The article addresses the issue of assessing identity dimensions as conceptualized by K. Luyckx et al. (2006) in people with mild intellectual disability using the modified Polish version of the Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (DIDS/PL-1). The author presents the steps followed in the modification of the questionnaire as well as its psychometric properties. Two studies were conducted in order to test the reliability and validity of the measure. The participants in Study 1 were people within the intellectual norm (n = 100), and the measures used were DIDS/PL as well as its modified version, DIDS/PL-1. The modified version turned out to be an instrument with a reliability comparable to that of DIDS/PL. The analysis of correlations yielded positive relations between the same scales in the two measures as well as the same direction and similar strength of relations between the variables within each measure. The participants in Study 2 were people with mild intellectual disability (n = 67) and within the intellectual norm (n = 60). Both groups completed the modified scale, DIDS/PL-1. The modified version proved to be a reliable instrument; the analysis of correlations found the relations between variables that are observed in other studies using the original DIDS and the Polish version, DIDS/PL. The modified version, DIDS/PL-1, can be used successfully among young people with a mild degree of intellectual disability.
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sonian and processual tradition of approaching personal identity. The instrument for measuring identity in this approach – *Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (DIDS)* – has been adapted for Polish conditions and functions under the same name, as *DIDS/PL* (Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2010).

The scale – both the original version and the Polish adaptation – has been used with various age groups (from early adolescence to adulthood, e.g., Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2009) and nationalities (for example, in Belgium – e.g., Luyckx, Soenens, & Goossens, 2006; in France and Switzerland – Zimmerman, Lannegrand-Willems, Safont-Mottay, & Cannard, 2013; in Poland – e.g., Brzezińska, Piotrowski, Garbarek-Sawicka, Karowska, & Muszyńska, 2010; in the United States – Schwartz et al., 2011; or in Italy – Crocetti, Luyckx, Scrignaro, & Sica, 2011), as well as with specific social groups: school students, university students (e.g., Rękosiewicz, 2013), working people (e.g., Luyckx, Duriez, Klimstra, & De Witte, 2010), and people with various kinds of disability (with diabetes: Luyckx, Seiffge-Krenke et al., 2008; with motor dysfunction: Piotrowski, 2010). It is not known, however, if the measure would work in the assessment of identity dimensions and statuses of people with intellectual disability. It seems that, as phrased in the scale, some of the items, especially the long ones, could be incomprehensible to them.

To date, no questionnaire for measuring identity specifically dedicated to this group has been developed (neither in accordance with Luyckx’s approach, nor, to my knowledge, in accordance with any other); there have only been attempts to construct a partly structured individual interview (Rękosiewicz, 2012a; 2012b; Rękosiewicz & Brzezińska, 2011). *DIDS* seems fit to be used among people with intellectual disability on the condition that a substantial part of it is modified in terms of language. The article presents the stages of the modification of *DIDS/PL* and an analysis of the psychometric properties of the new measure, *DIDS/PL-1*.

### THE THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE MEASURE

The scale under discussion is based on the dual-cycle model of identity formation by Koen Luyckx et al. (2006). Luyckx elaborated Marcia’s (1966) approach to identity, which in turn was a continuation of Erik H. Erikson’s thought; Erikson defined personal identity as a set of beliefs concerning oneself, the world, and other people, the perception of the sameness and continuity of the self despite the passage of time, and a sense of separateness and integrity (Erikson, 1950). However, it was Marcia that was the first to operationalize the dimensions of identity – exploration (seeking) and commitment – as well as the so-called identity statuses (e.g., Marcia, 1966; Marcia & Friedman, 1969; Toder & Marcia, 1973). Exploration was defined as orientational and exploratory activities, consisting in actively trying out and evaluating various alternatives before one has made choices to engage in action. Commitment making is the stage that follows exploration; it consists in making a decision and engaging in action. Depending on whether or not the two processes – corresponding to two consecutive stages of identity formation – take place (and on how intense they are), Marcia distinguished four identity statuses: achievement (high intensity of both identity dimensions), foreclosure (commitment and absent or weak exploration), moratorium (high exploration and absent or rare commitments), and diffusion (absence of exploration and absence of commitment).

Whereas Marcia argued that exploration takes place mainly in early adolescence and commitment occurs in late adolescence, nowadays it is pointed out that identity undergoes changes already in adolescence and at the beginning of adulthood, and that it may undergo further transformations during the rest of adulthood. Thus, identity is no longer treated as a state or permanent status; instead, it is viewed in dynamic terms – as a process taking place throughout adult life (Vleioras & Bosma, 2005).
In numerous studies (e.g., Bosma & Kunnen, 2001; Grotevant, 1987; Meeus, 1996; Meeus, Iedema, Helsen, & Vollebeorgh, 1999; Meeus, Iedema, & Maassen, 2002) it has been shown that: (1) there are various kinds of exploration (before and after making a commitment), (2) exploration and commitment are not two consecutive stages of identity formation, occurring in this particular order, but stages that may alternate, (3) there are two types of commitment (preliminary and final). Luyckx and colleague (Luyckx, Goossens, & Soenens, 2006), assumed that both exploration and commitment were two-phase processes, and the results of their studies support that assumption. Moreover, they distinguished the third type of exploration – so-called ruminative exploration (Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky et al., 2008). Eventually, the authors of the model described five dimensions of identity:

- **exploration in breadth**, understood as looking for possibilities of action appropriate to one's values, goals, and beliefs before one chooses the best of them;
- **commitment making**, defined as making preliminary choices of importance to identity;
- **exploration in depth**, presented as in-depth analysis of decisions already made in order to find out if the commitments made were the right choice;
- **identification with commitment**, meaning identification with the choices made, accompanied by the belief that these choices were the right ones for the individual;
- **ruminative exploration**, understood as fears, anxieties, and doubts concerning engagement in actions of importance to identity development.

The model by Luyckx et al. is referred to as the dual-cycle model of identity formation (Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, Beyers, & Missotten, 2011), because identity formation takes place in two cycles. Exploration in breadth and in depth constitute the first one – the commitment formation cycle. In the second cycle – commitment evaluation – the choice made is evaluated, which means the intensity of exploration in depth and identification with commitment increases.

In their numerous studies (e.g., Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky et al., 2008; Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, & Pollock, 2008), the authors of the dual-cycle model of identity formation confirmed the following relationships between identity dimensions:

- positive correlation between exploration in breadth and exploration in depth, which means that seeking alternatives involves their constant evaluation;
- positive correlation between commitment making and identification with commitment, which means that making choices fosters identification with them;
- negative correlation of ruminative exploration with commitment making and identification with commitment, which means that fears and uncertainty are not conducive to making important identity decisions;
- negative correlation between exploration in breadth and commitment making, which means choosing the best alternative is not accompanied by a need to seek others;
- positive correlation between exploration in depth and identification with commitment, which means evaluating choices fosters identification with them.

Similar correlation patterns are observed in Polish studies using **DIDS/PL** (e.g., Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2010).

The assessment of the sense of identity consists in measuring the intensity of each of the five dimensions and in establishing an individual identity profile based on which it is possible to identify identity status. The assessment instrument is the **Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (DIDS)**, adapted in Poland by Anna I. Brzezińska and Konrad Piotrowski (2010). The questionnaire measures the intensity of five identity dimensions (exploration in breadth, exploration in depth, ruminative exploration, commitment making, and identification with commitment). There are five items in each dimension. In various studies,
a similar finding is revealed concerning the reliability of five DIDS subscales (corresponding to five identity dimensions) – namely, a slightly lower value of Cronbach’s α for the exploration scales than for the commitment scales (examples from studies – Table 1).

STAGES OF CONSTRUCTING
THE MODIFIED DIDS/PL-1
FOR THE STUDY OF PEOPLE
WITH INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY

DIDS/PL, the Polish adaptation of DIDS (Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2010), is – just like the original version – a questionnaire consisting of 25 items in the form of declarative sentences. Each sentence is accompanied by the same scale of six answers (strongly disagree – disagree – rather disagree – rather agree – agree – strongly agree). In the instruction preceding the test, participants are requested to respond to each sentence by choosing one answer from the scale each time. DIDS/PL can be used in studies conducted on an individual basis as well as in groups.

Prepilot Study Using DIDS/PL

In order to make a preliminary assessment of whether the measure can be used in a study of people with intellectual disability, three individuals (aged 16, 21, and 22) with a mild degree of intellectual disability were invited. Each of them completed the questionnaire independently, in accordance with the principles of its administration. Afterwards, each person was interviewed and asked about the difficulties encountered when completing the questionnaire, particularly about the comprehensibility of each item. The participants pointed out that: (1) some of the sentences were too long (these comments referred to items 11, 16, and 21) and had to be read at least twice to be understood; (2) numerous words or expressions were completely incomprehensible or raised doubts regarding how they were to be understood, e.g., “image,” “the direction you follow in your life,” “path of life,” “value your plans for the future”; (3) the list of response options is long and thereby difficult to process mentally; (4) the scale would be easier to use if the items were read out by a different person, with access to the answer sheet being left to the participant.

The Construction of New Items

After this preliminary assessment, a decision was made to reduce the number of response options from six to four (disagree – rather disagree – rather agree – agree) and to retain the same number of items in the questionnaire (25). Shorter and linguistically simpler equivalents of all the sentences from DIDS/PL were constructed.

Table 1. The Values of Cronbach’s α Coefficients for the Subscales of DIDS and DIDS/PL in Selected Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>DIDS: Cronbach’s α</th>
<th>DIDS/PL: Cronbach’s α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploration in Breadth</td>
<td>.81/ .76/ .84</td>
<td>.76/ .70/ .72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration in Depth</td>
<td>.79/ .79/ .81</td>
<td>.70/ .70/ .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruminative Exploration</td>
<td>.86/ .85/ .85</td>
<td>.78/ .82/ .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Making</td>
<td>.86/ .83/ .91</td>
<td>.88/ .85/ .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification With Commitment</td>
<td>.86/ .85/ .93</td>
<td>.85/ .82/ .86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Luyckx, Soens, Goossens, Beckx, & Wouters, 2008 (n = 895).
2) Luyckx, Vansteenkiste, Goossens, & Duriez, 2009 (n = 714).
3) Schwartz et al., 2012 (n = 2411).
4) Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2010a (n = 174).
5) Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2010 (n = 100).
6) Piotrowski, Kaczan, & Rękosiewicz, 2013 (n = 693).
Evaluation by Competent Judges and the Modification of New Items

Three competent judges, doctoral students from the Institute of Psychology at the Adam Mickiewicz University, specializing in human development psychology, received the set of statements from DIDS/PL (each statement on a separate white sheet of paper) and the set of new statements (each one on a separate yellow sheet). Their task was to match them into pairs: “a white sheet and a yellow sheet” with sentences meaning the same. Not in all cases did the judges agree in matching the items, but those that they matched belonged to the same scales. This is a satisfactory result, since items within the same scales in DIDS/PL are very similar to one another in terms of content. Three statements were not correctly matched by all the three judges with another statement from the same scale (these were statements from exploration scales mismatched with statements from other exploration scales). The items with regard to which there was no full agreement among the judges were modified again.

Another Evaluation by Competent Judges

Three other competent judges – this time practicing psychologists working with intellectually disabled people on a daily basis – were given the same task: they were given the set of modified statements as well as the set of statements from DIDS/PL and asked to match “similar sentences” – those that had the same meaning. They were unanimous in matching all of the statements to others from the same scales. Thus, the items were verified by competent judges in terms of content validity. Examples of original and modified items are juxtaposed in Table 2.

Table 2. Examples of Modified DIDS/PL-1 Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Item numbers</th>
<th>Example item in DIDS/PL</th>
<th>Source of difficulties</th>
<th>Item in the modified version DIDS/PL-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>5, 10, 13, 17, 23</td>
<td>23. Staram się odkryć, jaki styl życia byłby dla mnie dobry (I try to find out which lifestyle would be good for me).</td>
<td>Incomprehensible expression: styl życia (lifestyles)</td>
<td>23. Zastanawiam się, co moglibym robić w przyszłości, żeby czuć się z tym dobrze (I think about what I could do in the future to feel good doing it).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>4, 11, 16, 19, 21</td>
<td>21. Staram się odkryć, co inni ludzie myślą na temat konkretnych kierunków, które chcą obrać w życiu (I try to find out what other people think about the specific direction I want to take in my life).</td>
<td>The sentence is too long.</td>
<td>21. Pytałem innych ludzi, co myślą o moich planach (I have asked other people what they thought about my plans).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>2, 7, 9, 20, 24</td>
<td>2. Mam wątpliwości dotyczące tego, co naprawdę chcę osiągnąć w życiu (I am doubtful about what I really want to achieve in life).</td>
<td>Incomprehensible expression: wątpliwości (doubtful)</td>
<td>2. Ciągle jeszcze do końca nie wiem, co moglibym robić w przyszłości (I am still not sure what I could do in the future).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>1, 6, 12, 14, 22</td>
<td>12. Mam jasną wizję mojej przyszłości (I have a clear view of my future).</td>
<td>Incomprehensible expression: wizja (image)</td>
<td>12. Wyobrażam sobie siebie dokładnie w przyszłości (I can imagine exactly what I am going to do in the future).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>3, 8, 15, 18, 25</td>
<td>18. Czuję, że kierunek, który chcę obrać w życiu, naprawdę będzie do mnie pasował (I sense that the direction I want to take in my life will really suit me).</td>
<td>Incomprehensible expression: kierunek, który chcę obrać w życiu (the direction I want to take in my life)</td>
<td>18. To, co sobie zaplanowałem, pasuje do mnie (What I have planned to do suits me).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


THE DIDS/PL-1 QUESTIONNAIRE AND THE STUDY PROCEDURE

The changes made in the measure concerned not only the content but also the procedure. In the modified version, the items of the questionnaire are read aloud by the researcher during a one-to-one session, and the participant’s task is to choose one of four answers, rating the extent to which the item refers to him or her. Although a considerable proportion of people with mild intellectual disability do learn to read and write and cope with it well, for some of them this activity may be too tiresome, making it difficult to complete the questionnaire. The study is carried out on an individual basis, with the researcher reading out consecutive items to the participant. Additionally, to make the task easier, a sheet of paper is placed in front of the participant, with answers on it: (disagree – rather disagree – rather agree – agree). When the respondent has given his or her answer, the researcher writes it down on the answer sheet. Thus prepared, the questionnaire is preceded by the researcher reading out the modified version, the items of the questionnaire are read aloud by the researcher during the one-to-one session, and the participant’s task is to choose one of four answers, rating the extent to which the item refers to him or her.

Just like the original scale, the questionnaire consists of 25 items in the form of declarative sentences about the participant making plans for the future. These items make up five scales (with five items in each scale) corresponding to five identity dimensions. Examples of new items for each scale read as follows:

- **Exploration in Breadth scale:** Zastanawiam się nad tym, czym mógłbym się zajmować w przyszłości / I think about what I could do in the future (the original version reads: Siaram się odkryć, jaki styl życia byłby dla mnie dobry / I try to find out which lifestyle would be good for me);
- **Exploration in Depth scale:** Pytalem innych ludzi, co myślą o moich planach / I have asked other people what they thought about my plans (the original version reads: Staram się odkryć, co inni ludzie myślą na temat konkretnych kierunków, które chcą obrać w życiu / I try to find out what other people think about the specific direction I decided to take in my life);
- **Ruminative Exploration scale:** Boj się czasem o moją przyszłość / Sometimes I worry about my future (the original version reads: Mam obawy dotyczące tego, co chcę zrobić ze swoją przyszłością / I worry about what I want to do with my future);
- **Commitment Making scale:** Wiem już, co chcę w życiu robić / I already know what I want to do in my life (the original version reads: Wiem, co chcę osiągnąć w życiu / I know what I want to achieve in my life);
- **Identification With Commitment scale:** To, co sobie zaplanowałem, pasuje do mnie / What I have planned to do suits me (the original version reads: Czuję, że kierunek który chcę obrać w życiu, naprawdę będzie do mnie pasował / I sense that the direction I want to take in my life will really suit me).

The DIDS/PL-1 result is the mean score for each of the five scales. For each item, the respondent can score the following numbers of points, respectively: 1 point for answering disagree, 2 points for answering rather disagree, 3 points for answering rather agree, and 4 points for answering agree.

THE PLAN OF THE PRESENT STUDY

Two studies were conducted using the modified version of the measure, DIDS/PL-1. The aim of the first one was to compare the psychometric properties of DIDS/PL and the modified DIDS/PL-1 version, administered in one group – to people within the intellectual norm. The aim of the second study was to compare the psychometric properties of DIDS/PL-1 administered in two groups – to people within the intellectual norm and to people with a mild degree of intellectual disability.
The Construction of the Modified Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (DIDS/PL-1)...

Study 1

Hypothesis
In Study 1, it was hypothesized that the modified version, DIDS-PL-1, was a valid and reliable measure to a similar degree as the baseline version, DIDS/PL. In order to test the hypothesis, a study was carried out on an individual basis with the same group of people using DIDS/PL and DIDS/PL-1; next, the reliability coefficients of the scales in the two measures were compared and an analysis of correlations between the scales of the former instrument and those of the latter was performed (the validity of DIDS/PL-1).

Procedure
The participants in the study were 100 university students aged 19–27 years (M = 21.59, SD = 1.85; 71% women), within the intellectual norm. The study was carried out on an individual basis. The participants completed the paper-and-pencil version of DIDS/PL on their own. DIDS/PL-1, by contrast, was read out, and the answers given were indicated by the researcher on the answer sheet.

Results

The reliability of DIDS/PL-1
An acceptable reliability of the new scale was obtained. The values of Cronbach’s α for DIDS/PL-1 were as follows: .72 for the Exploration in Breadth scale (compared to .65 in DIDS/PL); .71 (70) for Exploration in Depth; .76 (.82) for Ruminative Exploration; .90 (.86) for Commitment Making; .90 (.84) for Identification With Commitment. The differences in the values of α obtained for the modified version were similar to those obtained for the original version and for the first Polish adaptation in the case of commitment scales (slightly higher values) and exploration scales (slightly lower values).

The validity of DIDS/PL-1
In order to test the construct (convergent) validity of the instrument, correlations were computed between identity dimensions measured using DIDS/PL-1 and the corresponding dimensions in DIDS/PL. In each case, positive correlations were obtained at an acceptable level (see Table 3) – from moderate (in the case of Exploration in Breadth and Exploration in Depth) to strong (in the case of the remaining scales). The score on each subscale except Exploration in Breadth in the modified version correlated the most strongly with the score on the same scale in DIDS/PL (in Table 3, respectively: EB–EB-o; RE–RE-o; CM–CM-o; IC–IC-o). The score on the Exploration in Breadth scale in the modified version correlated a little more strongly with ruminative exploration (r = .59) than with exploration in breadth in the original version.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>IC</th>
<th>EB-o</th>
<th>ED-o</th>
<th>RE-o</th>
<th>CM-o</th>
<th>IC-o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-3.5</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>-.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3. Pearson’s r Correlations Between Identity Dimensions Measured Using DIDS/PL and DIDS/PL-1 – the Modified Version – in Study 1

version \((r = .55)\), though the difference was not large; at the same time, ruminative exploration measured using the original version correlated the most strongly and positively with ruminative exploration from the modified version \((r = .83)\), much more strongly than with exploration in breadth \((r = .59)\).

**Conclusions**

The modified version of DIDS/PL was found to have acceptable reliability and construct validity. In the analysis of correlations, most of the relationships observed in other studies (e.g., Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2010; Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky et al., 2008; Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, & Pollock, 2008) were confirmed, though not with regard to the scales measuring exploration in depth and identification with commitment – a negative correlation could be expected in this case, but the relationship found between these dimensions was not significant. It should be stressed, however, that both in Polish studies using DIDS/PL and in Luyckx’s studies the correlation, if it occurred, was weak (Pearson’s \( r \) from -.20 to -.35; Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2010; Luyckx, Schwartz, Berzonsky et al., 2008; Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, & Pollock, 2008). In some studies, a weak positive correlation was even observed (e.g., Piotrowski, Kaczan, & Rękosiewicz, 2013, Crocetti, Luyckx, Scrignaro, & Sica, 2011; Zimmerman, Lamengrand-Willems, Safont-Mottay, & Cannard, 2013). A much greater problem would have been a lack of correlation, for example, between the scales measuring exploration in breadth and exploration in depth, which is positive and at least moderate in strength in all the studies that I am aware of, or the lack of correlation between the commitment scales, which is also always positive, at last moderate and usually strong. In Study 1, these relations were replicated.

**Study 2**

**Hypothesis**

In Study 2 it was hypothesized that DIDS/PL-1 was a reliable and valid measure to a comparable degree in two groups: the group of people within the intellectual norm and the group of people with mild intellectual disability.

**Procedure**

Study 2 constituted one of the stages of a larger research project aimed at seeking the social mechanisms of identity formation in people with intellectual disability. The participants were 127 individuals, including 67 with mild intellectual disability (PID) and 60 within the intellectual norm (IHP), representing two age groups: late adolescence (16–17 years) and emerging adulthood (20–21 years; Table 4).

All the participants were examined individually. Items from the modified version, DIDS/PL-1, were read out to them, and the participant was supposed to choose one of the answers. This procedure was applied also with people within the intellectual norm to make further intergroup comparisons possible.

**Table 4. Participants in Study 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PID adolescence</td>
<td>PID emerging adulthood</td>
<td>IHP adolescence</td>
<td>IHP emerging adulthood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (% of women)</td>
<td>36 (41.7%)</td>
<td>31 (38.7%)</td>
<td>30 (63.3%)</td>
<td>30 (70.0%)</td>
<td>127 (52.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>(M = 16.36) (SD = 0.49)</td>
<td>(M = 20.42) (SD = 0.50)</td>
<td>(M = 16.23) (SD = 0.43)</td>
<td>(M = 20.43) (SD = 0.50)</td>
<td>(M = 18.35) (SD = 2.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* PID – people with intellectual disability, IHP – intellectually healthy people.
In all the groups, information was collected from the participants after the study – they were asked about their general impressions of the study as well as about whether any sentences were incomprehensible, whether the questionnaire was easy or difficult, and whether they would make any changes in it. Some of the participants expressed dissatisfaction with the high similarity of items, and many suggested shortening the questionnaire. Yet, importantly, no one reported that any sentence was incomprehensible. What the participants regarded as difficult was only the necessity of spending more time thinking about some of the sentences – the difficulty as they subjectively perceived it was associated with the necessity of engaging in self-reflection (often for the first time on this subject in the participants’ life – as was declared mainly by people with intellectual disability, but also by nondisabled ones) rather than with the sentences being formulated in excessively convoluted ways.

**Results**

**The reliability of DIDS/PL-1**

In order to verify the hypothesis, a reliability analysis was performed. The values of Cronbach’s $\alpha$ in the group of people with intellectual disability were as follows: .71 for the Exploration in Breadth scale (compared to .74 for nondisabled people), .70 for Exploration in Depth (.72 for nondisabled people), .71 for Ruminative Exploration (.71 for nondisabled people), .76 for Commitment Making (.91 for nondisabled people), and .82 for Identification With Commitment (.89 for nondisabled people). These values are sufficient for the measure to be regarded as reliable, and at the same time close to those obtained in Study 1 as well as in studies conducted using the original version of DIDS and the Polish adaptation, DIDS/PL.

**Table 5. Pearson’s $r$ Correlations Between Identity Dimensions Measured Using DIDS/PL-1 – the Modified Version – in Study 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>ED</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people with intellectual disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people within intellectual norm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-.71**</td>
<td>-.61**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$. 

The validity of DIDS/PL-1

The analysis of correlations performed separately for the two groups of participants revealed positive correlations – also found in other studies – between exploration in breadth and exploration in depth as well as between commitment making and identification with commitment (Table 5). Negative correlation of ruminative exploration with commitment making and identification with commitment was observed only in the group of nondisabled people. In people with disability, this relationship was not statistically significant. The positive correlation observed in other studies between exploration in depth and identification with commitment was found only among people with disability. In nondisabled people, this relationship was negative but weak. A difference between the two groups is visible also with regard to the relationship between exploration in breadth and commitment making. In other studies, the correlation between these two variables is usually negative. In this case, negative correlation was observed only in the group of people within the intellectual norm, while among disabled individuals the relationship was positive. In both groups, however, the correlations were weak.

Conclusions

In Study 2, the scales of the modified version of DIDS/PL were found to have acceptable reliability. At the same time, the values of Cronbach’s α are similar in the groups of nondisabled and disabled people. The strongest and the most frequently recurring relationships between variables observed in other studies (strong positive correlations between exploration in breadth and exploration in depth and between commitment making and identification with commitment) were found in both of these groups.

DISCUSSION

The Dimensions of Identity Development Scale (DIDS/PL) was adapted to Polish conditions (Brzezińska & Piotrowski, 2010) and has been used in scientific research carried out on various groups, but not yet with intellectually disabled people. It is estimated that these people constitute as much as 2–3% of the population, and 89% of them have a mild degree of disability (Burack, Russo, Flores, Iarocci, & Zigler, 2012). Even though this is a large group, the psychology of human development has only recently begun to be interested in young people with intellectual disability entering adulthood, including the formation of their personal identity (Burack et al., 2012). Perhaps one of the causes behind this state of affairs is the lack of appropriate instruments enabling its assessment. The modification of DIDS/PL was meant to remedy this deficit; it was supposed to provide a reliable instrument and indirectly contribute to extending knowledge about the development of identity in young people with intellectual disability.

The most important changes made in the Polish adaptation of DIDS concern the content of the questionnaire’s items, the length of the response scale, and the administration procedure. With the same order retained, all the items of the Polish version, DIDS/PL, were shortened and linguistically simplified. The scale of responses was reduced from six to four (two responses were removed and the others were not changed). The modified version can only be used for studies carried out on an individual basis: all the items are read out by the researcher. The participant’s activity is limited to selecting and uttering one response specifying his or her attitude to a given item.

The analyses showed this measure to be reliable to a degree comparable with the original version (DIDS) and the Polish adaptation of the original version (DIDS/PL). In Study 1, conducted on a group of people within the intellectual norm, the results of identity measurements using DIDS/PL and using its modified version, DIDS/PL-1, were juxtaposed. The corresponding scales had similar high values of Cronbach’s α. The analysis of correlations yielded similar associations also between variables within each meas-
ure, as well as moderate to strong correlations between corresponding scales in the two measures (construct validity).

In Study 2, using the modified version (DIDS/PL-1) only, the participants were people with intellectual disability, aged 16–17 years (late adolescence) and 20–21 years (emerging adulthood) and people within the intellectual norm at the same age. The modified version (DIDS/PL-1) turned out to be a reliable instrument, and the analysis of correlations identified the two strongest associations between variables (exploration in breadth – exploration in depth, and commitment making – identification with commitment) observed in other studies using the original version (DIDS) and the Polish version (DIDS/PL).

The modified version (DIDS/PL-1) can be used with young people with a mild degree of intellectual disability. As an instrument for assessing identity dimensions and statuses, it can find its applications not only in scientific research but also in psychological practice, in individual assessment of teenagers and young adults. Among other things, it can serve as a tool for identifying the risk group including people with an identity diffusion or foreclosure status as well as with a high intensity of ruminative exploration. As studies show, these are people with special difficulties in psychosocial functioning (Clancy & Dollinger, 1993; Helson & Srivastava, 2001; Luyckx, Schwartz, Goossens, & Pollock, 2008).

So far, research on identity development has focused mainly on the subjective determinants of its development or on its subjective correlates. Much less is known about the social mechanisms of identity development, as well as about identity development in “atypical” social groups with special kinds of experience, such as social or national minorities, nonstudents, or – finally – individuals with various physical limitations (Schwartz, 2001).

Studies should be conducted on various groups of people with mild intellectual disability – among students, employed people (in places dedicated to them, such as occupation activation centers or sheltered employment facilities, as well as in the open market) using the facilities dedicated to them, living with their parents or on their own, having completed (or receiving) special education or education in general public schools. Such research would provide important information about the role of specific kinds of positive and negative experience in building these people’s identity (cf. Rękosiewicz, 2012a; Rękosiewicz & Brzezińska, 2011).
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