THE RESEARCH REPORT

Background

This project involved pure basic research in relation to the central problem of how ‘structure and agency’ are linked, which has been my preoccupation since first developing the ‘morphogenetic approach’ in 1979. It is suggested that agents’ use of their reflexivity constitutes the missing and mediating link.

Through their reflexive deliberations (‘internal conversations’) agents subjectively define particular courses of action (‘projects’) in relation to their objective social circumstances (‘contexts’). Without this, we have no explanatory purchase upon exactly what agents do because in the same circumstances they do not act in uniform ways. Conversely, a proper grasp of reflexive deliberations accounts for subjects’ evaluations of their situations in the light of their personal concerns, and their (re-) evaluation of their projects in the light of their situations. Without such an account, sociology has to settle for empirical generalizations about what ‘most people do most of the time’.

Under my previous ESRC Senior Research Fellowship (R000271005) I first conceptualized a human agent who was capable of exercising the properties and powers of reflexivity that could give them some governance over their own lives and make them active agents in shaping the social order (Being Human: the problem of agency, CUP 2000). Secondly, I explored reflexivity as ‘internal conversation’, building upon a relatively neglected aspect (except by Norbert Wiley) of traditional American pragmatism.

In Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation (CUP 2003), reflexivity was highlighted as the process through which reasons become causes of the action-courses adopted by social subjects. However, it was also suggested that people’s modes of inner dialogue could be very different indeed and ventured that there were four distinctive modalities: the Communicative, the Autonomous, the Meta-reflexive and the Fractured modes. On the contrary, Western social theorising has regarded reflexivity as a homogeneous phenomenon, in what has recently become known as ‘the extended reflexivity thesis’.

Since Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation, was an exploratory volume whose empirical basis was confined to 20 diverse interviewees alone, it formed a rich source of hypotheses (explored in the present research), but a weak basis upon which to challenge opposing views. This was particularly the case for challenging the current dichotomous account proffered by Beck, Giddens and Lash (in Reflexive Modernization etc.), who maintained that not until the arrival of the ‘juggernaut’ or the ‘risk’ society did traditional or routine action give way to reflexive action. That makes reflexivity a ‘newcomer’ and there is no suggestion that when reflexivity ‘arrives’, it is other than a homogeneous mental practice. Nevertheless, the implication is that its advent is for all. This is in contradistinction to Bourdieu’s retention of the (‘semi-unconscious’) socialised habitus as the guide to action, with reflexivity denied to all but members of the academic collectivity.

The two phases of the present research attempted to rebut the above views both theoretically and empirically. This entailed the attempt to discover if the four modes of reflexivity that I had previously but tentatively delineated were adequate to characterise the general population – a very open question. In addition, I sought to say more about the future of Modernity than could be advanced on the basis of the rather anodyne proposition that there had been growth in the extensiveness of reflexivity, accompanying the (now precipitous) decline in routine action.
Objectives

Theoretical aim

An overarching theoretical aim guided this research as a whole. I maintain that social theory – especially Critical Realism – has adequately conceptualized how structural and cultural emergent properties impinge upon people by shaping the social contexts agents confront, thus constituting constraints and enablements inter alia. However, little attention has been given to how these are received by agents and it is this one-sidedness that I sought to redress. A constraint needs something to constrain and an enablement something to enable. The missing elements upon which they bite are agents’ ‘concerns’ and what they do to realize them. Because of their personal powers of reflexivity, subjects deliberate through internal conversation about their circumstances in relation to their concerns and vice versa, coming up with particular courses of action that are not related to structural influences in uniform ways.

This basic point was already argued in Structure, Agency and the Internal Conversation (2003) but I believe that it is clinched by the demonstration that different patterns of social mobility (immobility, upward mobility and lateral volatility) are related to subjects’ patterns of reflexivity, even if they come from the same socio-economic backgrounds. This is the substance of Making our Way through the World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility (2007).

Substantive objectives

The first empirical objective was to confirm whether or not the four modes of reflexivity, tentatively identified in 2003 (see ‘Background’), were adequate to characterize a sample of the English population. These different modes and their practitioners are: ‘Communicative reflexives’, whose internal conversations need completion and confirmation by others before leading to action; ‘Autonomous reflexives’, who complete their internal deliberations alone and act upon them; ‘Meta-reflexives’, who scrutinize and criticize their own inner dialogues, their chosen actions and their social contexts; ‘Fractured reflexives’, who are (temporarily) unable to conduct purposeful self-talk but, instead, augment their own distress and disorientation. This objective was successfully met: 93% of the stratified sample (see ‘Results’) belonged to one of the above categories, rendering it unlikely that there existed a further undetected mode.

When making the original submission, I had planned to employ a stratified sample of 1,000 respondents in order to infer the distribution of dominant modes of reflexivity for the population of England. When this was discountenanced under the award, the small sample of 128 Coventry residents that was substituted (see ‘Methods’) was inappropriate for any type of inferential statistics. However, a means was found to circumvent this problem, at least for future researchers. This entailed the development of ICONI (The Internal Conversation Indicator – see ‘Methods’ and ‘Appendix 1’), a thirteen item index assigning nearly all subjects unambiguously to a dominant mode of reflexivity. It is already in use in Germany, Italy and the United States, although it remains to be established if it works cross-culturally. If ICONI can provide a preliminary assessment of distributional differences in modes of reflexivity between countries, this would be an unexpected bonus.

The second concrete objective was to examine the hypothesis that the different dominant modes of reflexivity generated different patterns of social mobility, thus improving our understanding of the contribution made by subjectivity to the dynamics of social stratification. ‘Immobility’ was expected of the ‘Communicative Reflexives’, ‘upward mobility’ of the ‘Autonomous Reflexives’ and volatile biographies of lateral or even voluntary downward mobility for the ‘Meta-reflexives’. (‘Fractured’ reflexives are reserved for the next volume). Through in-depth interviews about personal and work histories, this was confirmed to be the case. Particularly interesting is the fact that many of the trajectories of mobility documented here would not have registered as such in standard quantitative
studies because they entailed small but very tenacious occupational shifts. Thus, the aim was accomplished of contributing to a theory of social stratification that gives due weight to both its voluntary and involuntary aspects, which intersect through the medium of the internal conversation — as reported in *Making our Way through the World* (2007).

The third objective was qualitatively to explore the factors contributing to the making (and breaking) of the different types of reflexives. The hypotheses were that ‘Communicatives’ would have experienced ‘contextual continuity’, that is dense and continuous contact with those sharing their natal social ‘context’ (who could become their trusted interlocutors), would have endorsed ‘concerns’ compatible with their remaining in that context and have sustained an interpersonal network continuous with it. ‘Autonomous’ subjects were expected to be the opposite in all respects, whilst ‘Meta-reflexives’ were anticipated to be similar but, in addition, to have developed ‘vocational’ commitments that were incongruous with the values of their natal backgrounds. All of this was confirmed and is reported in the above volume.

However, such data were collected at one point in time. Since the research methods had been changed, at the ESRC’s request, it was decided to investigate the ‘making and breaking’ of reflexive modalities *longitudinally* by following the 2003-04 intake of students through their first degree, interviewing them in-depth annually (see ‘Methods’). This yielded an extraordinary pay-off in terms of being able to follow the students’ reflexivity in formation, to understand the effects upon them of the rapid social changes with which they had grown up, and to gain crucial insights into how they would affect the millennial social order through their nascent employment preferences (see ‘Results’). The discovery of an increasingly generalized ‘contextual incongruity’ and of the growing propensity towards ‘Fracturing’ form the backbone of *The Reflexive Imperative: the making and breaking of human reflexivity*, now half written.

The fourth objective was to examine the relationship between subjects’ mode of reflexivity, their *modus vivendi* and their contributions to social movements and civil society. It proved impossible to study the connections with social movements because so very few subjects were involved with such. However, the strikingly different institutions of civil society to which practitioners of the different modes of reflexivity contributed most has significance for the future of Modernity, which will be fully explored in the final part of *RI*.

### Methods

N.B. Details concerning statistical operations are found in the ‘Methodological Appendix’ of *Making our Way* (pp. 326-336).

**Pilot Study**

This was conducted from amongst the 4,053 employees of Warwick University, July 2003, under a small grant from the University’s Research Development Fund. The sample was stratified by gender, age (16-24, 25-39, 40-54 and 55+) and occupational group using the National Statistics Socio-economic Classification (NS-SeC) in its simplified form of four categories. 64 subjects were selected in accordance with an equal probability of selection method and 32 of these were interviewed. These subjects were not included in the ESRC research. They were piloted, (a) to check for patterns of response about the (10) reflexive mental activities used in the 2003 study, (b) to develop a check list of questions probing personal and work histories for guidance when conducting the interviews proper and, (c) to essay the possibility of discovering a short list of questions that accurately indicated subjects’ dominant mode of reflexivity.
Developing the Internal Conversation Indicator (ICONI)

The aim was to discover if modes of reflexivity were measurable and, if so, to arrive at the smallest number of questions that discriminated effectively between practitioners of different modes of reflexivity. Because these are viewed as dominant modes, it was never expected that subjects would score highly on one mode and zero on the others. Beginning with 24 questions used in the Pilot Study and refining and eliminating items after three further re-administrations of the questionnaire, a thirteen item instrument resulted that represented the final ICONI used in the rest of the research. ICONI accounted for 46.8% of the variance on factor analysis, which compares respectably with directly comparable research instruments employed in social psychology. In the present research, ICONI was principally used to identify clear practitioners of a dominant mode of reflexivity for in-depth interview. In addition, it was used with the background data collected in order to test for statistical associations in both samples described below. (See Appendix 1 for ICONI)

The Coventry sample

Unlike the 20 subjects, picked solely for their diversity in the 2003 study, the aim was now to ensure that the major demographic categories were adequately covered. Stratification was the same as in the pilot study and availability sampling was used for reasons of feasibility, despite its non-representative character precluding the use of inferential statistics. Two research assistants located 174 Coventry residents, administered ICONI to them and collected background data from them. The final sample was refined to 128 cases, providing 4 subjects per cell. An availability sample is not ideal because it is imperfectly random, but that does not seriously compromise its utility as a framework from which to draw subjects for qualitative investigation.

Twelve interviewees were then selected for each of the ‘Communicative’, ‘Autonomous’, ‘Meta-reflexive’ and ‘Fractured’ categories on the basis of highest ICONI scores for each mode. Those interviewed should therefore be regarded as ‘extreme’ practitioners of each modality, but not as artificial ‘ideal types’. I conducted all interviews myself, making digital audio-recordings that were later transcribed. Interviews were long, extremely generous and were usually conducted in subjects’ own homes.

The Student sample

In order to obtain longitudinal data about the making (and breaking) of modes of reflexivity, ICONI was administered to all students taking the foundation course in Sociology in 2003-4 who were willing to participate (n = 130). 50 students, selected on the basis of the diversity of their initial scores, were invited for interview. They were re-tested on ICONI and re-interviewed in each of the three/four years of their degrees. Digital audio-recording was used and the files later transcribed. All qualitative data analysis was performed by me personally on a thematic basis.

Results

[PREAMBLE: Although numerous publications and presentations have resulted under this grant (see www.esrcsocietytoday.ac.uk), most are ancillary to the two books: Making our Way through the World: Human Reflexivity and Social Mobility (MOW), 2007, and The Reflexive Imperative: the Making and Breaking of Human Reflexivity (RI), half completed, upon which this report will concentrate.]

Reflexivity is defined as the regular exercise of the mental ability, shared by all normal people, to consider themselves in relation to their social contexts and vice versa. (MOW, p. 4) As exercised through ‘internal conversation’, reflexivity is responsible for, (a) subjects’ adoption of ‘projects’, that is, courses of action intended to realize their personal ‘concerns’, (b) for the reflexive mediation of
structural and cultural properties that shape the situations (‘contexts’) they confront, facilitating some actions and hindering others, and, (c) determining precisely what different subjects do with what intentions and with what consequences.

Both objectivity and subjectivity are needed to explain action, but too often the subjective element has been imputed to subjects by theorists writing in the third-person, and conceptualized as being hydraulically driven by vested interests, instrumental rationality or a socialized ‘habitus’. Instead, it is maintained that courses of action are produced through first-person reflexive deliberations of subjects who subjectively determine their projects in relation to their objective circumstances – objectively paying the price for their fallibility when they get things wrong.

Part I sets the scene by comparing and contrasting ‘Reflexivity’s Biographies’, as given by Beck and by Bourdieu, with my own morphogenetic sketch – developed much further in RI. It then examines the distinctive nature of internal conversation and introduces three of its four dominant modes: ‘Communicative’, ‘Autonomous’ and ‘Meta-reflexive’. These were found in roughly equal proportions within the Coventry sample and analysis of the patterns of social mobility distinctive of each forms the theme of the book.

Part II outlines how different combinations of (natal) contexts + (personal) concerns hold the key to the dominant mode of reflexivity practiced, one unrelated to gender or socio-economic background, though significantly correlated with length of education. Qualitative features of the natal background, summarized as ‘contextual continuity’, ‘contextual discontinuity’ and ‘contextual incongruity’, were found to be related to the dominant practice of Communicative, Autonomous and Meta-reflexivity respectively. This depended equally upon the ‘concerns’ of ‘Communicatives’ being capable of realization within their natal context, those of the ‘Autonomous’ being capable of fulfilment in a different but accessible context, and those of ‘Meta-reflexives’ having the continuous promise of realization in a succession of available contexts.

The following chapters used life and work histories to show how ‘Communicatives’ worked at staying-put, how ‘Autonomous’ subjects were upward and outward bound, and how Meta-reflexives were continuously moving-on, thus generating their three characteristic patterns of social immobility, upward mobility and social volatility.

The significance of the three distinctive modes of reflexivity lies in their different relationships to structural constraints and enablements. ‘Communicative reflexives’ work at remaining embedded in their original social ‘context’ by evading both the objective costs that would be incurred by resisting constraints and repudiating the objective bonuses associated with enablements. They do so in order to promote family well-being, which usually entails occupational self-sacrifice on their part. ‘Autonomous reflexives’ adopt a strategic stance towards constraints and enablements, fallibly seeking to avoid society’s ‘snakes’ and to ride its ‘ladders’. They progress up the occupational hierarchy through self-disciplined dedication to work and subordination of all other relationships to this ‘ultimate concern’. ‘Meta-reflexives’ are subversive towards constraints and enablements because they are willing to pay the price of the former and to forfeit the benefits of the latter in attempting to live out their vocational concerns. All of the above are active agents who succeed in achieving some governance over their own lives, in contrast to ‘Fractured reflexives’ who are (temporarily) passive agents to whom things happen.

Part III moves on to the out-workings of these different modes of reflexivity for the social order. Their main institutional impacts are upon quite different parts of civil society: ‘Communicatives’ principally invest themselves in the family, thus making a huge contribution to social cohesion and to inter-generational solidarity through the dense micro-worlds they sustain; ‘Autonomous’ subjects devote themselves strenuously to the market and contribute most to economic growth and development; ‘Meta-reflexives’ gravitate towards the Third Sector, where they foster values for social re-orientation and develop organizations that gesture towards social transformation.

The Conclusion returns to ‘Reflexivity’s Biographies’ to consider the implications of these (aggregate) findings for Modernity. This serves as the hinge to the next book, The Reflexive Imperative, which concentrates upon young people, those most influenced by two decades of rapid social change and whose reflexively defined *modi vivendi* will do most to shape the future social order.

On the basis of a three-year longitudinal study of undergraduates, *RI* begins to link-up micro-level practices of individual reflexivity with macroscopic themes, both theoretically and empirically. The focal point is the rapidity of social change, characterizing late Modernity. These undergraduates are part of the first generation to grow-up in an increasingly morphogenetic society, whose generative mechanism is for variety to generate still further variety.

In terms of the ‘making’ of their reflexivity, natal background influences were strikingly different from those reported by older members of the Coventry sample. Socialization has become a matter of selecting from mixed messages, given the number of parental re-partnerings that impinged upon many students’ upbringing. The deficit in social solidarity grows as ‘friends become the new family’, but cannot be taken for granted. In the face of novelty and innovation, the significance of inherited ‘cultural capital’ is petering out fast for all kinds of socio-economic backgrounds. In sum, an unprecedented proportion of these young people are now experiencing ‘contextual incongruity’ between their natal backgrounds and their occupational foregrounds. In determining what to do occupationally, they have only their personal ‘concerns’ and their readings of the new global context to guide them – hence, the reflexive imperative.

However, practices of reflexivity do not remain unchanged. The interviews showed that ‘Communicative reflexivity’ becomes harder to sustain, given the demise of community and geo-locality. ‘Autonomous reflexivity’ remains strong and responds to the challenge of combining social and geographical mobility. However, ‘Meta-reflexivity’ is proportionately gaining ground as is ‘Fractured reflexivity’ – the ‘breaking’ of reflexivity appears to feature increasingly prominently. This picture is obviously very different from that presented by the undifferentiated ‘individualization’ thesis.

Such differences go further and it is ventured that they indicate a re-structuring of the social order. The growth of ‘Meta-reflexivity’ is fostered by the necessity of carefully scrutinizing new opportunities in relation to personal concerns. In practice this was also associated with more graduates eschewing both the State and the Market, preferring to work in the Third Sector – with the self-declared aim of ‘making a difference’. For the immediate future, this signals a tense balance between the three sectors, whose affiliates variously attempt to ‘colonize’ or to ‘humanize’ one another.
**Activities** (selective)

**International Conference papers**


HONOUR ‘The Author meets her Readers’, an evening devoted to my work at the International Sociological Association’s XVI World Congress, Durban, South Africa, July 2006.

KEYNOTE PAPER ‘Inter-disciplinarity and Intra-subjectivity’. Annual conference of International Association for Critical Realism, Tromsø, Norway, August 2006.


‘Atheism as a default-setting’. Decennial meeting of the Italian Catholic Church, Verona, November 2006.

A DAY CELEBRATING the publication of my *La converzazione interiore*. ‘L’identità, riflessività, agire sociale: ripensare i processi di socializzazione’ (Identity, reflexivity and agency; rethinking socialisation) followed by 6 Italian Commentators, University of Milan Sacre Cuore, June 2007.


To cite this output:

‘Comment nos propres priorités définissent nos identités personnelles’ (How what we care about defines our personal identities), conference of L’Institut de France, Paris, January 2008.

International Workshops


‘Reflexivity and the Internal Conversation’, a 5 day Workshop at the University of Warwick sponsored by the ESRC, September, 2007.

‘The Ontology of Subjectivity’ and ‘Work histories and Social Mobility’, University of Gothenburg, October, 2007.

‘Critical Realism and Social Identity: an Inter-disciplinary Workshop with Margaret S. Archer’, University of Molise, October 2007.

Networks

Centre for Critical Realism (registered educational charity). Founder-Trustee, Editorial Board of two book series with Routledge, regular participant in seminars we organize at SOAS and the London Institute of Education.

Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences. Founder member and Councillor since 1994. Have organized three Plenary meetings on ‘Work and Employment’ and last week co-organized the Plenary on ‘Subsidiarity’ and presented the theme to Pope Benedict XVI.


Outputs

I confirm that ‘qualidata’ has been submitted to the Data Archive. Only particularly important outputs are mentioned below.

Books, articles and chapters


REFERENCE No.


‘Persons and ultimate concerns: Who we are is what we care about’, in E. Malinvaud and M. A. Glendon (eds.), Conceptualization of the Person in Social Sciences, Vatican City Press, 2006, pp. 261-83.


‘Lze najit pojítko mezi vysvetlenim a porozuměním? (Can explanation and understanding be linked?) Sociologický Casopis (Czech Sociological Review), 44:1, 2008, pp. 7-22.


Translations


Also forthcoming: Spanish translation of Realist Social Theory: the Morphogenetic Approach and Italian translation of Making our Way through the World, both scheduled for 2009.

Other media

Two Pod casts on reflexivity for London seminars of the Centre for Critical Realism, see http://criticalrealism.wikispaces.com/Critical+Realism+Media
See also socialsciences@acdscience.va for papers given to the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences.

Impacts

Impacts, as anticipated, have been largely academic. Within Sociology, Making our Way through the World, published in June 2007 was already a reading text (i.e. week by week and chapter by chapter) in Universities in Italy, Germany and Sweden. An issue of Sociologia e Politiche Sociali (Milan) 10:3, 2007 was devoted to Cultura riflessiva e politiche sociali (Cultural reflexivity and politics) and carried a long, positive review of the book. The Italian translation rights have also already been acquired by Ed. Erickson, Trento at a large seminar celebrating the publication of its predecessor (La conversazione interiore) in Milan June 2007, which I introduced at the start of the meeting and was followed by 6 commentators. My ‘Interdisciplinary Workshop’ at the University of Molise (October 2007), took the same format and will result in a book during 2009.

To cite this output:
ICONI (The Internal Conversation Indicator) is already in research use in Germany, the U.S. and Italy. This research project has attracted considerable interest on an inter-disciplinary basis: on ecological awareness (South Africa), on the anthropology of inter-generational and geo-local summer homes (USA), on the practice of prayer (Italy) and on development issues (Taiwan), to give just a few examples.

Main institutional users include: The International Association for Critical Realism, at whose annual conference I will be giving a Plenary paper in London, July 2008 see also [http://criticalrealism.wikispaces.com/Critical+Realism+Media](http://criticalrealism.wikispaces.com/Critical+Realism+Media) for two Podcasts of lectures already given. As the book upon which I am working (The Reflective Imperative) takes a particular interest in those (Meta-reflexives) seeking to work in the Third Sector, it was in recognition of this that Professor Pierpaolo Donati (one of the world's leading experts in various forms of the Third Sector) and I were co-organisers of the recent XIV Plenary meeting of the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences on 'The Common Good, Subsidiarity and Solidarity', May, 2008. We enjoyed the best world Press coverage since PASS was formed in 1994. I was honoured to present the theme of the meeting to the Pope: see L'Osservatore Romano, May 4th 2008 for my text and the Pope’s address. Donati and I are editing a book from the meeting (2009). See [http://socialsciences.academy.va](http://socialsciences.academy.va). The International Sociological Association’s next Newsletter on Social Theory is devoted to the Warwick Seminar (September 2007) and I will be in Montreal, at the invitation of the current President, at a closed Seminar to discuss recent research on ‘Discovery and Commitment’ (September 2008), with a book to follow. In January 2008, I was invited by L'Institut de France to present my research in a paper ‘Comment nos propres priorités définissent nos identités personnelles’, with the conference resulting in a book. Finally, Princeton’s CTI (USA) will be awarding me the first ‘Witherspoon Prize’ in 2009.

**Future Research Priorities**

With the completion of The Reflective Imperative, this trio of books on internal conversation about society still leave the morphogenetic project unfinished. They will have dealt with the aggregate effects alone of the dialectic between changing human subjectivity and the objective transformation of society. To deal adequately with this relationship requires the inclusion of collective effects too, which was not possible in this project because so few subjects were engaged in collective action.

This means that the examination of social movements, of communal experiments, and of new forms of collective engagement is needed to complete the meso-level of the morphogenetic approach, whose macro- and the micro-levels have been concentrated upon to date. As Frédéric Vandenberghe noted, in the most perspicacious review of the corpus of books published since 1979 (‘The Archers: Final Episode?’ European Journal of Social Theory, 8:2, 2005, pp. 227-37), a further instalment is required to link collective agency upwards to the macroscopic order.

Yet, that is not ‘The End’. Although globalisation undoubtedly accompanies the millennial transformation of the social, it is not its generative mechanism. The leitmotif of contemporary commentators (Bauman, Beck, Castells, Lash, Giddens etc.) is that ‘flows’ have replaced ‘structures’. Social Realists would regard that as an observation (and extrapolation) confined to the empirical level. What it crucially omits are the new structures generating the observable flows at a deeper ontological level. If the new millennium is finally beginning to sever its links with Modernity, including all those adjectives (post-, late-, high-, second-wave as well as the ubiquitous ‘beyond’) that merely signal adhesion to it, then we need to identify what is generating a true disjunction. I hold this to be morphogenesis itself and its generative mechanism for variety to stimulate yet more variety. This I will examine in Morphogenesis Unbound, as a historically unique époque in which morphostatic and morphogenetic cycles no longer circulate simultaneously, with the former restraining the latter and protracting variants upon the themes of Modernity. Perhaps that will indeed be the end of this theoretical trajectory.

To cite this output:
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Appendix 1

THE INTERNAL CONVERSATION INDICATOR
(ICONI)
Some of us are aware that we are having a conversation with ourselves, silently in our heads. We might just call this ‘thinking things over’. Is this the case for you?

YES ☐  NO ☐

**ON THE WHOLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I do daydream about winning the lottery.

2. I think about work a great deal, even when I am away from it.

3. I dwell long and hard on moral questions.

4. I blot difficulties out of my mind, rather than trying to think them through.

5. My only reason for wanting to work is to be able to pay for the things that matter to me.

6. Being decisive does not come easily to me.

7. I try to live up to an ideal, even if it costs me a lot to do so.

8. When I consider my problems, I just get overwhelmed by emotion.

9. So long as I know those I care about are OK, nothing else really matters to me at all.

10. I just dither, because nothing I do can really make a difference to how things turn out.

11. I’m dissatisfied with myself and my way of life - both could be better than they are.

12. I know that I should play an active role in reducing social injustice.

13. I feel helpless and powerless to deal with my problems, however hard I try to sort them out.
X. In general, what are the three most important areas of your life now - those that you care about deeply? (Please give the most important first).

1. ____________________________________

2. ____________________________________

3. ____________________________________

Y. Your (current or last) occupation ________________________________

Z. Age _____ Gender _______

Willingness to be interviewed __________________________

Name(s) __________________________________________

Phone/e-mail _______________________________________

Home address

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
N.B. Please note carefully that for Question 6 and Question 11, numerical scores should be INVERTED when calculating an individual's score.

1. The questions are divided into 4 categories, that is there are 3 questions indicative of 'Communicative reflexivity', 3 questions indicative of 'Autonomous reflexivity', 3 questions indicative of 'Meta-reflexivity' and 4 questions indicative of 'Fractured reflexivity'.

2. The scores for the four modes of reflexivity are calculated as follows:

- Communicative reflexive score = \( \frac{Q1 + Q5 + Q9}{3} \)
- Autonomous reflexive score = \( \frac{Q2 + Q6^* + Q11^*}{3} \)  (*= inverted)
- Meta-reflexive score = \( \frac{Q3 + Q7 + Q12}{3} \)
- Fractured reflexive score = \( \frac{Q4 + Q8 + Q10 + Q13}{4} \)

3. A score of 4 and above on any of the four categories of questions assigns a subject to the C, A, M, F category, as their dominant mode of reflexivity - whichever is their highest score over 4.

4. F scores of over 4 are held to 'trump' other scores. Such subjects are registered as 'F' regardless of their other scores - even if these are higher.

5. Regarding question 'X' – it is presented here as we used it, that is, as an open-ended question about subjects’ ultimate concerns. However, this has created some difficulties in later collapsing their responses into manageable categories. Although a lot has been learned through this, we would recommend that others take advantage of our experience and employ fixed choice categories. We can supply some suggestions here which basically seek to tap 'C' concerns (inter-personal relationships with family and friends), ‘A’ concerns (work, career, performative achievements, financial success etc.), ‘M’ concerns (intrinsic interests, socio-ethical pre-occupations, spirituality etc.) and ‘F’ concerns (resolving problems, establishing a better way of life, overcoming present difficulties).
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