221 .398**</td>
<td>.695 .221 .398**</td>
<td>.695 .221 .398**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' distinctive/parish</td>
<td>-.072 .225 -.036 ns</td>
<td>-.072 .225 -.036 ns</td>
<td>-.072 .225 -.036 ns</td>
<td>-.072 .225 -.036 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' difference/clergy</td>
<td>-.206 .233 -.127 ns</td>
<td>-.206 .233 -.127 ns</td>
<td>-.206 .233 -.127 ns</td>
<td>-.206 .233 -.127 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z' separateness/clergy</td>
<td>-.536 .241 -.310*</td>
<td>-.536 .241 -.310*</td>
<td>-.536 .241 -.310*</td>
<td>-.536 .241 -.310*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Listwise n = 136 participants.

* Comparing models 1 and 2, $R^2$ change = 4.7%, $F$ change (2, 132) = 3.92*.

* Comparing models 1 and 3, $R^2$ change = 14.3%, $F$ change (6, 128) = 4.36***.

* Comparing models 2 and 4, $R^2$ change = 10.0%, $F$ change (6, 126) = 3.01**; comparing models 3 and 4, $R^2$ change = 0.4%, $F$ change (2, 126) = .36 ns.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. 
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Model 4, in which all predictors were entered together, represented a significant improvement over model 2 ($F = 3.01, df = 6, 126, p < .01$), indicating that the distinction between pressures towards position, difference and separateness enhanced predictions of clerical collar use, but no improvement over model 3 ($F = .36, df = 2, 126, p > .05$), indicating that the variables measuring pressures towards position, difference and separateness fully accounted for the contribution to predictions of the variables measuring pressures towards distinctiveness in general.

In summary, the results for predictions of reported use of the clerical collar supported H3 and provided further support for H4.

Summary and Discussion

Pressures towards distinctiveness in identity

The first hypothesis was that participants' constructions of identity would emphasise position rather than difference or separateness as sources of distinctiveness from both 'parish' and 'clergy' targets.

Results for the 'parish' context conformed to this pattern (table 11.3, model 2). Distinctiveness in terms of position was the best predictor of perceived centrality of the identity elements, although distinctiveness in terms of difference also made a marginally significant contribution. The sources of distinctiveness accounted for just 3.7% of within-participants variance in perceived centrality within this model. However, parishioners are just one of many available comparison targets and the distinctiveness principle is just one of several motives which may shape identity, so large effect sizes would not necessarily be expected from this model.
Results for the 'clergy' context did not support H1 (table 11.4, model 2). Distinctiveness in terms of position did not predict perceived centrality of the identity elements, but distinctiveness in terms of difference did. However, even this result was somewhat insecure. Firstly, no relationship between ratings of distinctiveness from other members of the clergy and perceived centrality of identity items was detected in the preliminary analysis (table 11.1). Secondly, sources of distinctiveness within the 'clergy' context accounted for just 1.4% of within-participants variance in perceived centrality, considerably less than for the 'parish' context.

It should be noted that these results were consistent with findings from the quantitative analyses of the interview study (chap. 9), in which 'important' identity items were given higher ratings of 'inter-group distinctiveness' (distinctiveness of the clergy from other people in society) than did 'non-important' items, but no parallel effect was found for 'intra-group distinctiveness' (from other members of the clergy). It seemed that members of the Anglican clergy had little or no inclination to construct their identities by distinguishing themselves from each other.

**Distinctiveness and affect**

The second hypothesis was that, within both 'parish' and 'clergy' contexts, feelings of distinctiveness in terms of position would have positive implications for affect, whereas feelings of difference or separateness would be irrelevant or have negative implications for affect.

Consistent with results in the previous section, the expected pattern was found for the 'parish' but not for the 'clergy' context. Within the 'parish' context, greater distinctiveness in terms of position was associated with more positive and less negative affect, distinctiveness in terms of difference was unrelated to affect and greater distinctiveness in terms of
separateness was associated with less positive and marginally more negative affect. Within the 'clergy' context, none of the models tested produced significant predictions of either positive or negative affect. This provided further evidence that distinctiveness from 'other members of the clergy' was generally unimportant to these people.

The clerical collar

The zero order correlations presented in table 11.8 showed a consistent pattern across all sources of distinctiveness, with pressures towards any form of distinctiveness from parishioners associated with more reported use of the collar and pressures towards any form of distinctiveness from clergy associated with less reported use of the collar. However, pressures towards separateness were the strongest predictors in multiple regression. Distinguishing between sources of distinctiveness improved predictions from an estimated 18.9% to 26.4% of the population variance.

An important conclusion from the multiple regression analyses was that the construction of identity in terms of 'parish' or 'clergy' distinctiveness predicted this form of behaviour independently of the 'known' predictor of evangelical-catholic churchmanship, almost doubling the estimated variance accounted for by churchmanship alone. Apart from providing a statistical aside to the comments made about distinctiveness and the clerical collar within the interview study, this result has an important place within the questionnaire study. Although the questionnaire study focused mainly on intra-individual processes of self-representation, this analysis demonstrates the relevance of these processes to the prediction of a form of communicative behaviour which has considerable social consequences for the actor and for those with whom s/he interacts.
Distinguishing between sources of distinctiveness

These analyses reinforce the conclusions of the previous chapter about the point of distinguishing between position, difference and separateness as sources of distinctiveness. In the 'parish' context, where distinctiveness was relevant to both identity and affect, position, difference and separateness had different implications for these outcomes, confirming H1 and H2. Furthermore, distinguishing between them enhanced predictions compared to models using the general distinctiveness ratings only.

This was most apparent where the self-ratings for distinctiveness from parishioners were used to predict positive and negative affect (table 11.6). Using the general rating only (model 1), perceived levels of distinctiveness appeared to be unrelated to either positive or negative affect, implying that there was no motivational pressure towards distinctiveness. However, this might have been attributable to the subtraction of opposing effects of distinctiveness in terms of position and separateness: when the sources were entered as separate predictors, 'positional' distinctiveness was clearly positive whereas separateness was negative for affect.

The importance of context

These results also highlight the importance of paying serious attention to context in theorising expected consequences of identity dynamics. Hypotheses H1 and H2 were well supported where distinctiveness was constructed within a 'parish' context, but the same hypotheses appeared simply to be irrelevant within a 'clergy' context, with distinctiveness hardly related at all to either subjective identity structure or affect.

A possible explanation is that the context of 'other members of the clergy' was not particularly relevant to these people. If identity is understood to
be constructed through social interaction as well as cognitive processes (Marková, 1987; Reicher, 1999), then it is not surprising that the 'parish' context, within which the parish priest interacts a great deal, should be considerably more relevant to identity than the 'clergy' context, within which a great many parish priests interact comparatively seldom.

This interpretation is consistent with the interview data. As discussed in chapter 8, distinctiveness from other members of the clergy, although described on the whole quite fluently, was constructed mainly in terms relevant to the participants' roles within the parish context, rather than their relationships with other members of the clergy.

The importance of context is also a key feature of the analyses predicting participants' reported use of the clerical collar. Although the $z'$ scores measuring pressures towards different forms of distinctiveness were quite strongly intercorrelated across the two contexts ($r = .40$ to $.59$, table 11.8), they had opposite associations with this particular form of behaviour.

This has wider implications for any attempt to predict behavioural consequences of the distinctiveness principle. Without paying attention to the alternative contexts within which a person has the opportunity of constructing a sense of distinctiveness, it will be more or less impossible to predict what form of behaviour will lead to satisfaction of the principle.

**Consequences of the design**

As with the analyses presented in previous chapters, a significant feature of these results was the correlational design. While this had strengths in terms of ecological validity, the conclusions reached here would certainly be usefully complemented by experimental studies into the effects of manipulating the contextual availability of sources of distinctiveness.
Questions of generality

While the findings presented in the preceding chapter, in which the contributions of position, difference and separateness to distinctiveness were demonstrated, were expected to generalise to other populations and other comparative contexts, the analyses presented here were concerned with predicting consequences of the distinctiveness principle among this particular group of people and within these particular contexts.

Thus the findings presented here were not intended to be generalised to other populations. On the contrary, these analyses serve to illustrate the value of paying careful attention to cultural and contextual variation in the construction of distinctiveness in order to predict distinctiveness related outcomes. Thus in some respects the relative homogeneity of the sample studied here was a strength rather than a weakness, in terms of the detailed attention which could be paid to culture and context.

Future research will need to pay equal attention to the relationship between distinctiveness and beliefs, values, goals and motives within the specific populations and contexts studied in order to make predictions about the operation of the distinctiveness principle.

Conclusion

In summary, the analyses presented here have demonstrated the use of the account of the distinctiveness principle developed within this thesis to predict outcomes of identity, subjective well-being and behaviour among Anglican parish priests, through the careful examination of cultural and contextual influences on distinctiveness construction among these people.
This thesis began with the clarification of assumptions about identity, understood as representation, and the introduction of a theoretical model of identity processes and principles (Breakwell, 1986a, 1987, 1988, 1992, 1993). Some extensions to this model were proposed and findings were reported from research conducted among members of the Anglican clergy. In this chapter, I present an integrated set of conclusions about identity, culture and the distinctiveness principle. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed and some future directions are proposed.

**Evaluating the Research**

Before constructing an integrated account of the findings, it is important to establish their theoretical status in terms of the epistemological assumptions in which the research was grounded. The methods used in the research were considerably influenced by an understanding of identity as representation. According to this perspective, research into identity was understood as a necessarily imperfect and interpretative process involving an interaction of researchers' and researched systems of meaning.

*Integrating qualitative and quantitative methods*

Following this line of thought, there was no single methodology which could be trusted to provide access to “the truth”. The research combined
qualitative and quantitative approaches with the intention that their respective strengths and weaknesses should complement each other.

Given that identity was defined on one level as a subjective phenomenon, it was considered important to give expression to participants' subjective experiences within the research. Hence, participants were invited to talk about their identities in a relatively non-directive format at the beginning of the interviews and were subsequently questioned about their subjective experiences of distinctiveness. Interpretative phenomenological analyses were performed with the aim of constructing an 'insider's perspective' from participants' accounts of their experience (after J. A. Smith, 1996a).

Consistent with the assumptions about representation in chapter 1, it was understood as a necessary feature of these analyses that they involved interpretation on the part of the researcher. The analytic procedure was also in keeping with these assumptions, embodying the principle of the hermeneutic circle, or "the repeated return from the whole to the parts, and vice versa" (Gadamer, 1960/1989, p. 190). However it is not assumed that these analyses were the only possible readings of the material.

Another concern was to do justice to the 'multiplicity of identity' (after Deaux, 1992). Identity was understood to include both personal and social elements and these elements were understood to be interconnected. In both studies, elements of identity content were elicited using the 'Who am I?' technique (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954), placing comparatively little restriction on the elements which might be included. An important innovation in the quantitative analyses was the modelling of within-participant variance between these elements as a way of investigating the principles underlying subjective identity structures. This approach specifically focused on the relationships between elements within identity, rather than treating each element or each domain separately.
The within-participant analyses also eliminated the assumption that all participants were using each scale identically. Although the meanings of the rating dimensions must still have been comparable across participants for the analyses to be valid, idiosyncratic differences in the use of each scale could be eliminated without having to assume an additional additive individual differences variable of 'response bias' across all constructs.

A contrast between these approaches was in the distribution of power over the interactive process between researcher and participant. This was reflected in the relative status of theory and phenomenology within quantitative and qualitative research processes. The former gave precedence to theory: participants were mostly constrained to direct lines of questioning and analyses were mostly constrained to testing specific models and hypotheses. The latter gave precedence to phenomenology: lines of questioning were more exploratory and analyses were driven more by the data rather than by the researcher's preconceived ideas.

Although identity has been theorised as an aspect of phenomenological experience, the processes and principles shaping identity are not assumed to be accessible on a phenomenological level. Hence, the quantitative and qualitative analyses gave access to different aspects of identity dynamics. While the quantitative analyses were better suited to testing theoretical accounts of identity processes and principles, the qualitative analyses provided a better picture of the subjective experience of identity as well as exploring for issues underrepresented in the theoretical background.

The contrast between these approaches might have been extended further in both directions. A less structured interview schedule and less focused analyses would have given more influence over the research process to the participant. This might have brought the analyses closer to participants'
experiences, but would have reduced the possibility of addressing theory. Furthermore, it should be stressed that this would still not eliminate the influence of the researcher’s meaning system on the research process. At the other end of the spectrum, using experimental methods would have given more influence to the researcher. As noted in chapter 6, this might have created a more powerful demonstration of the operation of processes shaping identity, but would have provided no evaluation of the importance of these processes in shaping ‘real life’ identities.

**Speaking positions in the research**

Having theorised the research process reflexively as an interaction between researchers’ and researched systems of meaning, it may be useful to acknowledge extraneous aspects of the researchers’ meaning systems which may have influenced the conclusions reached within the thesis.

None of the main protagonists in the research design and analysis is currently a practising or believing Christian. Our intention has been to approach the religious beliefs of members of the clergy in the role of interested outsiders. Nevertheless, it is entirely probable that a different set of research questions and a different set of answers would have been formulated if we had come to the research from a Christian position or from the perspective of another religious faith.

It is interesting to note that none of the questions on the interview schedule made any mention of God, although He figured quite largely in many of the answers given (chaps. 5, 7, 8). In the questionnaire, God was restricted to a small part within the sections addressing representations of personhood and priesthood, but was elsewhere absent. Most references to God in this thesis come from the qualitative analyses where participants had more control in shaping the process of the research.
In chapter 5, two of the most strongly represented groups of identities across all participants were found to be relationships with God and family relationships. Yet we persisted with 'parish' and 'clergy' contexts in the subsequent questionnaire study. Perhaps if we had examined the construction of distinctiveness within the context of relationships with God and family, we could have predicted more variance in the perceived centrality of identity elements in the analyses reported in chapter 11.

**Issues of generality**

It has been argued that identities are embedded within wider systems of meaning, which are constructed through processes of perception, cognition and social interaction. This has the implication that important features of identity construction may be far from universal. Indeed, Breakwell (1987) has suggested that the identity principles of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy may be culturally and/or historically specific.

On the other hand, this thesis departs from the assumption that what is representational is necessarily relative or that what is physiological is necessarily general. An aim of chapter 1 was to 'clarify the rules of representation', outlining what were understood to be logically necessary and therefore general features of representational systems. This argument was extended to the distinctiveness principle in chapter 3.

Thus the epistemological assumptions of this thesis formed a middle ground between universalism and relativism, suggesting that both generality and specificity should be of theoretical interest.
All of the findings presented here were based on studies conducted among the Anglican clergy. Both qualitative and quantitative analyses aimed to take account of similarities and differences within this population. An important strategic issue within the interpretative phenomenological analyses was how to represent a large data set without losing track of individual voices in the crowd. By focusing analytic resources on a subset of the interviews, it was possible to portray individual participants in greater detail within the analysis, although it is acknowledged that this strategy necessarily privileged some participants' accounts above others. Quantitative analyses were also focused on both similarities and differences between participants. An innovation was the use of multilevel regression models in which weights were allowed to vary randomly between participants (chap. 6), reflecting both foci simultaneously.

On the other hand, the question of similarities and differences between this and other populations was left to theory. It was expected that the identity principles of self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy, as well as the constitution of distinctiveness from separable sources of position, difference and separateness, would generalise to other populations and contexts. Representations of personhood and the particular use of position, difference and separateness as sources of distinctiveness from 'parish' and 'clergy targets in identity construction were understood to be specific to the population under study.

**Theoretical Conclusions**

I now turn to an exposition of the main findings of this thesis. The findings are separated below into three interrelated sections, respectively addressing *identity, culture and the distinctiveness principle*. 
Identity was theorised here as a form of representation, shaped by processes of cognition, perception and communication. It was understood that these processes were guided by motivational principles pushing towards the construction of particular states within identity.

Social psychologists have traditionally emphasised the role of self-esteem in motivating identity (James, 1892/1984; Rosenberg, 1986; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), but have on the whole paid rather less attention to other principles, such as distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy, which may be of equal theoretical importance (Breakwell, 1986a, 1993). An important conclusion of the analyses reported in chapter 6 was that distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy should be given equal theoretical consideration to self-esteem as motives guiding identity processes. It was also a notable feature of the analysis presented in chapter 5, that self-esteem was not especially salient within participants' own accounts of identity.

These findings contribute to a growing interest within social psychology in examining the role of motives other than self-esteem in guiding identity processes and related behaviour (Brewer, 1991; Deaux, 1993; Hogg & Abrams, 1993; Reicher, in press). It will be important in future work to investigate the applicability of the distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy principles examined here to a range of different research populations, and to compare identity process theory with alternative models.

A particular concern for future research will be to investigate the processes understood to be guided by these identity principles. The results reported in chapter 6 showed that elements of identity most associated with self-esteem, distinctiveness, continuity and efficacy were perceived to be most central within participants' subjective identity structures.
However, these relationships might be attributed to processes shaping either the perceived centrality of the elements or the meanings of the elements themselves. Both processes might be expected to be guided by identity principles, but this remains to be demonstrated empirically.

A further issue was the investigation of potential additional principles of purpose and closeness, represented as phenomenological themes of 'sense of purpose' and 'relationships' in chapter 5. These constructs behaved similarly to the existing identity principles in the models tested in chapter 6, but did not add greatly to the variance explained. It seemed plausible that the phenomenological principles of purpose and closeness might derive their importance at least partially from satisfying the existing principles. This was especially the case for purpose, which was associated with feelings of continuity, distinctiveness and self-esteem (chap. 5).

This highlights an issue which will be especially important when comparing alternative models of identity motivation – it will be essential to examine the theoretical overlap between motivational principles proposed in different theories. For example, Hogg and Abrams (1993) have suggested that social identity processes are motivated by a need for 'uncertainty reduction', which they also describe as a need for 'meaning', echoing the account of the distinctiveness principle here. In as much as this need is understood to be satisfied by processes of intergroup differentiation (Grieve & Hogg, 1999; Mullin & Hogg, 1998), it might be argued that the 'uncertainty reduction' argument collapses into the more general account of distinctiveness and meaning offered in this thesis. The issue of theoretical overlap will require careful theoretical and empirical attention if future developments in the field are to be constructive.
A second consequence of theorising identity as representation was that identity should be studied within the context of the wider meaning systems of which it is a part. This led to an interest in the cultural representations of personhood within which identities may be anchored.

Social psychological accounts of these representations have frequently relied on studies in which cultural variation has been equated with cross-national differences. This approach carries the risk of underestimating both similarities between 'cultures' and differences within 'cultures' (U. Kim & Berry, 1993). This thesis has addressed the former risk theoretically (chap. 3) and the latter risk empirically (chap. 7).

The discussion of culture and the distinctiveness principle in chapter 3 was grounded in a critique of Triandis' (1995) theory of individualism and collectivism. Perspectives of indigenous theorists from 'collectivist' cultures, especially the work of Uichol Kim (1994) and Masaki Yuki (Yuki & Brewer, 1999), supported the replacement of Triandis' concept of 'collectivism' with a concept of 'relational orientation' (Ho, 1993).

Rather than assume an individualistic orientation among members of the Anglican clergy within the UK, I explored their representations of personhood and self-construals in analyses presented in chapter 7. Participants' representations of personhood appeared to combine individualistic and relational elements. Responses to a measure of self-construals suggested the presence of a considerably stronger relational orientation among the priests than among student samples measured by Gudykunst et al. (1996) in the USA, Australia, Korea and Japan.
Consistent with recent experimental studies in which independent and interdependent self-construals and 'western' and 'eastern' cultural frames have been manipulated (Gardner, Gabriel & Lee, 1999; Hong, Morris, Chiu & Benet-Martinez, 1999), these findings speak for the relevance of constructs derived from cross-cultural perspectives to an understanding of one's own culture, as well as showing the value of examining differences within cultures in order to understand these constructs better. This is likely to result in a much more dynamic understanding of 'culture'.

This way of thinking about culture carried over into the treatment of identity within this thesis. Rather than ignoring culture – as the priests were included within the 'western' culture from which most psychological theories of identity originate – or treating culture as an indivisible 'black box' construct which might explain cross-national differences in findings, an important theoretical and empirical issue here was to examine how specific aspects of cultural meaning systems might affect psychological processes and their outcomes. Hence, rather than assuming generality or making a token acknowledgement of possible specificity, theoretical and empirical attention was paid to cultural representations of personhood and how these especially might affect the distinctiveness principle.

... and the distinctiveness principle.

A further consequence of understanding identity as representation was the development of a theoretical account of the role of distinctiveness in the construction of a meaningful sense of identity (chap. 3). This led to a broadening of the concept of 'distinctiveness' to include relational as well as individualistic forms: distinctiveness might be achieved in terms of position, difference and/or separateness. Sources of distinctiveness might be emphasised in identity construction according to culture and context.
Supporting these developments, results presented in chapter 10 showed that position, difference and separateness each accounted for unique variance in ratings of the distinctiveness associated with identity items, while analyses presented in chapters 8, 9 and 11 showed that position, difference and separateness had different implications for identity, affect and behaviour, which were consistent with the priests' beliefs about personhood, but also varied according to contexts and purposes.

This points to a pressing need to theorise and examine the operation of the distinctiveness principle across a range of populations and contexts, both within and across cultures, in order to understand the multiplicity of ways in which pressures towards distinctiveness may affect identity and behaviour. According to the perspective developed in this thesis, it is predicted that the constitution of distinctiveness from position, difference and separateness (chap. 10) will be comparatively resistant to cultural and contextual variation, but that the ways in which these sources of distinctiveness are used in identity construction will vary widely.

It has been understood within this thesis that identity is shaped by interacting processes of perception, cognition and communication. The interpretative phenomenological analysis reported in chapter 8 gave some insight into the processes by which distinctiveness is constructed. It appeared that concerns for the appropriate construction of distinctiveness affected both the emphasis on a given element of identity – participants chose whether or not to wear a clerical collar in order to emphasise or de-emphasise their priesthood – and the definition of that element – there was a considerable level of disagreement over the distinctiveness of being a priest. A notable feature of these processes was that they appeared to be located in social interaction rather than within the individual. This highlights the role of communication as well as cognition in the definition and enactment of identity (cf. Marková, 1987; Reicher, in press).
An important theoretical outcome of the treatment of the distinctiveness principle within this thesis is the beginnings of an account of why identity principles should be important for identity. The thesis proceeded from a minimal definition that identity principles were pressures towards the construction of particular states within identity. However, the distinctiveness principle was subsequently grounded in a theoretical argument about the role of distinctiveness in constructing a meaningful sense of identity. This strengthened the theoretical status of the distinctiveness principle in two ways: (a) the pressure for distinctiveness was not reducible to self-esteem maintenance and (b) the principle was no longer tied to the presence of a particular set of cultural values.

In order to avoid a situation of 'anything goes' relativism within identity process theory, it would be valuable to extend a similar approach to self-esteem, continuity and efficacy, examining why these constructs are important for identity and what it is that they have in common with distinctiveness which justifies their theoretical status as identity principles. One criterion might be that there should be an argument for generality across cultures and contexts. However, this is hard to reconcile with Breakwell's (1987) description of identity principles as cultural values which are 'reified' within the individual. This central issue within identity process theory is in need of substantial future development.

A further implication of this work for the future development of identity process theory is that a similar level of attention should be paid not only to the different ways in which a sense of self-esteem, continuity or efficacy may be constructed (cf. Chandler & Lalone, 1995; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Damon & Hart, 1988; Heine et al., 1999; Robinson, 1990; Rothbaum et al., 1982), but also to the factors predicting these different constructions and their wider implications for identity processes and behaviour.
In addition to developing identity process theory, the reconceptualisation of distinctiveness in terms of position, difference and separateness will be relevant to research in other perspectives. The concept of distinctiveness has a central place in a number of perspectives on identity, including social comparison theory (Suls & Wills, 1991), social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), self-categorisation theory (J. C. Turner, 1987) and optimal distinctiveness theory (Brewer, 1991) and appears to be gaining ascendancy as a key concept within social psychology (Spears & Doosje, 1999). However, distinctiveness has usually been understood in terms of difference. Research in these areas might benefit considerably from a more inclusive understanding of this central concept.

**Benefits of the research**

Although the aims of the research presented here were theoretical rather than applied, a reasonable question to ask of any piece of social scientific research is whom it is expected to benefit and in what sense, given the resources expended and the efforts contributed by participants.

Firstly, the findings may be beneficial to the participants themselves and to members of the clergy in general. Many of those who gave their time for the interview study commented afterwards that they had found the interview interesting and enjoyable and expressed interest in seeing the results. Several participants mentioned that the findings might be valuable for those involved in training for the clergy. This might be especially true of participants' discussions of the necessity of negotiating sources of distinctiveness in order to fulfil their ministries. Similarly, over 70% of participants in the questionnaire study asked to see the findings.
Secondly, the empirical evaluation of identity process theory (chap. 6) has implications for a wide range of applied areas. Social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986) has focused on the prediction of intergroup relations, in which issues such as prejudice and discrimination have widely been understood as consequences of the motive for self-esteem (Abrams & Hogg, 1988; Long & Spears, 1997; Rubin & Hewstone, 1998). Applied research within this area might be considerably enhanced by the adoption of a more comprehensive model of identity motivation. As a non-trivial example, the recent actions of a group calling themselves the 'Continuity IRA' might be understood partly by examining how these people construct a sense of continuity within their group identity.

However, identity process theory is not restricted to an intergroup level of explanation. An area currently showing promise is the application of identity process theory to therapeutic contexts (e.g., Coyle & Rafalin, in press; D. P. Judd & Wilson, 1999; Rafalin, 1998). Although research in this area is still in its infancy, it may lead in due course to new therapeutic interventions. Relationships between distinctiveness and subjective well-being described in chapters 9 and 11 lend weight to this possibility.

A further area of potential benefit is the contribution of this thesis to a critical perspective on the currently dominant theoretical constructions of 'cross-cultural differences'. The theory of individualism and collectivism has been applied extensively within organisational contexts, especially to issues of communication across cultures (see Triandis, 1995). Contributing to the progress of cross-cultural psychology away from the reification of bipolar dimensions towards a more sophisticated account of similarities and differences across cultures may in the long term help to correct some of the misapprehensions currently passed into applied contexts through oversimplified understandings of individualism and collectivism.
Final Remarks

I began this thesis by defining identity as a form of representation. Through clarifying assumptions about representation and applying these assumptions to identity, a number of theoretical and methodological developments were made, which have led especially to an improved understanding of the role of distinctiveness in identity processes, and a new method for evaluating and comparing models of identity motivation.

My hope is that this small project will be the beginning of a much bigger project of studying the processes by which identities are constructed and the principles guiding these processes within different cultures and contexts, leading to a better understanding of the implications of these processes and principles for both subjective well-being and behaviour.
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## Appendix A: Interview Materials

### Who am I?\(^{24}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{24}\) Source: adapted from Kuhn & McPartland (1954).
Imagine a 'typical member' of the Anglican clergy

Write as many or as few words/phrases as you feel are appropriate:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Interview Materials

Satisfaction with Life Scale\textsuperscript{25}

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 to 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by putting a mark in the appropriate box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] In most ways my life is close to ideal.
- [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] The conditions of my life are excellent.
- [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] I am satisfied with my life.
- [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] So far I have got the important things I want in life.
- [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] If I could live my life again, I would change almost nothing.

\textsuperscript{25} Source: Diener et al. (1985)
Appendix A: Interview Materials

Work Satisfaction Scale\textsuperscript{26}

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5

I find real enjoyment in my work.

1 2 3 4 5

I consider my work rather unpleasant.

1 2 3 4 5

I am fairly well satisfied with my work.

1 2 3 4 5

I am often bored with my work.

1 2 3 4 5

I definitely dislike my work.

1 2 3 4 5

Each day in my work seems like it will never end.

1 2 3 4 5

Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.

\textsuperscript{26} Source: adapted from Price and Mueller (1981).
Appendix A: Interview Materials

Please could you supply the following demographic details:

Your age: _____ years.

Your sex: M / F (please circle).

Your ethnic origin: ________________.

Your marital status: single / married / widowed / other (please specify).

What is your current position within the clergy: ________________.

How long have you been in the clergy: ______ years.
Appendix B: Questionnaire

Who am I?\textsuperscript{27}

There are 12 numbered blanks on the page below. Please write 12 answers to the simple question 'Who am I?' in the blanks. Just give 12 answers to this question. Answer as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write the answers in the order that they occur to you. Don't worry about logic or 'importance.' Go along fairly fast, for time is limited.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{27} Source: adapted from Kuhn & McPartland (1954). This page folded out from the questionnaire, so that participants could see their responses when responding to subsequent questions about these items.
Please complete the 'Who am I?' section 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.
**What is a person?**

Please write just 5 statements.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What is a priest?**

Please write just 5 statements.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are some questions about the way you see yourself in relation to other people. Please answer each question by writing a number in the box next to it, using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no right or wrong answers - just write the number which best indicates how you feel about each of the questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you feel unique?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel unique when you are among your parishioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel unique when you are among members of the clergy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel close to other people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel close to your parishioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel close to other members of the clergy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you have a distinctive position within your parish?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you have a distinctive position within the clergy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you have a different personality from your parishioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you have a different personality from other members of the clergy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you see yourself as separate from your parishioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you see yourself as separate from other members of the clergy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you have different beliefs and opinions from your parishioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you have different beliefs and opinions from other members of the clergy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you have a definite role in relation to your parishioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel you have a definite role in relation to other members of the clergy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel that you have different abilities from your parishioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel that you have different abilities from other members of the clergy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel independent from your parishioners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you feel independent from other members of the clergy?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next section refers to the answers you wrote in the 'Who am I?' section at the beginning. Please answer each question for each of your 12 items by circling a number from 1 to 7.

If you didn't write 12 items, then just answer for the items you did write - you don't need to add items.

Don't think too long about each question - just give your first impression.
How much do you see each of these things as peripheral or central to your identity? 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very much peripheral...</th>
<th>... intermediate ...</th>
<th>... very much central.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 This and subsequent questions in the same format were presented so that the twelve 7-point scales lined up with participants' answers to the 'Who am I?' task presented at the beginning of the questionnaire.
How much do you see each of these things as positive or negative?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly negative ...</th>
<th>neither positive nor negative</th>
<th>... strongly positive.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things give you a sense of who you are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things give you a sense of purpose?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things give you a sense of self-esteem?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel effective in doing the things you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things give you a sense of continuity within your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel that you are unique?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   2   3   4   5   6   7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you from your parishioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much do you feel that each of these things distinguishes you from other members of the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel you have a distinctive position within your parish?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel you have a distinctive position within the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel different in your personality from your parishioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel different in your personality from other members of the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel separate from your parishioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel separate from other members of the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things mean that you have different beliefs and opinions from your parishioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things mean that you have different beliefs and opinions from other members of the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things give you a definite role in relation to your parishioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things give you a definite role in relation to other members of the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you different in terms of your abilities from your parishioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Questionnaire

How much does each of these things make you different in terms of your abilities from other members of the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel independent from your parishioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel independent from other members of the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel close to other people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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How much does each of these things make you feel close to your parishioners?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How much does each of these things make you feel close to other members of the clergy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all ...</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>... very much.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are some statements about what it is to be a person. If you disagree with any of the statements, please delete it. Then from the remaining statements please put a mark next to the four statements which you see as most important in understanding what it means to be a person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every person is unique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person is loved by God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person is a separate, bounded individual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person has a set of roles and responsibilities in life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person has a particular set of gifts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person has a purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person has a place amongst other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every person is made in God's image.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below are some statements about the nature of priesthood. If you disagree with any of the statements, please delete it. Then from the remaining statements please put a mark next to the four statements which you see as most important in understanding what it means to be a priest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who has been called by God.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who proclaims the Gospel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who administers the sacraments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who is set apart from ordinary life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who cares for people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who is part of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who leads people in worship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone who represents people to God.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A priest is someone with their own unique ministry.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following statements refer to how you think, feel or behave in general. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with each statement by writing a number in the box next to it, using the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>slightly disagree</th>
<th>neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>slightly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I should be judged on my own merit.
2. I consult with others before making important decisions.
3. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
4. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.
5. My personal identity is very important to me.
6. I consult with co-workers on work-related matters.
7. I prefer to be self-reliant rather than depend on others.
8. I stick with my group even through difficulties.
9. I respect decisions made by my group.
10. I help acquaintances, even if it is inconvenient.
11. I don't support a group decision when it is wrong.
12. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I am not happy with the group.

Source: Gudykunst et al. (1996).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I maintain harmony in the groups of which I am a member.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a unique person separate from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I respect the majority's wishes in groups of which I am a member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is a conflict between my values and the values of groups of which I am a member, I follow my values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I remain in the groups of which I am a member if they need me, even though I am dissatisfied with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to abide by customs and conventions at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try not to depend on others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take responsibility for my own actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is better to consult with others and get their opinions before doing anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give special consideration to others' personal situations so I can be efficient at work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for me to act as an independent person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I should decide my future on my own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationships with others are more important than my accomplishments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens to me is my own doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making a decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy being unique and different from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am comfortable being singled out for praise and rewards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Below is a list of words which have been used by members of the clergy to refer to different styles of *churchmanship*.\(^{30}\)

Please read the list and decide which of the words listed might be used to describe your own ministry.

**Please tick up to three of the descriptions:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Catholic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangelical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{30}\) Source: adapted from 1989 English Church Census (Brierley, 1991a, 1991b).
This scale\textsuperscript{31} consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you generally feel this way, that is, how you feel on the average. Use the following scale to record your answers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>very slightly or not at all</th>
<th>a little</th>
<th>moderately</th>
<th>quite a bit</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_________ excited  __________ irritable
_________ distressed _______ alert
_________ inspired  _______ ashamed
_________ upset      _______ interested
_________ strong      _______ nervous
_________ guilty      _______ determined
_________ scared      _______ attentive
_________ hostile     _______ jittery
_________ enthusiastic _______ active
_________ proud     _______ afraid

\textsuperscript{31} Source: Watson et al. (1988).
Appendix B: Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>always</th>
<th>most days</th>
<th>some days</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How often do you wear a clerical collar? (please tick)

Finally, please could you supply the following details:

Age: __________ years.

Sex: M / F (please circle).

Marital status: single / married / widowed / other: _______

Current position within the clergy: _______________________

Stipendiary / non-stipendiary (please circle).

Year of ordination: __________.
If you would like me to send you a summary of the findings from this study, please write your name and address below. Please note that this will not affect your anonymity which will be preserved at all times in all reporting of this research.

Thank you very much for your co-operation.