



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

Elaheh Khezri, Alexander Tatarko

**PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES
AND VALIDATION OF THE
PERSIAN VERSION OF THE
STATUS-BASED IDENTITY
UNCERTAINTY SCALE IN IRAN**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM
WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: PSYCHOLOGY
WP BRP 136/PSY/2023

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE

PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES AND VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE STATUS-BASED IDENTITY UNCERTAINTY SCALE IN IRAN³

Status-based identity uncertainty (SBIU) is the extent of instability in an individual's understanding of their socioeconomic status (SES). This study aimed to adapt and validate the SBIU scale within the general Iranian population. We translated this scale into Persian and collected data from 162 Iranian adults. Corrected item-total correlations and Cronbach's alpha coefficient (.85) supported the reliability of this instrument. Factor analysis yielded a two-factor model consisting of status doubt and status instability. Convergent validity was confirmed by establishing the unique association of SBIU with SES and income. The distinct factor loading of SBIU from self-concept clarity also provided support for its discriminant validity. Overall, this study establishes the reliability and validity of the SBIU scale for measuring status uncertainty in Iran.

Keywords: Status-based identity uncertainty, socioeconomic status, self-concept clarity,
Iran

JEL Classification: Z.

¹ Former student at National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University), School of Psychology, ekhezri@edu.hse.ru

² Professor at National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University), School of Psychology, atatarko@hse.ru

³ This research was implemented to validate the necessary instrument as part of a master's thesis within the masters program 'Applied Social Psychology' at HSE University.

Background

Recent social psychological research deems social class as a cultural context that fosters distinct socialization practices, resulting in diverse thoughts, feelings, behaviors, and life outcomes (Kraus et al., 2019). Consequently, individuals' subjective perception of their socioeconomic status (SES) along with its objective indicators such as occupation, education, and income have psychological implications (e.g., Carey & Markus, 2017; Miyamoto et al., 2018; Yu & Blader, 2020) that need to be addressed. This need is more highlighted when considering that individuals tend to view their socioeconomic standing as a central component of their identity, even compared to gender and ethnicity (Thomas & Azmitia, 2014).

The growing significance of the identity function of SES has led to conceptualization of status-based identity (Destin & Debrosse, 2017), defined as “the subjective understanding, meaning, and value that people attach to their SES from moment to moment in real time.” (Destin et al., 2017, p. 271). This identity intertwines with narrative, social, and future identity, as it helps individuals construct a cohesive life story, foster a sense of belonging to their class-based social group, and generate ideas for their future (Destin & Debrosse, 2017). However, due to the malleable nature of SES, status-based identity may be subject to instability during periods of social mobility. Addressing this issue, Destin et al. (2017) proposed the construct of status-based identity uncertainty (SBIU) to quantify the extent to which one's understanding of their SES may be strong and stable or weak and unstable.

Status-based identity uncertainty is conceptually related to, yet distinct from self-concept clarity (SCC) (Destin et al., 2017). SCC captures one's sense of stability, consistency, and clarity of their generalized self-concept (Campbell et al., 1996), while status-based identity uncertainty taps into their uncertainty at the level of status-based identity. This distinction implies that self-concept clarity is more informed by general psychological characteristics and encompasses various self-related mechanisms, while status-based identity is more tied to an individuals' socioeconomic situation and social mobility. Nevertheless, these constructs are closely

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

connected, as individuals with a higher self-concept clarity tend to have lower status-based identity uncertainty (Destin et al., 2017).

Taking into account these conceptual underpinnings, Destin et al. (2017) developed the SBIU scale by adapting the SCC scale. While the items of the SCC scale emphasize individuals' sense of clarity, consistency, and stability of their self-concept, the SBIU scale measures these qualities with respect to one's understanding of their SES. This scale has thus far been validated only among first-year undergraduate students of an American university. This group was selected due to the probability of experiencing social mobility when entering college. The validation study provided evidence of acceptable interitem correlation for all items, establishing the internal consistency of this scale. Furthermore, construct validity was confirmed by demonstrating that items of both the SBIU and SCC, while interrelated ($r = -.556, p < .001$), load on distinct factors. Additionally, this research revealed that SBIU is uniquely associated with lower self-esteem and income levels when controlling for SCC. It further showed that greater levels of SBIU were linked to a pessimistic future identity, a less coherent narrative identity, and a weaker sense of belonging in college. These associations served as means of establishing convergent and discriminant validity of this instrument (Destin et al., 2017).

The SBIU scale is yet to be validated in other countries. Given that status-based identity uncertainty is impacted by social mobility, it is specially relevant to the context of Iran where extreme cases of mobility are present. Precisely, Ghahremanpour (2003) mentions that the excessive interference of Iranian government in the economy and the correlation of economical power with political and religious affiliations has led to extremity of social mobility in Iran. As a result, social classes in this country lack the element of continuity and individuals frequently experience status change over the course of their lives. This account is backed by the historical discourse on social classes in Iran, which hold that this country's ecological and political features have historically hindered the long-term accumulation of capital. For example, with respect to the political features, it was suggested that no long-standing social classes have existed in Iran,

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

as the Iranian states have historically had the unrestrained power of assigning or revoking land and titles regardless of one's social class (Katouzian, 2010). Therefore, it may be proposed that living in this political and economical context amplifies the salience of social mobility in everyday experiences of individuals, thereby contributing to a sense of status-based identity uncertainty. This proposition underscores the significance of validating the Persian version of the SBIU scale in Iran.

Method

Translation

Forward and back translation methods were used to translate the SBIU scale from English to Persian. There were two possible ways to translate this scale (Appendix A). The first approach entailed a complete word-by-word translation, in which the phrases of “where I stand in society”, “social standing”, “social status”, “standing in society”, and “status in society” were translated to their exact Persian equivalent. This version (referred as pilot version in Appendix A) was piloted in a sample of 204 Iranians, but it did not perform as expected. Namely, this version did not significantly correlate with any indexes of socioeconomic status, including income.

Consequently, a second translation was adapted (referred as final version in Appendix A) wherein the aforementioned phrases were translated to the Persian equivalent of “where I socioeconomically stand in society”, “socioeconomic standing”, “socioeconomic status”, “socioeconomic standing in society”, and “socioeconomic status in society”. The nuances of Persian language and culture justify the clarification of “socioeconomic” in our translation. To be specific, ambiguous phrases such as “social standing”, when translated to Persian, may tap into various cultural notions of status, such as dignity [شأن] and honor [آبرو] that are broader than socioeconomic status and encompass multiple facets. Hence, specifying the measure's reference to socioeconomic status could help prevent the activation of other interfering cultural concepts.

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

As expected, this second translation performed in accordance with Destin et al. (2017) and significantly correlated with socioeconomic status and income (see Results).

Data Collection

The questionnaire was prepared using Porsline (an Iranian survey platform) and distributed online via a popular Telegram channel named Farsi Tweets [فارسی توییت‌ر]. This channel was selected due to its extensive audience reach (around 500,000 subscribers) and the non-specific nature of its content, making the ad likely to be viewed by diverse segments of society. Accordingly, our sample included 162 Iranian adults aged from 18 to 60 ($M = 29$, $SD = 9$). The share of employed individuals was 54.3%, which is close to the employment to population ratio of 39.7% in Iran (International Labor Organization, 2017). The majority of the sample were women (72.2%). The distribution of SES levels was normal ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 0.67$, Skewness = .06, Kurtosis = -.20).

Measures

Given that the present study was part of a larger research on the role of sociocultural self-construals in Iran, the questionnaire included numerous measures. Only the measures pertaining to the validation of the SBIU are reported here.

Status-based Identity Uncertainty (SBIU). SBIU self-report scale was developed and validated by Destin et al. (2017). This study was the first attempt to provide the Persian translation (reported under final version in Appendix A) of this instrument. The scale has 11 items (e.g., “یک روز ممکن است یک نظر در مورد جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی خود داشته باشم و روز دیگر ممکن است نظر دیگری داشته باشم. [On one day I might have one opinion of my social standing and on another day I might have a different opinion.]”) with a 7-point Likert scale (1 = “strongly disagree”, 7 = “strongly agree”).

Socioeconomic Status. SES was measured by Ghodrathnama et al. (2013) scale of SES in Iran. This scale has been validated by Eslami et al. (2014) and has a Cronbach's alpha of .83 for

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

six items that correspond to family income, subjective SES, individual's education, education of their parents, their house value, and their financial ability to purchase a house. An example item is "فکر می‌کنید درآمد شما (یا خانواده‌تان) به چه میزان برای هزینه‌ی زندگی‌تان کفایت می‌کند؟" [How much do you think your (or your family's) income is enough for your living expenses?]. Responses are indicated on Likert-type scales with verbal anchors (e.g., 1 = "Absolutely insufficient", 5 = "Absolutely sufficient"). The alpha of this scale in the present study was .76.

Self-Concept Clarity. The English SCC scale (Campbell et al., 1996) has been previously translated and validated among Iranians (Razian et al., 2019; $\alpha = .83$). There are 12 items (e.g., "در یک روز ممکن است نظری درباره‌ی خودم داشته باشم و در روز دیگر ممکن است نظر متفاوتی داشته باشم." [On one day I might have one opinion of myself and on another day I might have a different opinion.]) with a 7-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree", 7 = "strongly agree"). This scale had an alpha of .85 in the present sample.

Self-Esteem. Rosenberg Self-Esteem (RSE) scale, translated and validated in Iran by Shapurian et al. (1987), was included in our questionnaire. This measure has 10 items (e.g., "احساس می‌کنم چند ویژگی خوب دارم." [I feel that I have a number of good qualities.]) with a 4-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly disagree", 4 = "strongly agree"). This study yielded a Cronbach's alpha of .89 for this scale.

Sociodemographic variables. Participants also indicated their gender, age, and employment status.

Statistical Procedures

Cronbach's alpha and interitem correlations were used as the criteria of reliability. To assess factorial validity, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for a two-factor and one-factor model with all items of the SBIU and SCC was conducted. Another CFA was performed to examine a two-factor model of the SBIU alone. As for convergent and discriminant validity,

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

partial correlations of SBIU with SES, income, and self-esteem, when controlling for SCC, were analyzed. Discriminant validity was further examined by investigating the distinction of SBIU from SCC.

Results

Descriptive Findings

There were no missing values in the data. The descriptive results for continuous and categorical variables are presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Continuous Variables

Variable	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	18	60	29.09	9.38
Income	1	5	2.44	1.07
SES	1.33	4.67	2.59	0.67
SBIU	1	6.73	4.01	1.06
SCC	1	7	4.15	1.32
RSE	1.10	4	2.61	0.63

Note. *N* = 162. SES = socioeconomic status; SBIU = status-based identity uncertainty; SCC = self-concept clarity; RSE = Rosenberg self-esteem.

Table 2

Descriptives for Categorical Variables

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Female	117	72.2
Male	45	27.8
Education		
Less than high-school diploma	44	27.2
High-school diploma	46	28.4
Associate's or bachelor's degree	47	29
Master's degree	18	11.1
PhD	7	4.3
Employment		
Employed	88	54.3
Unemployed	74	45.7

Note. $N = 162$

Reliability

Reliability was assessed by calculating Cronbach's alpha and interitem correlations. This analysis provided an alpha of .85, which is considered satisfactory and establishes the internal consistency of this scale in our sample. Regarding interitem correlations, as shown by Table 3, all items except item 10 had acceptable interitem correlations (within the range of .15-.50; Clark & Watson, 1995). Corrected item-total correlations yielded adequate results for all items (above .30; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). With respect to item 10, the observed results may be attributed to the reverse-coding, given that such coding was only employed for this item. Nevertheless, considering the satisfactory corrected item-total correlation, we opted not to exclude this item.

Table 3

Interitem and Corrected Item Total Correlations of SBIU Items

Item number	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1	1.000										
2	.224	1.000									
3	.365	.217	1.000								
4	.382	.332	.470	1.000							
5	.332	.261	.434	.491	1.000						
6	.343	.281	.326	.510	.335	1.000					
7	.189	.569	.322	.317	.410	.384	1.000				
8	.191	.610	.318	.337	.365	.302	.711	1.000			
9	.174	.367	.203	.365	.417	.426	.390	.474	1.000		
10	-.005	.236	.044	.086	.124	.156	.333	.367	.344	1.000	
11	.211	.373	.281	.184	.404	.313	.515	.545	.544	.461	1.000
Corrected Item-Total Correlation	.371	.547	.461	.547	.564	.528	.667	.680	.585	.330	.608

Note. Values below the ideal range are indicated by bold face. SBIU = status-based identity uncertainty

Validity

Factorial, convergent, and discriminant validity of the SBIU scale were examined.

Factorial Validity

CFA was conducted in an attempt to replicate the theory-driven two-factor structure proposed by Destin et al. (2017). This model includes all items of the SBIU and SCC and assumes that each scale would load on a separate factor. The results of our study (Table 4) demonstrated that items loaded on their respective factors, with all paths being significant. The only exception was the factor loading of the 11th item of SCC, which fell below 0.3. This low

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

factor loading could potentially be attributed to the item's different coding. Fit statistics of this model, however, were marginal; CFI = .813, RMSEA = .095, SRMR = .080.

Table 4

Factor Loadings of SBIU and SCC with Maximum Likelihood Analyses

Items	Factor loading	
	1	2
SBIU		
1. My beliefs about where I stand in society often conflict with one another.	.316	
2. On one day I might have one opinion of my social standing and on another day I might have a different opinion.	.640	
3. I spend a lot of time wondering about where I stand in society.	.453	
4. Sometimes I feel that I am not really the social status that others think I am.	.520	
5. When I think about the kind of person I have been in the past, I'm not sure what it means for my current social standing.	.571	
6. Sometimes I think it's easier to identify where other people stand in society than to identify where I stand.	.538	
7. My beliefs about where I stand in society seem to change frequently.	.769	
8. If I were asked to describe my standing in society, my description might end up being different from one day to another day.	.791	
9. Even if I wanted to, I don't think I could tell someone how I view my own social standing.	.633	
10. In general, I have a clear sense of where I stand in society. (R)	.426	
11. It is often hard for me to make up my mind about things because I don't have a clear sense of my status in society.	.671	
SCC		
1. My beliefs about myself often conflict with one another. (R)		.715
2. On one day I might have one opinion of myself and on another day I might have a different opinion. (R)		.847
3. I spend a lot of time wondering about what kind of person I really am. (R)		.566

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

4. Sometimes I feel that I am not really the person that I appear to be. (R)	.690
5. When I think about the kind of person I have been in the past, I'm not sure what I was really like. (R)	.708
6. Sometimes I think I know other people better than I know myself. (R)	.594
7. My beliefs about myself seem to change very frequently. (R)	.910
8. If I were asked to describe my personality, my description might end up being different from one day to another day. (R)	.800
9. Even if I wanted to, I don't think I could tell someone what I'm really like. (R)	.685
10. In general, I have a clear sense of who I am and what I am.	.329
11. I seldom experience conflict between the different aspects of my personality.	.274
12. It is often hard for me to make up my mind about things because I don't really know what I want. (R)	.667

Note. SBIU = status-based identity uncertainty; SCC = self-concept clarity; (R) = reverse-scored item.

As per suggestion of Destin et al. (2017), a one-factor model including all items of SBIU and SCC was also explored. In accordance with the original study, the fit of this model was significantly worse than the two-factor model mentioned above; $\chi^2_{\text{difference}} = 150.39, p < .0001$, showing that despite the correlation between SBIU and SCC, they represent distinct factors.

In order to explore a more suitable fit, a two-factor model of SBIU alone was also tested. This model yielded acceptable fit statistics (CFI = .910, RMSEA = .089, SRMR = .063), indicating that in our sample, SBIU appears to consist of two factors, with the first factor pertaining to status doubt, and the second factor concerning temporal instability and unclarity of status. The path loadings are presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Two-Factor Model of SBIU Based on Maximum Likelihood Analyses

Items	Factor loading	
	1	2
Factor 1: Status doubt		
1. My beliefs about where I stand in society often conflict with one another.	.515	
3. I spend a lot of time wondering about where I stand in society.	.621	
4. Sometimes I feel that I am not really the social status that others think I am.	.750	
5. When I think about the kind of person I have been in the past, I'm not sure what it means for my current social standing.	.660	
6. Sometimes I think it's easier to identify where other people stand in society than to identify where I stand.	.618	
Factor 2: Status instability and unclarity		
2. On one day I might have one opinion of my social standing and on another day I might have a different opinion.		.677
7. My beliefs about where I stand in society seem to change frequently.		.805
8. If I were asked to describe my standing in society, my description might end up being different from one day to another day.		.855
9. Even if I wanted to, I don't think I could tell someone how I view my own social standing.		.589
10. In general, I have a clear sense of where I stand in society. (R)		.445
11. It is often hard for me to make up my mind about things because I don't have a clear sense of my status in society.		.668

Note. SBIU = status-based identity uncertainty; (R) = reverse-scored item.

Convergent and Discriminant Validity

For convergent and discriminant validity, partial correlations were conducted to determine if SBIU is uniquely correlated with SES, when controlling for SCC. The relationship of SCC with SES, controlling for SBIU, was also investigated. As anticipated, SBIU was uniquely associated with SES, whereas SCC had no unique correlation with SES.

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

In line with Destin et al. (2017), we also investigated the relationships between SBIU and the sole measure of income, controlling for SCC, as well as between SCC and income when controlling for SBIU. The findings replicated the original study, with SBIU displaying a unique relationship with income, while SCC demonstrated no such link.

Furthermore, the original study explored the distinct associations of SBIU and SCC with self-esteem and established a relationship between SBIU and self-esteem, even when controlling for SCC. However, the current analysis did not replicate this finding, as SBIU had no significant association with self-esteem when controlling for SCC. Conversely, SCC correlated with self-esteem when controlling for SBIU. Detailed results can be found in Table 6.

Table 6

The Unique Relationships between SBIU/SCC and Relevant Variables Indicated by Partial Correlations

Variables	SBIU, controlling for SCC	SCC, controlling for SBIU
SES	-.266**	-.106
Income	-.261**	-.106
RSE	-.014	.544***

Note. SBIU = status-based identity uncertainty; SCC = self-concept clarity; SES = socioeconomic status; RSE = Rosenberg self-esteem.

** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Discussion

The present investigation marked the first attempt to validate the scale of status-based identity uncertainty (SBIU) in the general population of Iran. The findings indicate that our translation of this scale (final version in Appendix A) is reliable and internally consistent. Furthermore, in line with the original study of this scale (Destin et al., 2017), our results provided evidence that greater status-based identity uncertainty is related to lower socioeconomic status and income, independent of self-concept clarity (SCC), thus establishing the convergent validity of this scale. Moreover, the absence of a relationship between SCC and these variables, when accounting for the variance of SBIU, confirms that SBIU is a distinct

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

construct from SCC in the Iranian context, supporting its discriminant validity. This divergence was further confirmed by the loading of SBIU and SCC on two separate factors. Therefore, our study successfully replicates the conceptual distinction between SBIU and SCC.

However, notable differences emerged in the performance of SBIU among Iranians in our sample and the American sample in Destin et al. (2017). The first disparity was that a two-factor model of SBIU exhibited a better fit in the Iranian sample, contrary to the original study that reported a more acceptable fit for a one-factor model. In our study, the extracted factors distinguished between ‘status instability and unclarity’ and ‘status doubt’. Status instability seems to capture one’s fluctuating perception of their socioeconomic status, resulting in frequent changes in beliefs about their standing. Status unclarity taps into lacking a clear sense of one’s socioeconomic status. Status doubt, on the other hand, reflects the presence of conflicting views and being unsure of one’s status, leading to constant wondering about where one stands.

It may be argued that this discrepancy is attributable to the economic context of Iran and the specific characteristics of social mobility within this country. As previously noted, scholars have discussed the extremity of status changes, discontinuity of social classes, and political barriers to long-term accumulation of capital in Iran (Ghahremanpour, 2003; Katouzian, 2010). This interpretation is specially highlighted when one considers the frequent periods of hyperinflation and subsequent loss of resources, as well as the devaluation of local currency in Iran (World Data, 2022). Therefore, it is plausible to propose that status instability and unclarity are more pronounced among Iranians compared to Americans, leading to emergence of a distinct factor for this mental state. Future studies with larger and more representative samples are needed to examine the replicability of this factor structure.

Another significant difference was that, in contrast to Destin et al. (2017), our analysis revealed status-based identity uncertainty is not uniquely related to self-esteem when controlling for self-concept clarity. This finding may also be explained by cultural differences. The higher levels of uncertainty tolerance in Iranian culture compared to the USA (House et al., 2004) may

be relevant. This cultural tolerance for uncertainty may transmit to an individual level, potentially contributing to individuals' self-esteem being less impacted by their status uncertainty. To evaluate this argument, future research could incorporate a measure of uncertainty tolerance and examine whether it mediates the relationship between status-based identity uncertainty and self-esteem. Further cross-cultural research is also essential in clarifying the role of culture-level uncertainty tolerance in the link between status uncertainty and self-esteem.

This study had several limitations. First, our sample size potentially limits the generalizability of the findings. Second, the composition of the sample was predominantly female, which could introduce gender-related biases and further limit the representativeness of the sample. Third, the study did not incorporate scales of narrative, social, and future identities, which could have contributed to a more accurate validation of this scale.

Conclusion

The present investigation attempted to translate and validate the scale of status-based identity uncertainty in the general population of Iran. We provided evidence for the reliability and validity of the translated scale and confirmed the conceptual distinction of status-based identity uncertainty and self-concept clarity. As a result, our translated SBIU scale is appropriate for future studies that aim to explore status uncertainty in Iran.

This research also revealed differences in the factor structure of SBIU and its relationship with self-esteem between Iranians and Americans, highlighting the significance of economic and cultural contexts when investigating psychological constructs. Further research is necessary to confirm and expand upon these findings and shed light on the complex interplay between status uncertainty, self-concept, and cultural factors.

References

- Campbell, J. D., Trapnell, P. D., Heine, S. J., Katz, I. M., Lavalley, L. F., & Lehman, D. R. (1996). Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(1), 141–156. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.1.141>
- Carey, R. M., & Markus, H. R. (2017). Social class shapes the form and function of relationships and selves. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *18*, 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.08.031>
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, *7*(3), 309–319. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.7.3.309>
- Destin, M., & Debrosse, R. (2017). Upward social mobility and identity. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *18*, 99–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.08.006>
- Destin, M., Rheinschmidt-Same, M., & Richeson, J. A. (2017). Status-based identity: A conceptual approach integrating the social psychological study of socioeconomic status and identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science: A Journal of the Association for Psychological Science*, *12*(2), 270–289. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616664424>
- Eslami, A., Mahmoudi, A., Kheibari, M., & Najafian-Razavi, M. (2014). The role of socioeconomic conditions in the citizens' motivation for participating in public sports. *Applied Research in Sport Management*, *2*(3), 89–104. <https://dorl.net/dor/20.1001.1.23455551.1392.2.3.7.5>
- Ghahremanpour, R. (2003). Avamel-e moaser bar taharok-e tabaghati dar Iran [Class mobility in Iran: The determining factors]. *Journal of Law and Politics*, *1*(1), 113–140. https://jlap.srbiau.ac.ir/article_6268.html?lang=en
- Ghodratnama, A., Heidarinejad, S., & Davoodi, I. (2013). Rabete-ye vaziat-e eghtesadi-ejtemayi ba mizan fa'aliyat-e badani-e daneshjouyan-e daneshgah-e Shahid Chamran Ahwaz [The relationship between socioeconomic status and the rate of physical activity in Shahid Chamran University

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

students of Ahwaz]. *Sport Management Journal*, 16, 5–20.

<https://doi.org/10.22059/jsm.2013.30410>

House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. W., & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership, and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. SAGE Publications.

International Labour Organization. (2017). *Islamic Republic of Iran: Employment and environmental sustainability fact sheets 2017*. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---asia/---ro-bangkok/documents/publication/wcms_627809.pdf

Katouzian, H. (2010). *The Persians: Ancient, mediaeval and modern Iran*. Yale University Press.

Kraus, M. W., Callaghan, B., & Ondish, P. (2019). Social Class as culture. In D. Cohen & S.

Kitayama (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 721–747). The Guilford Press.

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5432c0d8e4b0fc3eccdb0500/t/58a3af1e03596e0fdbb0b494/1487122206985/social-class-as-culture.pdf>

Miyamoto, Y., Yoo, J., Levine, C. S., Park, J., Boylan, J. M., Sims, T., Markus, H. R., Kitayama, S.,

Kawakami, N., Karasawa, M., Coe, C. L., Love, G. D., & Ryff, C. D. (2018). Culture and social hierarchy: Self- and other-oriented correlates of socioeconomic status across cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 115(3), 427–445. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000133>

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (Vol. 56). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Razian, S., Fathi-Ashtiani, A., Hassanabadi, H., & Ashrafi, E. (2019). Psychometric properties of the Persian version of the self-concept clarity scale. *Journal of Research in Psychological Health*, 13(3), 78–90.

Shapurian, R., Hojat, M., & Nayerahmadi, H. (1987). Psychometric characteristics and dimensionality of a Persian version of Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 65(1), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pms.1987.65.1.27>

Thomas, V., & Azmitia, M. (2014). Does class matter? the centrality and meaning of social class identity in emerging adulthood. *Identity*, 14(3), 195–213.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15283488.2014.921171>

World Data. (2022). *Inflation rates in Iran*. <https://www.worlddata.info/asia/iran/inflation-rates.php>

Yu, S., & Blader, S. L. (2020). Why Does Social Class Affect Subjective Well-Being? The Role of Status and Power. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(3), 331–348.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219853841>

Appendix A

Original Version and Persian Translations of Status-based Identity Uncertainty Scale

Original (Destin et al, 2017)	Pilot Version	Final Version
1. My beliefs about where I stand in society often conflict with one another.	۱. باورهای من در رابطه با جایگاه اجتماعی ام در جامعه اغلب با یکدیگر در تضادند.	۱. باورهای من در رابطه با جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی ام در جامعه اغلب با یکدیگر در تضادند.
2. On one day I might have one opinion of my social standing and on another day, I might have a different opinion.	۲. یک روز ممکن است یک نظر در مورد جایگاه اجتماعی خود داشته باشم و روز دیگر ممکن است نظری دیگری داشته باشم.	۲. یک روز ممکن است یک نظر در مورد جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی خود داشته باشم و روز دیگر ممکن است نظری دیگری داشته باشم.
3. I spend a lot of time wondering about where I stand in society.	۳. من زمان زیادی را در اندیشه‌ی اینکه جایگاهم در جامعه کجاست، می‌گذرانم.	۳. من زمان زیادی را در اندیشه‌ی اینکه جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی ام در جامعه کجاست، می‌گذرانم.
4. Sometimes I feel that I am not really the social status that others think I am.	۴. گاهی احساس می‌کنم که جایگاه اجتماعی واقعی ام با آنچه که دیگران در موردم فکر می‌کنند، مطابق نیست.	۴. گاهی احساس می‌کنم که جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی واقعی ام با آنچه که دیگران در موردم فکر می‌کنند، مطابق نیست.
5. When I think about the kind of person I have been in the past, I'm not sure what it means for my current social standing.	۵. وقتی به آدمی که در گذشته بوده‌ام فکر می‌کنم، مطمئن نیستم که چه معنایی برای جایگاه اجتماعی فعلی ام دارد.	۵. وقتی به آدمی که در گذشته بوده‌ام فکر می‌کنم، مطمئن نیستم که چه معنایی برای جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی فعلی ام دارد.
6. Sometimes I think it's easier to identify where other people stand in society than to identify where I stand.	۶. گاهی اوقات فکر می‌کنم تشخیص اینکه دیگران در جامعه چه جایگاهی دارند، آسان‌تر از تشخیص جایگاه من است.	۶. گاهی اوقات فکر می‌کنم تشخیص اینکه دیگران در جامعه چه جایگاهی دارند، آسان‌تر از تشخیص جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی من است.
7. My beliefs about where I stand in society seem to change frequently.	۷. به نظر می‌رسد که باورهای من در مورد جایی که در جامعه دارم مکرراً تغییر می‌کنند.	۷. به نظر می‌رسد که باورهای من در مورد جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی ام در جامعه دارم مکرراً تغییر می‌کنند.
8. If I were asked to describe my standing in society, my	۸. اگر از من بخواهند که جایگاهم را	۸. اگر از من بخواهند که جایگاه

VALIDATION OF THE PERSIAN VERSION OF THE SBIU SCALE IN IRAN

description might end up being different from one day to another day.	در جامعه توصیف کنم، ممکن است توصیف‌هایم روزی به روز دیگر متفاوت باشد.	اقتصادی-اجتماعی‌ام را در جامعه توصیف کنم، ممکن است توصیف‌هایم روزی به روز دیگر متفاوت باشد.
9. Even if I wanted to, I don't think I could tell someone how I view my own social standing.	۹. حتی اگر بخواهم، فکر نمی‌کنم بتوانم به کسی بگویم که جایگاه اجتماعی خودم را چگونه می‌بینم.	۹. حتی اگر بخواهم، فکر نمی‌کنم بتوانم به کسی بگویم که جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی خودم را چگونه می‌بینم.
10. In general, I have a clear sense of where I stand in society. (R)	۱۰. به طور کلی، درک روشنی از جایگاه خود در جامعه دارم.	۱۰. به طور کلی، درک روشنی از جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی خود در جامعه دارم.
11. It is often hard for me to make up my mind about things because I don't have a clear sense of my status in society.	۱۱. اغلب برایم سخت است که در مورد مسائل تصمیم بگیرم چون درک روشنی از جایگاه خود در جامعه ندارم.	۱۱. اغلب برایم سخت است که در مورد مسائل تصمیم بگیرم چون درک روشنی از جایگاه اقتصادی-اجتماعی خود در جامعه ندارم.

Note. Before answering the questions, participants were presented with an introductory text: "To answer the following questions, please think about your socioeconomic status. This position is often based on income, education levels, and occupational prestige. Consider your family background, where you are now, and where you think you will be in the future. [برای پاسخ به سوالات بعدی، لطفاً به جایگاه اجتماعی-اقتصادی خود در جامعه فکر کنید. این جایگاه اغلب ناظر به درآمد، سطح تحصیلات و اعتبار شغلی است. پیشینه‌ی خانوادگی خود، جایگاهی که اکنون دارید و جایگاهی را که فکر می‌کنید در آینده خواهید داشت، در نظر بگیرید.]"

Elaheh Khezri

National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University), former student,

ekhezri@edu.hse.ru

Any opinions or claims contained in this working paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

© Khezri, Tatarko, 2023