

**THE IMPACT OF THE EDUCHANGE AND RESEARCH FOUNDATION (ERF)
SELF-AWARENESS PROGRAMME ON LEARNERS' REACTIONS AND
LEARNING**

by

NKATEKO EUDORA LOWANE

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for
the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the subject

PSYCHOLOGY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Supervisor: Prof M.J. Terre Blanche

October 2015

Abstract

The aim of the current study was to explore the impact of the Educhange and Research Foundation (ERF) self-awareness programme on the participants' reactions, experiences, and changes in opinion regarding their knowledge of concepts of self-awareness. This study constitutes an evaluation of a workshop presented by the ERF which is a Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) aimed at generating solutions toward a better education for all learners through the application of Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating education and training programmes. Kirkpatrick's model follows the goal-based evaluation approach and is based on four levels of evaluation. These four levels are widely known as reaction, learning, behaviour, and results. Due to the feasibility of the research, only the reaction and learning evaluation levels were researched. The population identified for the study comprised 15 grade 9 to 11 secondary school learners from Soweto in South Africa which were encouraged to volunteer to take part in the study at their convenience. The sample consisted of all the learners who attended the self-awareness workshop, in effect making this a purposive, convenience sampling. The ERF Board were responsible for the sample selection for their scholarship programme. One of the minimum criteria of selection to take part in the programme was that the learner must have obtained 70% and stem from poor backgrounds. The relatively small sample size possesses the potential to limit the generalisation of the findings. A mixed method approach was employed for this research. Positivist paradigm is the epistemological stance adopted due to the social reality investigated. The sources of data consisted of pre- and post-evaluation questionnaires on self-awareness. The results were thematically and statistically analysed. Thematic analysis included familiarisation with the data and first finding meaning, and then identifying patterns of recurring meaning by generating initial codes and lastly generating themes that run through these meanings.

Statistical analysis was conducted through comparison of the data before and after the workshop using chi-square. Objective self-awareness theory and the self-regulation theory were the theoretical framework that informed the current research study. The main finding from this study was that the programme was perceived to have raised positive subjective opinions and feelings of most of the participants, although one participant raised negative subjective opinions about the programme and made suggestions for improvement. After the workshop, the participants felt that they had gained a better understanding of the key concepts of self-awareness, although most items were found to be statistically insignificant.

KEYWORDS: Attitude, ERF Self-awareness programme, evaluation, feelings, Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating education and training programmes, mixed methods, opinion, reactions, self-awareness knowledge, statistical analysis, thematic analysis.

Declaration

Student number: **42366526**

I declare that “**The impact of the Educhange and Research Foundation (ERF) self-awareness programme on learners’ reactions and learning**” is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

SIGNATURE

Nkateko Eudora Lowane

DATE

Acknowledgements

All of my help cometh from thee, oh Lord!

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the following people:

- My supervisor, Prof. M. J. Terre Blanche, who always gave me detailed feedback timeously - you are the best Martin.
- My husband Ello Shirilele Nyambi, for all the love and support you have given me - I could not have done this without your love. My daughter Kurhula Nyambi, thank you for all your care and for understanding when I had to study.
- My mom, Nancy Lowane, and dad, Ephraim Lowane, for always reminding me of how joyful the graduation ceremony will be - you kept me going.
- My sister Nkhensani Lowane for assisting me in summarising all those articles and my sister Amanda Lowane for helping me with house chores when I couldn't, my brothers Dr Tinyiko Lowane and Dunisani Lowane, for all your inspiration.
- My dearest late grandad Nelson Yingwani Shikuhele- unfortunately you missed the graduation ceremony but I know in spirit you are happy for me as you always wished to live just to see me graduate. You will forever be in my heart kokwani Oupa.
- My mentors, Prof. M. Matoane who assisted me with the data collection and literature review, Dr Gift Baloyi, who gave me support and Prof. M. Temane who assisted me with reviewing my chapters.

- My colleagues, Mrs Keit Shirinda-Mthombeni, Mrs Joan Mokhele, Ms Rena Letsoalo, and Mrs Chantel Williams, who were there to motivate me to go on.
- Thank you to Prof G.M. Moche, Prof Juan Nel and Ms Gladys Thembani for the initial conception of the idea of completing my degree and support when I first joined UNISA.
- Dr Katu Kalule, Dr Jan Chabalala, Dr Tebogo Deo and Dr Duma Qolohle- for looking after my well-being.
- My friend, Miss Eva Ngobeni- You have always been with me throughout this journey.
- My editor, Ms Pat Finlay for your wonderful editorial work and Ms Lilian Lombard for formatting my dissertation.
- The National Research Foundation and the UNISA Masters & Doctoral Support Programme for granting me funding for my study.
- To all the volunteers from ERF who participated in this study, without them the study would not have been possible
- My line managers, Ms Vuyo Memani-Sedile, Mr Phumlani Zwane and Mr Sbusiso Mthembu for understanding when I needed time to study and Mrs Deidre Jacobs for her complementary support together with Mrs Antonie Elaine for assisting in my office when I was on study leave.

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my husband Ello Shirilele “Hanyani” Nyambi for his love and support, for keeping me calm and motivating me to adhere to the deadlines and to complete my degree. For cooking all those delicious meals for us when I could not. I love you papa Kurhula. May the lion of Judah prosper and protect our family at all times. This is just the beginning of greater heights and more blessings from the Lord our God.

Table of Content

Abstract	i	
Declaration	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Dedication	vii
Table of Content	viii
List of tables	xiii
Chapter 1 Introduction and Background to the Study	1
1.1	Introduction.....	1
1.2	Background to the Erf Programme	3
1.3	Kirkpatrick’s Model of Evaluation	5
1.4	What is Self-Awareness?	8
1.5	Benefits of Self-Awareness.....	8
1.6	Drawbacks of Self-Awareness	9
1.7	Johari’s Window	9
1.8	Problem Statement	10
1.8.1	Research Question/Hypothesis.	10

1.8.2	Objective of the present study.....	10
1.9	Outline of Chapters	11
1.10	Conclusion	11
Chapter 2 Self-Awareness: Literature Review		12
2.1	Overview of the Chapter	12
2.2	Conceptual Definition of Self-Awareness	12
2.3	Development of Self-Awareness	14
2.4	Self-Disclosure.....	20
2.4.1	Benefits of self-disclosure.....	21
2.5	Private and Public Self-Awareness	22
2.5.1	Private self-awareness.....	22
2.5.2	Public self-awareness.....	22
2.6	Benefits of Self-Awareness.....	24
2.7	Dangers of Self-Awareness.....	25
2.8	Ways to Become More Self-Aware	26
2.9	Objective Self-Awareness Theory	26
2.10	Self-Regulation Theory.....	28

2.10.1	Implications of self-awareness theories.....	29
2.11	The 4 Main Aspects of Johari’s Window.....	30
2.11.1	Criticism of Johari’s window.....	32
2.12	Knowing the Meaning of Self-Acceptance.....	33
2.12.1	Ways in which self-acceptance can be increased/improved.....	33
2.13	Conclusion.....	35
Chapter 3 Method.....		37
3.1	Introduction.....	37
3.2	Research Objectives.....	37
3.2.1	Research Question/Hypothesis.....	37
3.3	Study Sample.....	38
3.4	Research Approach.....	39
3.4.1	Evaluation research.....	40
3.4.2	Kirkpatrick’s model of evaluation.....	41
3.4.3	Sources of data.....	44
3.4.4	Data management and analysis.....	48
3.5	Ethical Considerations.....	49

3.6	Conclusion	50
Chapter 4 Results.....		52
4.1	Introduction.....	52
4.2	Kirkpatrick’s Model: Reaction Level	52
4.3	Kirkpatrick’s Model: Learning Level	56
4.3.1	The impact of the workshop on participants’ perceptions regarding their knowledge.....	57
4.4	Conclusion	98
Chapter 5 Conclusion.....		102
5.1	Introduction.....	102
5.2	Brief Overview of the Dissertation	102
5.3	The Impact of the Programme on Participants’ Reactions	103
5.4	The Impact of the Programme on Participants’ Learning.....	103
5.5	The Strengths of the Study.....	105
5.6	The Limitations of the Study	106
5.7	Suggestions for Improving the Self-Awareness Programme.....	107
5.8	Suggestions for Future Research.....	107

5.9	Conclusion	108
	References	111
	Appendix A Pre- workshop Questionnaire	119
	Appendix B Post-workshop Questionnaire	124
	Appendix C Participant Information Sheet	129
	Appendix D Informed Consent Form to Participate in the Study	132

List of tables

Table 2.1 <i>Johari's window</i>	31
Table 4.1 <i>Categories and frequencies of participants' reactions towards aspects of the workshop (n=15)</i>	53
Table 4.2 <i>Aspects of the workshop which were helpful in understanding self-awareness</i>	56
Table 4.3 <i>I understand/ don't understand the meaning of self-awareness (n=15)</i>	57
Table 4.4 <i>Themes indicating perceptions regarding their knowledge of the meaning of self-awareness</i>	59
Table 4.5 <i>I know/don't know how to become more self-aware (n=15)</i>	61
Table 4.6 <i>Themes indicating how to become more self-aware</i>	63
Table 4.7 <i>I have/ haven't heard about the phrase Johari's window (n=15)</i>	64
Table 4.8 <i>Themes indicating the four aspects of Johari's window</i>	67
Table 4.9 <i>I know/ don't know what is meant by self-acceptance (n=15)</i>	68
Table 4.10 <i>Themes indicating the opinions regarding understanding of the meaning of self-acceptance</i>	70
Table 4.11 <i>Themes indicating perceptions regarding the importance of self-acceptance</i>	72
Table 4.12 <i>Self-acceptance can/cannot be increased/ improved (n=15)</i>	73

Table 4.13 <i>Themes indicating the various ways in which self-acceptance could be improved</i>	76
Table 4.14 <i>Importance of Self-awareness (n=15)</i>	77
Table 4.15 <i>Themes indicating opinions regarding the importance of self-awareness</i>	79
Table 4.16 <i>I know/don't know the benefits of self-awareness (n=15)</i>	80
Table 4.17 <i>Perceived knowledge acquired from the benefits of self-awareness</i>	82
Table 4.18 <i>I know/don't know the dangers of self-awareness (n=15)</i>	83
Table 4.19 <i>Themes indicating the dangers of self-awareness</i>	86
Table 4.20 <i>Is it possible to uncover hidden and free areas (n=15)</i>	87
Table 4.21 <i>Perceived knowledge acquired from uncovering hidden and free areas</i>	90
Table 4.22 <i>Whether the workshop assisted the participants in being more self-aware (n=15)</i>	91
Table 4.23 <i>Areas where the participants became more self-aware</i>	92
Table 4.24 <i>Summary of the Reaction and Learning levels</i>	93

Chapter 1

Introduction and Background to the Study

1.1 Introduction

It is necessary to give a brief personal account about my involvement with the Educhange and Research Foundation (ERF). The ERF was established in 2008 and my involvement started in 2011 when I was working at the University of South Africa Psychology Department as a Research Assistant to the Chair of Department, Prof. M. Matoane and was enrolled to study for a Master's degree in Research Psychology at UNISA. As part of my degree requirement, I was expected to conduct research on a topic of my choice and at that stage I was requested to conduct an evaluation of the ERF programme as part of my duties as a Research Assistant. I perceived an opportunity to turn the evaluation of the ERF self-awareness programme into a research topic for my Master's degree. Prof. M. Matoane agreed to be my mentor throughout the research project and was also the facilitator of the self-awareness workshop.

The focus of my research fell on evaluating the personal development of learners, which comprised nine workshops, namely Team Building; Mentorship; Goal Setting; Self-awareness; Communication; Study Skills and Exam Techniques; Being a Teenager; Seven Habits of Highly Effective People and the 8th Habit; and Stress Management and Effective Problem Solving (Annual report, Educhange and Research Foundation [ERF], 2010). This is referred to as the learner empowerment component of the programme and aims at teaching the learners life skills and preparing them for further education and training. The approach to learning is holistic and includes family, school, and other subsystems who are encouraged to volunteer in the programme at their convenience. Of these workshops, the self-awareness workshop was selected for the purpose of this study because self-awareness

is fundamental to personal growth, self-improvement, intelligence, reflection and introspection (Crisp & Turner, 2010). These aspects are vital in contributing to the personal and social development of the learners. The self-awareness workshop was selected also because it was the only workshop where I was present to observe both the presentation of the workshop and the instrument. Self-awareness is important to any interactions involving peers. With this in mind, this research describes how the self-awareness workshop will be evaluated and describes concepts of self-awareness at a basic level as the target audience selectively comprises grades nine to eleven only. Of the nine workshops, I found the self-awareness workshop unpacking some of the complexities presented by personal development in society, for example, self-disclosure. I found this to be the central theme playing a role in self-acceptance and gaining support from family regarding issues such as teenage pregnancy, HIV, peer pressure and substance abuse, which are central to the target audience age group. From my observations, most learners were fearful of disclosing information about themselves. The aforesaid reasons motivated me to evaluate the ERF self-awareness programme.

Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating education and training programmes was used as a framework to evaluate the workshop. The model proposed four levels of evaluation, that is, reaction, learning, behaviour and results. However, only the reaction and learning levels were evaluated in the current study, because of the feasibility to do so. Despite the problematic assumptions of the model that may be identified, the model has received enduring popularity (Kirkpatrick, 1996). Evaluation is important for improvement of the workshop, gives feedback to the facilitator on how the workshop could be improved, ensures that the objectives of the training are successfully achieved, and facilitates the commitment of the learners to implement learned concepts on their return to school.

1.2 Background to the Erf Programme

The Educhange and Research Foundation (ERF) is a non-profit organisation aiming to improve South Africa's education system at both policy and implementation levels (Annual report, Educhange and Research Foundation [ERF], 2010). Their mission is to become the most comprehensive agent in transforming education in South Africa. The ERF aims to achieve their mission by increasing the level of literacy in black communities, by regulating the educational environment in township schools and by producing structures for improving the quality of education in South African schools (Annual report, Educhange and Research Foundation [ERF], 2010).

The ERF has the following objectives in order to achieve their mission:

- To inform policy and practice by generating knowledge in the field of Education; and
- To intervene in under-resourced communities by creating centres of excellence in schools.

The ERF is composed of various components, namely financial support, learner empowerment, mentorship, and research, which support learners in township schools by preparing them for a successful transition from school to the world of work or tertiary education. The financial component addresses the scholastic financial needs such as school uniforms, additional stationery, and study material that are not provided by the government. The learner empowerment component of the scholarship programme involves personal and social development. This is carried out through a series of monthly (sometimes twice in a month) workshops throughout the year. The third component is academic intervention through the mentorship programme. The ERF aims to provide learners with both academic and psycho-social support by placing each learner with a

mentor to assist learners to deal with challenging aspects of their curriculum in English, Mathematics, Accounting, Natural Sciences, and Physical Sciences. The learners are then able to learn at an optimal pace (Fynn, 2011).

The mentors are young professionals from a range of fields such as engineering and finance and who volunteer their services to act as role models in modifying attitudes, behaviours, and skills needed for a successful life. The last component to the ERF scholarship programme is research. The research leg of the ERF seeks to create new ideas by producing structures for improving the quality of education in South African schools, as mentioned above. This study focuses on the psycho-social intervention component, which is referred to as the learner empowerment component of the scholarship programme, where the self-awareness workshop forms part of the psychological, academic, and social development of the learners. The ERF targets learners who stem from poor families and as a result may not have access to basic resources such as stationery, school uniforms, school fees and academic support (Annual report, Educhange and Research Foundation [ERF], 2010).

The ERF was conceptualised by the founder of the organisation, who was motivated by both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. The state of the education system and socio-economic conditions in South Africa were extrinsic motivating factors of the founder of this NGO. Intrinsic motivating factors include educational background, beliefs, experiences, personal traits, and values (Fynn, 2011). The ERF seeks to encourage a holistic approach to learning which recognises that the learners do not exist in isolation; hence the involvement of their parents, educators and social environment. The educators and the school leadership were not supportive of the initiative of the ERF during the implementation phase of the programme. They indicated that this would be time

consuming as they had to deal with the low matric pass rates, high drop out rates and teacher strikes that were taking place (Fynn, 2011). However, according to Rose (2006), greater emphasis is placed on documenting positive experiences within the NGO than the challenges; hence the challenges in implementing the programme are not discussed in detail. The main challenge facing the ERF is the continued poor performance levels in township schools, exacerbated by poor resources and poverty. This challenge is investigated by a meaningful response to the predominant problems in education where comprehensive programmes through centres of excellence are the solution. The approach to solving the challenge includes research, mentorship, motivation, workshops, and influence, which are conducted through professional volunteerism, partnerships, sustainable operations, and peer-to-peer support. The expected outcomes include support systems and research publications (Fynn, 2011).

1.3 Kirkpatrick's Model of Evaluation

Due to the popularity and major contribution made by Kirkpatrick's model, it has been declared the first global heuristic for training evaluation and has performed well compared to other similar models of training evaluation criteria (e.g., Jackson & Kulp, 1978; Warr, Bird, & Rackham, 1970). The four levels, each measuring complementary aspects of a training programme, are outlined in detail below:

Reaction level: At the end of the training programme, data is gathered about the subjective opinions or feelings of the participants, for example, likes/dislikes and not what the participants have been trained in (Kirkpatrick, 1959). In assessing this level, the following questions are asked:

- Did trainees like and enjoy the training?

- Did they consider the training relevant?
- Was it worthwhile?
- Did they like the venue, style, timing and catering
- What was their level of participation?
- Was their experience easy and comfortable?
- What was the level of effort required to make the most of learning?
- What is the perceived practicability and potential for applying the learning?

In the current study, the subjective evaluations of the participants to concepts of self-awareness were assessed, which is in line with process evaluation, a form of formative evaluation (Fynn, 2011).

Learning level: assesses the extent to which participants experienced a change in attitude, knowledge, and/or skills as a result of having participated in a particular programme. Assessments or tests may be administered before and after training to evaluate whether the learning objectives have been achieved. Interviews or observation can be used, although this may take time and can be inconsistent (Deniz, 2002). Questions asked in assessing this level include the following:

- Did the trainees learn what was intended to be taught?
- Did the trainees experience what was intended for them to experience?
- What is the extent of advancement or change in the trainees after the training, in the direction or area that was intended?

In the current study, participants were asked questions after the training to assess

the extent to which they have changed their opinion regarding knowledge and attitude, which is in line with summative evaluation (Fynn, 2011).

Behaviour level: Assesses whether participants use their newly acquired knowledge and/ skills that result from training. The level evaluates performance changes immediately after the training and several months after the training. Methodological difficulties may be experienced at this level (Holton, 2006). The following questions are asked:

- Did the trainees put their learning into effect when back on the job?
- Were the relevant skills and knowledge used?
- Was there noticeable and measurable change in the activity and performance of the trainees when back in their roles?
- Would the trainee be able to transfer their learning to another person?
- Is the trainee aware of his/her change in behaviour, knowledge or skill level?

This level falls beyond the scope of the present study as measurement of behavior change is not as easy to quantify and interpret as reaction and learning evaluation. Co-operation and skill of observers, typically line-managers, are important factors, and difficult to control. Management and analysis of ongoing subtle assessments are difficult, if not virtually impossible without a well-designed system from the onset (Bates, 2004).

Results level: Assesses the final results that emanate from the training: that is, the effect of training on the business or environment resulting from the trainee's performance. The level evaluates the impact of training such as costs and benefits. Kirkpatrick (1959) declared this level to be the most difficult due to extraneous variables in organisations.

The assessment of this level of training usually entails key performance indicators such as volumes, values, percentages, and quantifiable aspects of organisational performance.

Holton (2006) argues that research is necessary to develop a fully specified evaluation model which will specify outcomes correctly and will also indicate causal relationships.

1.4 What is Self-Awareness?

In simple terms, self-awareness can be described in brief as a psychological state in which one is aware of their personality, feelings, and behaviour. Alternatively, it can be defined as the ability to reflect on oneself and to recognise oneself as a separate entity from the environment and other individuals (Crisp & Turner, 2010). This brief definition of self-awareness has been provided to better contextualise my research. Self-awareness is explored in greater detail in the next chapter. Self-awareness can be increased by examining one's thoughts, feelings, behaviour, and motives. This may have its advantages and disadvantages.

1.5 Benefits of Self-Awareness

According to Duval and Wicklund (1972), self-awareness has an adaptive function and is a form of self-control, thereby creating the most favourable environment and developing mutually beneficial relationships. The more a person understands themselves, the more confident they become, and the more they are able to make informed decisions and communicate effectively. Self-awareness assists one in knowing appropriate behaviour in various situations and increases one's sensitivity to social situations. Increased self-awareness is associated with feelings of being transparent to others, hence helping in becoming the person one wants to be. Self-awareness helps in the understanding of oneself and assists in personal problem solving. The benefits and drawbacks of self-awareness will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2.

1.6 Drawbacks of Self-Awareness

However, dwelling on ourselves as objects can make us aware of how we fall short of our ideals, thus leading us to form negative views of ourselves. Research was conducted on participants who stutter and one finding was that the more aware individuals were of their stutters the more pronounced the stutters became (Mullen, Migdal, and Rozell, 2003). Williams (2003) suggests that higher amounts of momentary self-awareness in therapists may be distracting in the helping process. The more aware we are of our anxieties, the more our anxieties may intensify. This may result in depression due to failure to live up to one's own standards. Unproductive self-awareness can lead to being focused too much on the negative aspects of oneself. There is a technique used to assist people in understanding their relationship with self and others through the use of Johari's window.

1.7 Johari's Window

The workshop on self-awareness is based on Johari's window described below, and is discussed in detail in Chapter 2. The Johari's Window is a technique used to help people understand their relationship with self and others better. One can become more self-aware by examining one's thoughts, feelings and motives, observing one's behaviour and putting one's feelings and reactions into words to others (Perry, 2010). The Johari's Window model is a simple and useful tool for illustrating and improving self-awareness, and mutual understanding between individuals within a group. This model was developed by American psychologists, Joseph Luft and Harry Ingham, in the 1950s, calling it "Johari" after combining their first names, Joe and Harry.

Feedback from others in a growing relationship reduces the amount of information that the subject is not aware of, but that others are aware of and increases the amount of

information that both the subject and their peers are aware of, hence increasing self-awareness. The Johari's window can be used as a self-assessment tool to increase individuals' understanding of themselves. This may be an exploration of the skills they have or their personal and professional characteristics (Perry, 2010).

1.8 Problem Statement

1.8.1 Research Question/Hypothesis.

The hypothesis in forming the research is that after participation in the workshop, the learners will feel that they have increased their knowledge of the key concepts of self-awareness and hold positive subjective opinions and feelings about the workshop. The following research questions will be outlined in detail in Chapter 3:

Research questions:

- What impact has the workshop made on the learners' subjective evaluations of the workshop?
- What impact has the workshop made on the learners' perceptions of their knowledge of the key concepts of self-awareness?
- What suggestions do learners have for improving the workshop?

1.8.2 Objective of the present study.

The main objective of the present study is to investigate the impact of the self-awareness workshop on the learners' perceptions regarding knowledge of key concepts of self-awareness and to provide suggestions for improvement to the self-awareness workshop.

1.9 Outline of Chapters

Chapter 2 discusses the theoretical assumptions upon which the self-awareness workshop is based. This will include the themes covered and the main objectives of the workshop.

The research design and method is dealt with in Chapter 3, which encompasses a description of evaluation research, Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating training programmes, sampling, data collection and data analysis. The ethical considerations for the study are also presented.

Chapter 4 discusses the results of the impact of the self-awareness workshop on participants' learning and experiences by using Kirkpatrick's reaction and learning levels, thus addressing both formative and summative evaluation.

Chapter 5 presents the overall conclusions that can be drawn from the study, including suggestions for improving the ERF self-awareness programme. Limitations of the present study and suggestions for future research are also discussed.

1.10 Conclusion

This chapter furnished an overview of the introductory background to the study by providing the purpose of the study, which was to evaluate the impact of the ERF self-awareness programme on participants' learning and subjective evaluations of the workshop. The chapter also covers the framework used to evaluate the workshop, which is Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating education and training programmes with the focus falling on the reaction and learning levels of this model. The chapter offered a brief overview of Johari's window and summarised the overview of subsequent chapters.

Chapter 2

Self-Awareness: Literature Review

2.1 Overview of the Chapter

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the theoretical framework that grounds the current research study on self-awareness and also to review literature on previous empirical studies that have been conducted on self-awareness. The review begins with a conceptual definition of self-awareness and a comparison of various definitions of self-awareness by different authors, which is followed by an overview of the development of self-awareness. The difference between private and public self-awareness is subsequently outlined. A discussion on self-disclosure and its benefits is followed by a discussion of the benefits and dangers of self-awareness. Further, ways to become more self-aware are discussed.

Two theories of self-awareness are discussed, that is, the objective self-awareness theory and the self-regulation theory followed by the application of both theories in previous studies. Thereafter, implications of theories of self-awareness are discussed followed by a detailed overview of Johari's window and self-acceptance. Recent studies on self-awareness are also explored throughout the chapter. Theories on self-awareness were originally proposed in the early seventies, hence most research studies herein referred to studies on self-awareness which were conducted then.

2.2 Conceptual Definition of Self-Awareness

Self-awareness is defined as “general self- knowledge (an ability to have insight into one's inner world and personality)”, also well-known as self-consciousness (Williams, 2003, p. 178). From this definition, one can deduce that for an individual to know and

understand him/herself, it is fundamental to have self-awareness, which is significant to self-disclosure. Self-awareness is vital to self-control and is used as a form of intelligence in psychology (Duval & Wicklund, 1972). This definition emphasizes the importance of knowing oneself, in order to be able to disclose information about one's self to others, thereby improving emotional intelligence. In line with this definition, individuals who are self-aware are able to control themselves in ways that make them adaptable to various situations.

Self-awareness is also defined as “the capacity to become the object of one's own attention”, (Carver, 2002, p. 179). From this definition, the focus also falls on the internal environment of the individual and there are multiple definitions of self-awareness that place an emphasis on the individuality of the person on whom attention is focused. Mullen et al. (2003) state that individuation is the recognition of oneself as a distinct object from other individuals and the environment, hence the reflection and examination of one's thoughts. Self-awareness is also defined as per the introductory definition in Chapter 1, as a psychological state in which individuals are aware of their personalities, emotional state, and behaviour (Crisp & Turner, 2010). Behaviour is one of the components of the self that emerge in this definition, but is not included in the first definition above. We are not always aware of our behaviour. This leads to difficulty in keeping record of the effects of self-awareness on our behaviour, because of self-awareness changes to a series of various behaviours which are not in conflict with the self. These two definitions however, place an emphasis on individuation, which was outlined in detail in my first definition. This shows that the first definition is comprehensive and covers all the necessary psychological constructs of self-awareness and that various authors hold similar conceptions on self-awareness. Franzoi (1996) defines self-awareness as a state in which an individual reflects oneself to be the centre of attention; this definition still focuses on an individual, but

supports the notion that was originally proposed by Duval and Wicklund (1972) in their objective self-awareness theory, which states that attention is focused on the self. This is discussed in detail in the objective self-awareness theory section herein. However, it is vital to note that at birth we do not have self-awareness, but it is influenced by the developmental stage of the individual and develops as one grows.

2.3 Development of Self-Awareness

Self-awareness has been found to be the most fundamental issue in psychology, from the developmental perspective (Phileppe, 2003). As stated above, we are not born with self-awareness, but it develops as one grows. Phileppe (2003) distinguishes five levels of self-awareness as they chronologically unfold from the moment of birth.

- **Level 0: Confusion.** The individual has no self-awareness at this level; this is evident from the inability of an infant to perceive a mirror and the mirror reflection. The reflection may be mistaken as being another person in adults.
- **Level 1: Differentiation.** At this level, the individual can identify mirror reflections and have the ability to differentiate between the mirror and surroundings.
- **Level 2: Situation.** The individual is able to make a connection between movements in the mirror reflections and their own body.
- **Level 3: Identification.** The individual discovers that the mirror reflection is actually him or herself.
- **Level 4: Permanence.** At this level, the individual can identify both images in the mirror and other photographs.
- **Level 5: Self-consciousness or "meta" self-awareness.** At this level

Individuals generally become more aware about what other people think about them. This will be discussed in detail in the public self-awareness section herein.

With the aim of integrating Phileppe's five levels described above, Legrain, Cleeremans, and Destrebecqz (2011) described the "I" and the "me" inter-related levels of the self. The "I" level is the implicit level which encompasses differentiation between the mirror and the ability to make connections between movements on the mirror and their own body. The "me" level is the explicit level at which the individual identifies oneself in the mirror and on photographs and is more aware about what people think about them. The "me" level allows the self to become the subject of one's own attention.

With the aim of finding out when self-awareness develops, Lewis and Brooks-Gun (1979) conducted research where they applied a red dot on an infant's nose aged eighteen months and on another aged less than a year. A mirror was then placed in front of the children and it was hypothesised that children who touch their noses instead of the reflection of the mirror have at least some self-awareness. It was found that children less than a year reached out to the reflection in the mirror as they could not recognise themselves in the mirror, but infants eighteen months and older reached to their own noses. These researchers have demonstrated that self-awareness develops around one year of age and becomes fully developed around eighteen months of age. This implies that infants less than one year of age are on the first two levels described by Phileppe (2003) and infants older than eighteen months are on the final three explicit levels. Lewis and Brooks-Gun (1979) only indicate visual self-awareness and it is possible that the children may possess other forms of self-awareness at earlier stages. The study is also not recent but has guided recent studies on the development of self-awareness which have concluded that self-

awareness occurs around 1-3 years when a child recognises herself in the mirror and develops the ability to make choices.

The current study is based on evaluating the self-awareness programme and necessitates researching similar studies that have been conducted in this regard. An evaluation of a self-awareness intervention (SAI) was conducted for adults with Type 1 diabetes with the primary purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of the intervention in promoting self-awareness, health, and satisfaction with information and skills learned. The study was based on integration and self-efficacy theories which suggest that self-awareness gives confidence in using signals from the body in order to adapt to living with diabetes (Hernandez et al., 2003). The programme included health education and counselling, which were aimed at promoting self-awareness. A sample of eighteen participants was selected and requested to complete the Diabetes Questionnaire and the Insulin Management Diabetes Self-Efficacy Scale which were both reliable instruments. The SAI consisted of four weekly, six-hour sessions and a follow-up session at three months post-intervention. The internal consistency before and after the intervention were found to be similar. The participants showed improvement in integration and self-efficacy, but the change was not significant although it supports the idea that the intervention is useful. It was recommended that to improve the intervention, the sessions should be shorter and more follow-up sessions should be added. It was also recommended that a support group for family members be included. The sample size was relatively small and has the potential to limit the generalization of the findings. Further research using larger samples is necessary. The absence of a control group was a limitation to the study. In conclusion, this study found the SAI to be vital in improving the quality of life of individuals with Type 1 Diabetes (Hernandez et al, 2003). Both the current study and the diabetes study are theory-based and have used convenience sampling with a relatively

small sample size. The purpose of both studies was to evaluate the effectiveness of a self-awareness programme. There was an improvement in both cases, although it was not significant. The post-evaluation of the current study took place immediately after the workshop, as opposed to the three-month follow-up programme evaluation in the diabetes study. Both studies did not have a control group, which is a limitation. From the participants' responses, it was evident that they were satisfied with the programme in both cases. Questionnaires were administered in both studies; however, in the diabetes study, the participants in focus groups were further interviewed.

Owensworth et al. (2000) evaluated a group support programme aimed to improve self-awareness and psychosocial functioning in patients with Acquired Brain Injury (ABI) by using a Self-Regulation Skills Interview (SRSI) and self-report measure. The programme involved an evaluation of a 16-week session with a post-intervention and a 6-month follow-up assessments. The study is based on three models which represent the development of self-awareness following ABI. The first model, developed by Crosson et al. (1989) was composed of three interdependent levels of awareness namely intellectual, emergent and anticipatory awareness. Intellectual awareness involves the patient's ability to recognise his or her deficits and to understand the implications thereof. Emergent awareness involves the patient's ability to recognise his or her difficulties as they occur, and anticipatory awareness involves the patient's ability to expect difficulties due to the deficit. The second three-level model of intellectual self-awareness was proposed by Fleming et al. (1996), who developed the Self-Awareness of Deficits Interview (SADI). The third model was a neuropsychological model, which suggests that disruption to the executive control system results in general disorders of self-awareness. A sample of twenty one participants was selected. The results at 12 months post-injury show that the group had a high level of intellectual self-awareness, which supports previous findings by

Fleming et al. (1996) and the self-report measure was not significantly different to the pre-assessment self-report score. The relatives of the participants observed fewer emotional and behavioural problems before the group programmes and the gains made between the pre- and post-assessment periods were maintained by the participants over the 6-month follow-up period.

A similar study was conducted by Lundqvist et al. (2010) where the primary objective was to evaluate the effects of a group therapy programme for anticipatory self-awareness and coping strategies for patients with acquired brain injury. Methodological triangulation was used to gather data, where self-report questionnaires, SRSI and focus interviews (conducted one month after each group programme) were used. The study also sampled 21 participants. It was found that the participants increased their self-awareness and strategy behaviour significantly and it was concluded that the group therapy programme helps participants to understand the consequences of their deficits, helps them improve awareness of their impairments, and assists in coping. The study was based on the first model that was developed by Crosson et al. (1989) which is composed of three interdependent levels of awareness namely intellectual, emergent, and anticipatory awareness. The group members meet for 11 sessions for 6 months, 2 hours per session. The self-report questionnaire contained nine questions about the logistical arrangements of the programme, The SRSI was implemented before and after an intervention. The focus groups were recorded, transcribed, and analysed statistically. Most participants were satisfied with the group programme and there was a significant difference in level of awareness and strategy behaviour before and after the group therapy. The results agree with the findings of Ownsworth et al. (2000) discussed above. This programme included only one session with a relative, which is a limitation to the study, as they should have conducted a follow-up interview with relatives. The current study has limitations when

compared to the reviewed studies. Only one method was used to collect data and the participants were the only source of information. However, in this case, obtaining information from relatives was not necessary. Most studies on evaluating self-awareness have been conducted in a group setting, including the present study.

As outlined above, self-awareness is the key to self-disclosure; this is explored in an internet-based survey, which differs from interaction with human beings, where the experimenter is visible and may disclose confidential information. However, Moon (2000) argues that computers can be treated as being human provided there is reciprocal self-disclosure, which includes descriptive information about the computer or the experimenter. Self-disclosure was measured for breadth (word count) and depth (rating on information that makes the discloser feel vulnerable). It was found that the participants disclosed greater depth of information when they knew the experimenter. It was found that the self-disclosure of the experimenter also leads to greater breadth of self-disclosure. The research questions asked exerted a huge impact on the results, because they affected the breadth as opposed to the depth of self-disclosure. The questions were not intimate in nature, as is the case in my current study, as the questions asked required the participants to disclose factual information and perceptions (breadth) about self-awareness, rather than intimacy. The willingness of the participants to disclose information about themselves through the internet provides electronic data to researchers, which saves time and obviates the need for transcription because the data is directly coded and analyzed. The fact that the responses are anonymous also encourages self-disclosure; however, this does raise ethical concerns as information is disclosed to an unknown researcher in non-reciprocal conditions. Nonetheless, research has concluded that paper and pen surveys increase socially desirable responses when compared with electronic surveys and that computer-mediated communication (CMC) studies have also found heightened self-disclosure

compared with face-to-face participation (Joinson, 2001). My study focuses only on the breadth of self-disclosure as the words recalled are thematically and statistically analysed. Self-disclosure is discussed in detail herein.

Disclosing personal information about oneself has been perceived as being vital to close relationships and maintenance of psychological well-being. There are two general models that have been used to explain the relationship between disclosure and liking. These include social exchange and information processing models. The first one considers self-disclosure to be a social exchange in the context of ongoing relationships, thus people should be more attracted to those with rewards. The second model suggests that liking is determined by having positive beliefs about an individual. Sharing personal information at the earliest stages of a relationship may be inappropriate; hence the result is that the discloser is liked less. It has been suggested that the disclosure-liking effect should be stronger for female than for male disclosers. This may be due to the sex-role stereotypes which suggest that females are better in communication and more concerned with intimacy than males. Linking this to the appropriateness in disclosure above, males may be viewed as being maladjusted should they disclose more intimately than a female. However, it has been suggested that same-sex partners would have a stronger disclosure-liking relation than opposite-sex partners. People who have received intimate disclosure feel obligated to respond with a personal disclosure of equal intimacy (Miller, 1990). Literature on self-disclosure will be explored below in line with the research findings above.

2.4 Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure is defined by Johnson (2006) as describing oneself and giving information verbally. In simple terms, disclosure entails revealing new private information, thereby making the information known to the public or individual. The

common theme in these two definitions on self-disclosure is individuation; the decision to disclose depends on the individual and is fundamental to self-awareness and significant to self-disclosure. The definition above on self-disclosure limits the discloser to verbal information, whereas information can also be written. Self-disclosure allows the discloser to be known and liked which may lead to self-understanding. The level of openness depends on self-awareness, trust and self-acceptance. Johnson (2006) further suggests that for self-disclosure to be effective, the information shared should be current and common to both individuals; more topics and personal experiences should be shared and the level of disclosure should match reciprocally. As described above, self-disclosure allows the discloser to be liked, which shows that there are benefits of disclosing information about oneself. This will be explored below.

2.4.1 Benefits of self-disclosure.

Forgas (2011) states that self-disclosure is the key initiator of relationships and further strengthens the relationship. He further asserts that perceptions and reactions to situations are compared with those of others, thereby soliciting feedback and increasing self-awareness and self-understanding. Sharing feelings with someone is a relief to the discloser and may relieve stress; however disclosure can be deliberately ended or emphasised as a means of social control. Through self-disclosure, one allows oneself to be known and accepted (Forgas, 2011). It was stated above that the level of self-awareness determines the level of self-disclosure, however, there are two different types of self-awareness that is public and private self-awareness which will be discussed in detail below.

2.5 Private and Public Self-Awareness

2.5.1 Private self-awareness.

Private self-awareness refers to a person who looks within himself and is aware of the hidden aspects of himself (Crisp & Turner, 2010). Private self-consciousness involves awareness of the self as a self-reflective individual and directing attention to inner thoughts and feelings (Franzoi, 1996). From these definitions, one can deduce that private self-awareness includes mental states. The mental states have an impact on decision making. This is evident in previous research conducted by Scheier and Carver (1998), where it was found that participants manipulated to be more privately self-aware displayed more positive effects than the control group. Similar effects were shown in a study that was conducted by Chernev (2003) with the aim of examining the effect of private self-awareness on choosing a variety of drinks. It was hypothesised that private self-awareness should increase the consistency in preferences on juices. It was found that private self-awareness influenced the participants to select less variety of juices, that is, only stick to their preferences, hence select their favourite, which supports the hypothesis.

From the two studies above one can conclude that private self-awareness is necessary for individuals to conform to positive standards. Furthermore, individuals can focus their attention on either private or public aspects of the self. One can conclude that for an individual to be able to reflect on oneself, it implies that one is self-aware and is in a position to make decisions and hence conform to positive standards.

2.5.2 Public self-awareness.

Public self-awareness is a state which occurs when people focus on the impressions they make on others and involves awareness of the self as a social object. For instance,

when a person is in a state of public self-awareness, they worry about what others think of them, and they seek social approval (Prentice-Dunn & Rogers, 1982). One can deduce that public self-awareness includes observable features such as behaviour and appearance.

This explains why anxious individuals may seek social approval by being concerned with giving a helping hand, hence the focus of attention on performance. They are continually evaluating their performance and are preoccupied with the impressions they make on others. Consequently, though speculative, one can deduce that high public self-awareness may lead to seeking of social approval. Research was conducted by Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975), with the aim of finding out whether self-consciousness affects self-attributions. This was achieved by measuring individual differences in self-consciousness in two components (private and public). Participants were selected based on their high or low private self-consciousness. An experimental group was exposed to a mirror.

Participants were requested to respond to eight situations in terms of percentages, whether they were responsible for the outcome in various situations. Four of these situations had positive outcomes, and the other four had negative outcomes. Private self-consciousness was found to exert a stronger effect on self-attributions as compared to self-awareness. Self-awareness, induced by a mirror, had a weak effect on self-attribution. Only private self-consciousness affected self-attribution; public self-consciousness did not.

The replication of the outcomes of the study carried out by Duval and Wicklund (1973) in this study implies that there were repetitions made in the current study and means that there was no new information added to the field of Psychology. However, reference to previous theorists lends weight to the study. The presence of a mirror has a weak effect on self-attribution; however private self-consciousness increased self-attributions more so when self-awareness was manipulated by the presence of a mirror. Private self-consciousness leads to more self-attributions. Recent research supported by

the two studies above was conducted by Joinson (2001) on the role of self-awareness and visual anonymity on self-disclosure in computer-mediated communication (CMC). It was found that a significantly higher level of spontaneous self-disclosure was found in CMC compared with face-to-face discussions. Visual anonymity contributed to high levels of disclosure as opposed to non-visual anonymity and through the use of video-conferencing cameras and accountability cues, it was found that a combination of low levels of public self-awareness and high levels of private self-awareness resulted in higher levels of self-disclosure. This is logical, as seeking social approval requires disclosing information about one's self.

2.6 Benefits of Self-Awareness

Self-awareness improves appropriate behaviour in different situations; it contributes to increased sensitivity to social situations and improves communication skills. Self-awareness serves an adaptive purpose in the form of self-control, while it also assists one to conduct and present oneself appropriately in relevant situations, understand oneself; and to know how to solve personal problems. Carver (2002) found that increased self-awareness is associated with feelings of transparency, resulting in the expression of acceptable behaviour according to the relevant situation.

Self-awareness also increases compassion in social situations and allows one to focus on one's strengths, to adapt to the situation one is faced with, and to develop intuitive decision-making skills. Self-awareness also assists one in dealing with challenges in a more positive and less anxious manner. Moreover, one may be rewarded with more meaningful, trusting relationships with increased self-awareness. The more one reveals about oneself to others, the more others will in turn open up to one (Forgas, 2011).

Throughout these interactions, one will gain further insight about oneself and develop a

better self-image. One can learn more about oneself by watching and listening to feedback from others. Despite the benefits discussed herein, certain dangers are inherent in self-awareness, as discussed in the following section.

2.7 Dangers of Self-Awareness

Unproductive self-awareness can lead to consciousness of one's weaknesses, hence this could lead to being too self-absorbed with too much focus on negative aspects of the self. Depression may result from failure to live up to one's own standards. Williams (2003) suggests that greater amounts of momentary self-awareness in therapists may be distracting to the helping process. The more aware we are of our anxieties, the more anxious we may become. Encouraging self-awareness with self-focusing stimuli produces self-evaluation (Duval & Wicklund, 1972), whereby the individual compares any given most important aspect of the self to an ideal representation thereof. Self-criticism is then likely to occur, leading to defenses such as avoidance of the state of self-awareness, or by either modifying the objective aspect of the self, or by changing the ideal itself.

Another danger of self-awareness is emotional intensity —the suggestion that focusing on one's emotions or physiological responses intensifies one's subjective knowledge (Gibbons, 1983). In view of this notion, research on aggression has shown that self-awareness results in more aggression compared to individuals who were not self-aware. Reference can be made to the studies discussed above which support this notion. Theories that explain self-awareness are discussed below. Other dangers of self-awareness include sensitivity to social rejection and a decrease in social traditional values (Franzoi, 1996). Having discussed both the benefits and dangers of self-awareness, it is also vital to explore ways of becoming more self-aware, because it will facilitate the process of overcoming the dangers of self-awareness, thereby leading to meaningful self-reflection,

resulting in self-disclosure.

2.8 Ways to Become More Self-Aware

Introspection, that is, examining one's thoughts, feelings and motives, is one approach to becoming more self-aware (Johnson, 2006). Observing one's behaviour is normally a good way to understand one's feelings as well as by explaining oneself to others, and comparing oneself to them. Seeking feedback from others and self-reflection may increase one's self-awareness (Forgas, 2011). Self-reflection is closely linked to self-awareness. It refers to the understanding of one's mentality, beliefs, and life desires, and the willingness to learn about oneself in order to help achieve self-awareness (Trapnell & Campbell, 1999). One can become more self-aware by interacting with a wide variety of diverse people. On this note, I explore the stance of various theories in the following section.

2.9 Objective Self-Awareness Theory

The theory of self-awareness was initially formulated by Duval and Wicklund (1972) and has undergone essential changes since then because of the assumptions which required revision; the original statement of the theory employed only a few constructs and processes. One of the earliest self-awareness theories was the Objective self-awareness (OSA) theory, followed by Subjective self-awareness (SSA). The OSA theory assumes that when attention is focused on the self, directing attention on the self (state of objective self-awareness) leads to awareness of discrepancies between the ideal self and the actual self, thereby facilitating self-evaluation. When attention is focused on the self, one compares the self with standards of correctness that specify ones thoughts, behaviour and feelings; hence allowing change and self-control. In contrast, when attention is focused away from the individual (the state of subjective self-awareness) (SSA), it leads to being

subjected to oneself as the source of perception and action. Subjective self-awareness draws a distinction between the self, physical, or social environment. Research has not justified why OSA has fundamentally caught the attention of researchers rather than SSA. However, the OSA theory has been subjected to contemporary improvement during its history and has encouraged research in social psychology in issues such as self-focused attention. The fundamental principle of the OSA theory is that self-focus increases consistency motivation. Research since the 1970s has strongly supported the self-awareness theory (Silvia & Duval, 2001). When people focus attention on the self, they compare the self with standards, try harder to meet standards, and show stronger emotional responses to meeting or failing to meet a standard. The tendency to change the self to match a standard depends on other variables, particularly perceptions of how difficult it will be to attain the standard.

The OSA theory has shown that self-focused attention initiates comparison of the self with certain standards. The self-regulation theory contends that focusing attention on the self has important implications for motivation and self-regulation. In a quantitative review on private self-awareness, which focused on negative affect or attributions which are key focuses of OSA theory (Duval & Wicklund, 1972), it was found that the overall effect of private self-awareness on negative affect and self-referent attribution was small. The overall effect of private self-awareness was stronger for women than for men. Although the finding on the association does not necessarily support a core proposition (i.e., negative affect always follows private self-awareness) in the OSA theory. Carver and Scheier (1998) suggested that private self-awareness increases rather than produces an existing affect. These findings do not fall in line with the OSA theory statement of the direct effect of private self-awareness on negative affect. The present review supports the ideas contended by both the OSA theory and the self-regulation theory which states that

private self-awareness influences certain aspects of affect. Objective self-awareness occurs when attention is directed inward toward the self and is increased by the presence of a mirror in most studies on self-awareness. As described above, private self-awareness entails focusing attention inward and the presence of a mirror increases the level of private self-awareness. When attention is focused on the self, the individuals will tend to evaluate themselves and may want to conform to a salient standard. Research has shown that self-awareness can increase aggression. For example, in a case where female subjects delivered shock to male victims, subjects in the presence of a mirror displayed stronger shock compared with those with no mirror (Carver & Scheier, 1998). This also supports the idea that self-awareness has its disadvantages as outlined in the dangers of self-awareness section above.

2.10 Self-Regulation Theory

Carver and Scheier (1998) established a theory of self-focused attention grounded on principles of self-regulating feedback systems. In this model, self-focused attention simply talks about the direction of attention which can be oriented externally toward the environment or internally toward the self. This is called public and private self-awareness respectively. Zell and Baumeister (2013) define self-regulation as efforts maintained with the aim of controlling responses or impulses in order to meet preferred standards. The term self-regulation is used interchangeably with the term self-control. The self-regulation model argues that self-focus can be directed toward either public or private aspects of the self. This notion on directing attention, either on the self or on the external environment, is also supported by the study conducted by Chernev (2003), discussed above, where it was found that private self-awareness reduces the tendency to seek variety, but adheres to preferences. Research reliably indicates that people focus differently on private and public

self-characteristics, leading to distinct motivational, cognitive, social, and behavioural effects. This is supported by findings on frequent corporal punishment, which was an important contributor to the growth of peer aggression in children (Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1987). Being knowledgeable about one's private self-aspects (private self-awareness) signifies a higher form of self-awareness compared with attending to one's public self-dimensions (public self-awareness), because that kind of self-information is more abstract than public self-aspects, though self-awareness has its own consequences for various behaviors such as aggression, which was explored in previous research studies.

2.10.1 Implications of self-awareness theories.

For objective or subjective self-awareness to occur, the assumption is that one should be conscious. The state of consciousness will result in automatic experience of perceptions and execution of actions thereof. Self-evaluation results from focusing attention on one's self, an objective self-awareness theory stance. When standards of correctness of the self are doubted, then one becomes aware of a corrected position. Attention focused on the self varies from individual to individual. This is motivated by rumination and reflection. Rumination is "self-attentiveness motivated by perceived threats, losses, or injustices to the self" (Trapnell & Campbell, 1999, p. 297). Reflection is "self-attentiveness motivated by curiosity or epistemic interest in the self" (Trapnell & Campbell, 1999, p. 297). One level of consciousness is meta-self-awareness —being aware that one is self-aware. Meta-awareness focuses attention on awareness and uses the formulation that the subject becomes the object of consciousness. The nature of the consciousness becomes so automatic that one becomes unaware of the ego processes. In this process, the individual realises the current contents of their minds. Attention is then completely absorbed by the contents of awareness and opens the way for experiencing the

nature of awareness. However, the attention is not bound in the ego processes and the needs of the self and may be focused on events unrelated to current demands of the external environment. A useful tool for improving self-awareness is a disclosure or feedback model of self-awareness called the Johari's window. The model integrates the types of self-awareness, self-disclosure, and the various ways of becoming more self-aware as discussed above.

2.11 The 4 Main Aspects of Johari's Window

Johari's window was named after two American psychologists, Joseph Luft and Harrington Ingham in 1955. The model was used to assist people to understand their relationship with self and others thereby improving trust and communication. Johari's window has been widely used in groups for building trust. The key ideas behind the model include understanding the value of self-disclosure, thereby building trust and giving and accepting constructive feedback, which will assist in self-discovery (Perry, 2010). Johari's window consists of four quadrants, the first quadrant is known as the free or open area which includes behaviour and attitudes that are seen by both the self and others. The second quadrant is known as the blind area which is seen by others, but that which we are not aware of. Quadrant 3 is called the hidden area, which is the private aspects that are kept a secret from others. Quadrant 4 is called the unknown area which is mysterious as it is not seen by either the self or others (Perry, 2010). The main goal of the model is to enlarge the free area through self-disclosure without disclosing personal information. As information is shared and feedback is provided, the free area expands and the hidden and blind area gets smaller. The free area is the most important quadrant and people with a large free area are usually very easy to talk to and they communicate openly with others. A large blind area may lead to low self-esteem or anger issues. Miller (1990) states that

the more the discloser is liked, the higher the probability of reciprocal self-disclosure, due to the trust that was built. Table 2.1 below, presents the Johari's window.

Table 2.1
Johari's window

	Known to self	Unknown to self
	Quadrant 1: Free area	Quadrant 2: Blind area
Known to others	Information about the person is known to both the self and others	Information about the person is known to others but unknown to the self
	Quadrant 3: Hidden area	Quadrant 4: Unknown area
Unknown to others	Information about the person is known to the self but hidden from others	Information about the person is unknown to the self and others

The model became widely used for understanding and training self-awareness, group dynamics, interpersonal relationships, and so forth (Steward et al., 1999). Individuals in a new group have a low shared awareness because they do not know one another yet, thus the open or free area for all members is small, but increases with greater shared awareness. Obviously, the open area can be increased by decreasing the blind area, thus increasing self-awareness; this can be achieved by asking for feedback from team members. Disclosure can also increase the open area, which automatically reduces the hidden area. The unknown area can be increased by self-discovery (Perry, 2010). Group discussions also increase the open area. As the team interacts, individuals may make various observations, which will lead to the reduction of the unknown area, which automatically increases the blind area. Traumatic experiences may form part of the unknown area and may remain unknown forever. Strong mutual understanding leads to a reduction in the hidden, blind, and/or unknown area and increases the open area. For a new team member, the open and the blind area is small, as little about the individual is

known to the group. Conversely, the hidden and the unknown areas are relatively large. On the other hand, an established team member is well known to the team, consequently creating a large open and blind area, with small hidden and unknown areas (Steward et al., 1999).

In line with private self-awareness as discussed earlier, the individual becomes aware of the hidden aspects of him or herself which are unknown to others, but known to the self. This implies that the hidden area is large, as the individual has discovered the self and the hidden area can be reduced only through self-disclosure, which will result in the increase of the open area, hence decreasing information about the individual that is known to others but unknown to the self (Brook & DeVidi, 2001). In line with public self-awareness as discussed earlier, the individual becomes aware of impressions made on others. Such individuals seek social approval and may do so through self-disclosure, thereby reducing information about the individual that is known to the self but hidden from others (Froming et al., 1990). Self-disclosure will lead to the reduction of the unknown area as information about the individual becomes known to the self and others, thereby increasing the blind area. Social approval leads to reduced hidden, blind, and unknown areas and increases the open area, resulting in information about the individual being known to both the self and others (Crisp & Turner, 2010).

Despite the advantages of Johari's window, it has been criticised for some of the reasons outlined below.

2.11.1 Criticism of Johari's window.

By its very nature, if we are to make the most of the Johari's Window model, it needs to be used within the context of a group or team. No one should feel obligated to

reveal anything about themselves with which they do not feel comfortable when sharing. Self-disclosure may either increase trust within a group, or may be dangerous if inappropriately carried out. Positive perceptions of oneself by others can be motivating. However, finding out about the weaknesses others perceive can be demotivating (Crisp & Turner, 2010).

Despite being easy to grasp and having flexible outcomes, the Johari's Window technique can be more limited than other tools or techniques (e.g., SWOT) for generating ideas about what to do next and requires that all stakeholders value the perspectives and potential differences between groups. Social approval will lead to self-acceptance, which is more applicable at an individual level than at a team level, as in Johari's model. Self-acceptance is described briefly below (Miller, 1990).

2.12 Knowing the Meaning of Self-Acceptance

According to Shepard (1979), self-acceptance occurs when one views oneself and his/her actions with approval or satisfaction. The individual has regard for him/herself and is not critical about one's self.

2.12.1 Ways in which self-acceptance can be increased/improved.

According to Maslow (1954), self-acceptance is one of the most important characteristics of self-actualised people. Self-actualised people are innately good and naturally driven to develop their potential. Reflected self-acceptance is one way of improving self-acceptance, that is, drawing conclusions about oneself on the basis of how one thinks other people see one. In this regard, the first association that comes to mind is public self-awareness. Related to Maslow's theory, self-actualisation drives individuals to develop their potential and relate to others in a manner that they may disclose themselves

to significant others, depending on whether they believe that the disclosure will be beneficial to their self-actualisation. Basic self-acceptance, as another way of improving self-acceptance, is about drawing conclusions about oneself from deep within oneself and without setting any conditions for oneself. Without self-actualisation, one may set conditions for self-acceptance, which could result in conditional elements which may affect the level of disclosure. The third way of improving self-acceptance is known as conditional acceptance, where one bases acceptance of one's self on how well one meets external standards set by others and how much they meet their expectations (Wahba & Bridwell, 1976). This also relates to public self-awareness whereby self-actualisation will be affected by external standards, which will contribute to disclosure. Self-evaluation is yet another way of increasing self-acceptance, by estimating how positively one's attributes compare with those of one's peers. Finally, one could engage in Real-ideal comparison, that is, one judges how the real self compares with the ideal self (Maslow, 1954). Unconditional, basic self-acceptance is a constructive way of determining self-concept (Johnson, 2006). Self-evaluation leads to self-awareness and improvement of one's self-actualisation. Should the individual's attributes be the same as one's peers, self-disclosure is highly likely to be motivated. Real-ideal comparison is more focused on private self-awareness as opposed to all the other factors that have been discussed here. Self-acceptance is a perspective on which the self-awareness workshop is based and is important as it facilitates self-disclosure and acceptance of others. This will also lead to the assumption that others will like you and a high level of self-acceptance is reflected in psychological health. In conclusion, the better one knows oneself, the easier it is to disclose the self, thereby contributing to the improvement of emotional intelligence and self-control. The importance of individuality was emphasised in both the objective self-awareness and self-regulation theories. Previous research has shown that self-awareness

develops as one grows and it was also found that it is easier to disclose to someone who is known to the discloser and may benefit from the disclosure by being liked. Private self-awareness was found to play a role in decision making by promoting participants to stick to their preferred choices, whereas those with public self-awareness may seek social approval for their choices. However, self-awareness may lead to more aggression when compared with those who are not self-aware. A tool for improving self-awareness, which is a disclosure/feedback model was used in the literature to integrate types of self-awareness and self-disclosure.

2.13 Conclusion

In this chapter, a variety of theoretical perspectives and empirical studies on self-awareness and how it can be cultivated was reviewed. It was shown that self-awareness develops around the age of one year and becomes fully developed around the age of eighteen months. Self-disclosure was found to solicit feedback, thereby increasing self-awareness and self-understanding. It was found that participants who were privately self-aware displayed more positive effects than those who were not manipulated. It was also found that private self-consciousness exerted a stronger effect on self-attributions as compared to self-awareness. The benefits and dangers of self-awareness were reviewed, as well as the objective and self-regulation theories. The Johari's window was found to be the tool to self-discovery and communication to build trust. An evaluation of a self-awareness intervention found it to be vital in improving the quality of life of individuals with Type 1 Diabetes. Similar studies conducted in brain injury participants have shown that their self-awareness and strategy behaviour increased significantly. A group therapy programme was found to help participants to understand their illness and help them improve awareness of their deficits, thus assisting them in coping.

In the next chapter, the methodology that has been adopted for evaluating the impact of the workshop on the participants is discussed.

Chapter 3

Method

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to outline the research method employed to conduct an evaluation of the Educhange and Research Foundation (ERF) self-awareness workshop. The chapter focuses on an overview of the research approach, research design, research objectives, research questions, sample selection, data collection, and data analysis, which employs a thematic and statistical analysis of the content. The evaluation of the self-awareness workshop specifically focused on the impact of the workshop on the learners' subjective opinions, feelings, and knowledge. In conclusion, the ethical considerations are discussed.

3.2 Research Objectives

The primary objective of the evaluation was to compare the impact on the learners before and after the intervention. The secondary aim of the evaluation was to identify the strengths of the ERF scholarship programme, and then include other nearby schools in the programme. The final objective of the research was to identify means of improving the self-awareness workshop in future. These objectives are highly dependent on self-disclosure in order to analyse views as described in detail earlier in Chapter 2. This reflects the aim of the researcher to attain an understanding of the experiences of the learners in the ERF scholarship programme.

3.2.1 Research Question/Hypothesis

The hypothesis informing the research is that after participation in the workshop,

the learners will feel that they have increased their knowledge of the key concepts of self-awareness and have positive subjective opinions and feelings about the workshop. The research questions that guided the study were:

- What impact has the workshop made on the learners' subjective evaluations of the workshop?
- What impact has the workshop made on the learners' knowledge of the key concepts of self-awareness?
- What suggestions do learners have for improving the workshop?

3.3 Study Sample

The sample identified for the study consisted of fifteen learners from two secondary schools from Soweto, Johannesburg in South Africa. There were six (3 males and 3 females) participants who were in Grade 10 from one school, and two females who were in Grade 11 from the other school. In addition, seven learners were selected, of whom three (2 females and 1 male) were in Grade 9 and four (2 males and 2 females) were in Grade 10. The ERF board members were responsible for the sample selection. One of the minimum criteria of selection was that the learner must have obtained 70%. The learners had to stem from poor backgrounds in order to be included in the programme. The ERF scholarship programme is described in detail in Chapter 1. The sample consisted of all the learners who attended the self-awareness workshop, in effect making this a purposive, convenience sampling. All the fifteen learners were selected to take part in the ERF programme, due to their presence at the workshop; they were all given an equal chance of being selected in the study.

3.4 Research Approach

This study used a mixed methods approach to evaluate the impact of the Educhange and Research Foundation self-awareness programme on the reaction and learning of the participant learners. McMillan and Schumacher (2010) indicated that researchers choose the approaches, variables, and units of analysis, which are the most appropriate for finding an answer to their research question. The quantitative component of the study comprised cross-tabulations and analysis of the data through the calculation of chi-square statistics which was further analysed qualitatively by identifying themes. The chosen method that is opted for was based on the interest of the researcher in the rich detail of the phenomenon of learners in the ERF scholarship programme, as well as its suitability for the kind of research undertaken. Mixed method is essential in understanding the research problem more completely (David & Sutton, 2011). Qualitative and quantitative research are both appropriate for this study, as meaning is discovered in the data, which is in the form of themes, and data are analysed statistically. According to Banister, Burman, Parker, Taylor, and Tindall (1994), qualitative research aims at representing the nature and quality of people's experiences, thereby gaining valid knowledge. It is inductive and theory generating, as opposed to quantitative research which is deductive. The qualitative method has become an increasingly important mode of inquiry for the social sciences and complements quantitative methods for a more complete analysis (Mertens, 2010). Qualitative research makes generalisations from particular or specific observations, while quantitative research quantifies data and generalises results from a sample to the population of interest. Quantitative research methods rely on a process of moving from a general theory to specific observations (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). This research has interacted with learners with the aim of eliciting rich and detailed responses regarding their experiences, perceptions, feelings, attitudes, and knowledge on self-awareness, which have

been analysed statistically. Qualitative research provides a rich source of information and fits in with the postmodernism way of thinking. This perspective argues against the reductionist approach towards human experience and thus is more concerned with capturing aspects of the social world, for which it is difficult to develop precise quantified measures expressed as numbers (Neuman, 2000).

According to Creswell and Plano (2011), it is vital to take into consideration the following decisions when designing a mixed methods study:

- What method takes priority during data collection and analysis?
- What does the integration stage of finding involve?
- Will a theoretical perspective be used?

In line with the theoretical perspective to be used when designing a mixed methods study, Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation is the most popular model that has been used since the 1950s to measure the effectiveness of workshops and will be used for evaluating the self-awareness workshop. There is a need to discuss literature related to the evaluation of the self-awareness workshop, which is outlined below, with the aim of giving an outline on how the model relates to the method employed in the study.

3.4.1 Evaluation research.

Evaluative research is the approach adopted in this study. Weiss (1998, as cited in Matoane, 2008) focuses on evaluation by placing an emphasis on the outcomes with the aim to improve the programme. Evaluation therefore determines what works and gives information on improving the effectiveness of programmes. Formative and summative evaluations are the two forms of evaluative research. Formative evaluation involves the collection of data during the early phases of the intervention so as to provide suggestions

on how to improve the programme. Summative evaluation involves collecting data at the end of the intervention so as to provide information for decision-makers and to specifically evaluate whether the participants acquired the necessary knowledge and skills (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). This research evaluates the impact of the self-awareness workshop on the learners' subjective feelings/opinions, attitudes, and knowledge at both the formative and summative levels. Weiss (1998, as cited in Matoane, 2008) distinguishes between two different forms of summative evaluation, that is, outcome and impact evaluations.

Outcome evaluations evaluate how the participants' knowledge and skill will change after the intervention, whilst impact evaluations assess the long-term effects of a programme on the participants. Programme monitoring (also known as process evaluation) is a form of formative evaluation in which an assessment of the impact of the programme is performed. In this study, formative evaluation is assessed in Kirkpatrick's Reaction level, whilst the summative evaluation is assessed by Kirkpatrick's learning level described below.

Kirkpatrick's behaviour and the results level of evaluation are not assessed in this research as it would be difficult to follow up on the learners months after the training and one may experience many challenges, such as the availability of the participants and other related extraneous variables. However, this could be a worthy field of research in the future.

3.4.2 Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation.

Kirkpatrick's model forms the basis of evaluation of the self-awareness workshop and has four levels, each measuring complementary aspects of a training programme (Deniz, 2002). The model includes the reaction, learning, behaviour, and results levels and is outlined in detail in Chapter 1. In this study, formative evaluation is assessed on the Reaction level, whilst the summative evaluation is assessed on the Learning level. The overall aim of this study is to evaluate whether the ERF self-awareness workshop made

any impact on the learners who participated (outcome evaluation); this was accomplished through administering pre- and post-evaluation questionnaires. According to Babbie and Mouton (2001), there is a need to assess whether the outcome of the evaluation is indeed due to the programme by using pre- and post-evaluation questionnaires, since irrelevant factors could account for the results of the intervention. It will not be possible to determine the latter because experimental and control groups were not established in the present study. Previous research studies which show how Kirkpatrick's levels have been used in evaluation research are explored.

Research has examined the nature and characteristics of the web-based continuing medical education (CME) evaluative outcomes in peer-reviewed literature. The evaluative outcomes were categorised using Kirkpatrick's model for levels of summative evaluation. Out of 86 studies, 31 revealed that 25 included evaluations of learner satisfaction (level 1), 16 studies included evaluation of learning outcomes (level 2), 2 studies evaluated performance change in clinical practice (level 3), and no studies evaluated the outcomes of the patient or health (level 4). The descriptive nature of some of the reviewed studies included evaluative methods which did not fall within the scope of Kirkpatrick's levels of evaluation, but were relevant for the evaluation of the programme. Including peer-reviewed literature is a limitation of the study and could have been improved by including previous literature. A comparative study would have improved the strength of the study (Deniz, 2002).

Recent work undertaken by Biesta (2009) on the evaluation of training in organisations has also shown how Kirkpatrick's levels have been used in evaluation research. The Reaction level evaluated affective reactions and utility judgments of the trainee and the Learning level evaluated measures of learning outcomes such as tests and

tasks. The Behaviour level evaluated job outputs and the Results level evaluated productivity gains. Levels one and two in this study are in line with my current study. The Kirkpatrick model of evaluation added value in a study conducted by Matoane (2008), as it allowed the researcher to evaluate the impact of the UNISA HIV/AIDS training programme on the participants' learning in their respective communities. The study also shows how the various Kirkpatrick levels were applied. The participants' reactions to the methods used during training were assessed by the reaction level. The learning level assessed whether the training programme assisted the participants in gaining entry to the field of HIV/AIDS counselling and the extent to which participants experienced a change in attitude, knowledge and skills, which were compared with learning outcomes. The behaviour level assessed the ability of the participants to develop and conduct HIV/AIDS prevention programmes, utilising the information gained in the programme. The Results level was not assessed as it required observation of national trends over a long period.

Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation is suitable for this study as it is simple to apply, easy to replicate, and easy generalise to larger groups. The evaluation of the outcomes and flexibility of the model renders it suitable for this study. The model allows the understanding of training evaluation in a systematic and straightforward manner. The model provides language to assess the extent to which training programmes have achieved certain objectives. The type of questions that have to be asked are given and the focus falls on training evaluation outcomes. Hence, the four-level model is suitable for the current study, even though the model has certain limitations which include the notion that the last level is more important than the other three levels, and the first level is the least important. The model is also found to be incomplete, and assumes causality.

Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating and training provides the overall framework for evaluating the self-awareness workshop, which entails the following topics:

- Understanding the meaning of the word “self-awareness”
- The importance of self-awareness
- The benefits of self-awareness
- The dangers of self-awareness
- Ways to become more self-aware
- The 4 main aspects of Johari’s window
- Ways of uncovering hidden and free areas
- Knowing the meaning of self-acceptance
- Ways in which self-acceptance can be increased/improved
- The importance of self-acceptance
- Areas about myself I am now aware of
- Aspects of the workshop
- Helpful aspects in understanding self-awareness
- Suggestions for improvement.

There is a need to play an active role as a researcher and become involved in the evaluation process, which is explored by examining the evaluation research below.

3.4.3 Sources of data.

The primary sources of data were derived from a pre-workshop questionnaire (Appendix A) and a post-workshop questionnaire (Appendix B) on self-awareness. Pre-evaluation questionnaires were completed before the workshop, whilst post-evaluation questionnaires were administered after the workshop. Delport (1999, as cited in Matoane,

2008) states that a self-administered questionnaire is a method of collecting data in which the respondent completes the questionnaire on his or her own, with the guidance of the researcher. Data collection included self-administered or self-completion questionnaires (SCQs), which were given to the participants to complete at a designated time in a classroom setting. The SCQs are cost effective, easy to administer, they reduce the possibility of bias and are convenient, but may be tiring for the respondent if the questionnaire is too long and the data may be at risk of not being fully completed and may be lost if not securely stored. The questionnaires, constructed by the facilitator, Prof. Matoane, basically covered the topics mentioned above. The established questionnaires were used because of their conducive availability. The pre-workshop questionnaire (Refer to Appendix A) has 10 items which evaluate the Learning level (concepts of self-awareness) of the evaluation model and the post-evaluation questionnaire consists of 14 items, of which items 1-10 are the same in both pre- and post-workshop questionnaires (Refer to Appendix B). Items 11-12 evaluate the Learning level and items 13-14 evaluate the Reaction level of the evaluation model. The instrument was administered at the workshop venue (Gold Reef City) and it took approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. The pre-evaluation workshop included the administration of questionnaires that asked the participants to complete information that was going to be taught in the workshop, in order to check the participants' prior knowledge of that information. This included the topics mentioned above. A workshop on self-awareness was then conducted and based on the questions asked in the pre-evaluation questionnaire, the post-evaluation intervention checked whether the participants understood the information presented at the workshop.

Evaluation forms were distributed to the participants before the workshop as well as after the workshop. Items 1-9, 11 and 12 were Yes/No questions, followed by a description of the concept that was asked about in the Yes/No questions above. Items 1-9

are the same for both pre- and post-evaluation. Items 10, 13 & 14 asked the participants about concepts presented in the workshop.

3.4.3.1 Understanding the meaning of the word “self-awareness”.

Item 1 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether they understood the meaning of the word “self-awareness”, followed by a request to define what self-awareness means.

3.4.3.2 The importance of self-awareness.

Item 2 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether it is important for them to be self-aware and to describe what self-awareness is the key to.

3.4.3.3 The benefits of self-awareness.

Item 3 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether they knew the benefits of self-awareness and to list these benefits.

3.4.3.4 The dangers of self-awareness.

Item 4 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether they knew the dangers of self-awareness and to list these dangers.

3.4.3.5 Ways to become more self-aware.

Item 5 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether they knew ways of how they could become more self-aware and to describe how they could become more self-aware.

3.4.3.6 The 4 main aspects of Johari’s window.

Item 6 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether they have heard about the phrase “Johari’s window” and to describe the 4 main aspects of Johari’s window.

3.4.3.7 *Ways of uncovering hidden and free areas.*

Item 7 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether it is possible to uncover aspects of themselves that people do not know about them and that they themselves are unaware of (hidden and free areas) and to describe how these aspects can be uncovered.

3.4.3.8 *Knowing the meaning of self-acceptance.*

Item 8 asked the participants to select either Yes/ No as to whether they knew what is meant by self-acceptance and to describe what self-acceptance means.

3.4.3.9 *The importance of self-acceptance and its improvement.*

Item 9 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether self-acceptance could be increased/improved and to describe the different ways in which self-acceptance can be increased/improved. Item 10 asked the participants what the importance of self-acceptance is.

3.4.3.10 *Areas about myself I am now aware of.*

Item 12 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether the workshop assisted them in being more self-aware and to list the areas about themselves that they are now aware of.

3.4.3.11 *Helpful aspects in understanding self-awareness.*

Item 11 asked the participants to select either Yes/No as to whether the workshop was helpful in assisting them in understanding self-awareness and to specify the reason.

3.4.3.12 *Suggestions for improvement.*

Item 13 requested the participants to give their suggestions of what the facilitator could have done to help them understand self-awareness better.

3.4.3.13 Additional comments.

Item 14 requested the participants to give any additional comments not included in the questionnaire.

3.4.4 Data management and analysis.

Each completed questionnaire was safely stored and accessible to the researcher and facilitator only. The analysed results are presented in a form that does not identify the participants' names. Folders were created on a computer in order to store data in a secure office with limited access. As mentioned above, the data was collected in the form of questionnaires. Qualitative thematic analysis and statistical analysis was employed in the research. Thematic analysis includes three sequential levels. The first level includes finding meaning in the participants' thoughts. The second level includes identifying patterns of recurring meaning and the last level includes generating themes that run through meanings (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The first step taken upon receipt of the questionnaires was to familiarise myself with the data by reading the questionnaires as many times as possible and taking note of ideas that emanated from the data. These ideas facilitated the generation of initial codes which assisted in the searching of themes. The themes were then reviewed by checking if the themes work in relation to the initial coded items and the entire data set. The themes were then defined and named accordingly, then finally selected extracts relating back to the research question and literature were identified. I found this method to be accessible, easy and quick to employ, and applicable to my participatory research.

Two types of analysis were conducted, that is, quantitative and qualitative analyses. Qualitative thematic analysis involved identifying and reporting patterns (themes) within data. The themes were identified by finding meaning in the participants' thoughts,

identifying patterns of recurring meaning, and finally generating themes that run through the meanings. The themes that were identified from the open-ended questions were then interpreted by coding participants' thoughts according to the identified themes. The data was analysed before and after the workshop and was interpreted by comparing the two. The comparison was through checking how often the participants' thoughts fell in line with the identified themes before and after the workshop.

The frequency of the participants who said "yes" vs "no" to the close-ended questions was counted and compared with the pre-test and post-test frequencies using chi-square to show whether the participants' perceptions regarding concepts about self-awareness had changed or not.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

The participants were informed that their questionnaires would form part of the primary data for a study on the impact of the ERF self-awareness programme on learners' reactions and learning. An information sheet was compiled in this regard (Refer to Appendix C). No risk was anticipated to be associated with participation in the study. It is essential that the research participants' anonymity be protected throughout the research. This was performed through the use of numerical values to identify the participants. Murphy (1980) emphasises the importance of assuring participants of confidentiality. These ethical precautions were adhered to in order to protect the legitimate rights of the participants.

All the data or information was recorded in writing. The respondents were informed that the information that they provide during the course of the study will not at any time be shared with anyone other than the researcher, facilitator, and respective

supervisor. The participants voluntarily participated in the study and all gave permission to be included in the study by signing the informed consent sheet (Refer to Appendix D). The participating learners were guaranteed confidentiality and treated in accordance with the “Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct” (American Psychological Association, 2002) as per agreement with the Psychology department. Lastly, the research endeavoured to adhere to the above mentioned ethical considerations, while at the same time to provide a true reflection of the data. The next chapter focuses on the results of the study.

3.6 Conclusion

The chapter outlined the research method employed in conducting the evaluation of the Educhange and Research Foundation (ERF) self-awareness workshop and focused on an overview of the research approach, research design, research objectives, research questions, sample selection, data collection, and data analysis. The primary objective of the evaluation was to compare the impact on the learners before and after the intervention. The hypothesis informing the research was that after participation in the workshop, the learners would feel that they have increased their knowledge of the key concepts of self-awareness and have positive subjective opinions and feelings about the workshop.

The sample identified for the study consisted of fifteen learners from two secondary schools from Soweto, Johannesburg, South Africa. The sample consisted of all the learners who attended the self-awareness workshop, in effect making this a purposive, convenience sampling. All the fifteen learners were selected to take part in the ERF programme and due to their presence in the workshop they were all given an equal chance of selection to participate in the study.

This study used a mixed methods approach to evaluate the impact of the Educhange and Research Foundation self-awareness programme on learners' reaction and learning. In line with the theoretical perspective used when designing a mixed methods study, Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation was used to measure the effectiveness of workshops and was used for evaluating the self-awareness workshop. The data were analysed by employing thematic and statistical analysis of the content. The primary sources of data were a pre-evaluation questionnaire and post evaluation questionnaire on self-awareness. In this chapter, the research process followed for this study is discussed. The chapter furnishes an overview of the overall research approach, the design, the methods used for data collection, and analysis. Thereafter, the chapter is concluded by looking at ethical considerations.

In the next chapter, the results of the study will be presented.

Chapter 4

Results

4.1 Introduction

This chapter describes and gives an interpretation of the data from which the impact of the self-awareness workshop on the participants' reactions and learning was assessed. This is done through analysis of data by thematic and statistical analysis described in chapter 3. The assessment was conducted with reference to the 'reaction' and 'learning' levels of Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating training programmes (Kirkpatrick, 1996). The aim of the assessment was to ensure that the objectives of the workshop were achieved, thereby providing recommendations for improvement of the workshop and ensuring that there is advancement in the participants' perceptions in terms of their knowledge with regard to self-awareness.

4.2 Kirkpatrick's Model: Reaction Level

Kirkpatrick's Reaction Level evaluates the participants' reactions towards aspects of the workshop, for example, whether the workshop was enjoyable, relevant, and worthwhile. Participants could be asked what their subjective opinions or feelings were about the workshop, for example, whether they liked the venue, facilitator, timing, and so on. The participants could also be asked what their level of participation was (Kirkpatrick, 1996). The above mentioned questions posed in the reaction level of Kirkpatrick's model lead to engagement in formative evaluation, which aims at ensuring that programme goals are achieved and the recommendations for improvement of the workshop are made. In the current study, the participants' reactions to concepts of self-awareness were assessed, which is in line with process evaluation, a form of formative evaluation.

With the aim of improving the process of delivering the self-awareness workshop, the participants' comments about the workshop were analysed in order to obtain the participants' reactions towards the workshop.

Participants were asked to complete open-ended and close-ended questions on aspects of the workshop, where they expressed their feelings and made general comments about their reactions towards the self-awareness workshop, thereby providing suggestions for improving the workshop. In total, 15 participants of the 15 responded to this question. Table 4.1 presents a summary of the categories that describe the participants' reactions to the self-awareness workshop.

Table 4.1
Categories and frequencies of participants' reactions towards aspects of the workshop (n=15)

Category	Frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation opinion
Liked the workshop	12	80%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"The workshop was perfect ..."(Participant 2)</i> • <i>"The workshop was good"(Participant 03)</i> • <i>"The workshop was Fun and exciting..."(Participant 06)</i> • <i>"The workshop was well done, the exercises were good and I enjoyed the programme" (Participant 10)</i> • <i>"...The exercises made it simple for me to understand"(Participant 14)</i>
Disliked the workshop	1	7%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"The workshop was difficult ...It was not good and was not planned"(Participant 1)</i> • <i>"...more information should be added on self-acceptance"...Add more time"(Participant 10)</i>
Suggested improvements	2	13%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Explain Johari's window in detail...The hall was small"(Participant 11)</i>

The three categories were: “liked the workshop”, “disliked the workshop” and “suggested improvements”. Most participants (80%) liked the workshop. This category of participants generally gave positive reactions. The positive reactions towards the workshop were as follows: The workshop was said to be good, fun, exciting, well done, and enjoyable. However, these responses were rather shallow, not interesting, and difficult to analyse thematically. The only description that was given about what was liked about the workshop was the exercises that were given during the workshop. The exercises were found to have simplified and enhanced the learning process. The responses were positive and showed that the participants were satisfied with the training. Only the exercises were mentioned as to what was liked about the workshop and most of the reactions were not specific as to what they liked about the workshop, which could have given clear recommendations for improvement.

Only one participant (7%) disliked the workshop as he or she found it to be difficult to comprehend. This category identified negative reactions towards the workshop and gave a description of what was disliked about the workshop. The negative reactions towards the workshop were as follows: The workshop was found to be difficult, not good, and not planned. The participants’ reactions did not give a detailed description about what they were unhappy about so as to improve the workshop. The participants could have specified what they liked and disliked about the workshop. However, very few comments were made for the “disliked” category of the workshop, whilst more comments were made under the “like” category.

There were two participants (13%) who made suggestions as to how the workshop could be improved. The sub-categories from the participants’ responses included time allocation, which was found to be short; content, where more information on self-

acceptance and Johari's window could have been added; and venue, which was said to be small. These suggestions give a detailed description about what in the content could have been added in order to improve the workshop. From the above responses, it is evident that the participants found the workshop to be fun and satisfactory. Considering that fewer suggestions for improvement were given, one can conclude that most participants liked the manner in which the workshop was presented. In summary, most participants liked the workshop, whilst a few disliked the workshop and some suggested that more information on self-acceptance and Johari's window should be added; more time should be allocated and a larger venue should be considered.

With the aim of improving the workshop, the participants' perceptions towards what were helpful aspects of the workshop, which assisted in the understanding of self-awareness, were assessed. An overwhelming majority of participants (93%) found the workshop to be helpful in understanding self-awareness. Table 4.2 presents aspects of the workshop which assisted in understanding self-awareness.

Table 4.2
Aspects of the workshop which were helpful in understanding self-awareness

Topics	Content
Johari's window	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Because I did not know that my peers know this lot about me I was surprised to see that they do take notice". (Participant 11)</i> • <i>"...I know Johari's window and I know myself better". (Participant 10)</i>
Benefits and dangers of self-awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"I learnt the benefits and dangers of self-awareness..." (Participant 03)</i>
Self-awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Before the workshop I did not even know what exactly self-awareness meant. After the workshop I know". (Participant 05)</i>
Self-acceptance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"I was not sure about what exactly was meant by self-acceptance". (Participant 10)</i>

The common topics that assisted the participants in understanding self-awareness included the benefits and dangers of self-awareness, Johari's window, the meaning of self-awareness and self-acceptance.

4.3 Kirkpatrick's Model: Learning Level

The Kirkpatrick's learning level of evaluating training programmes was used to evaluate the self-awareness workshop. This level evaluates the extent to which participants experienced a change in opinion in terms of knowledge as a result of having undergone the training (Kirkpatrick, 1996). The aim of Kirkpatrick's learning level was not to measure the learning directly, but to establish whether the participants' perceptions regarding their learning had changed. This level is in line with summative evaluation, which is also the extent to which participants change as a result of participating in a particular programme (De Vos, 2002; Noe, 1999). The results on the impact of the programme on the participants' opinion in terms of their knowledge are presented below.

4.3.1 The impact of the workshop on participants' perceptions regarding their knowledge.

With the aim of evaluating the impact of the workshop on participants' opinions in terms of knowledge of understanding the meaning of the word "self-awareness", participants were asked before and after the workshop what their opinions were with regard to whether they understood the meaning of the word "self-awareness". Table 4.3 presents participants' pre- and post-evaluation frequencies on positive, negative, and no responses given.

Table 4.3
I understand/ don't understand the meaning of self-awareness (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: I understand the meaning of the word "Self Awareness"	11	73%	12	80%
Negative response: I do not understand the meaning of the word "Self Awareness"	2	13%	0	0%
No response	2	13%	3	20%

In order to authenticate the results of the question as to whether the participants were of the opinion that they understood the meaning of the word "self-awareness", a chi-square statistic has been calculated. The test is for evaluating the strength of the relationship between workshop attendance and perceptions regarding understanding the meaning of the word "self-awareness". In all of the tables, only the positive and negative responses were taken into consideration and the no response category was ignored as it is a neutral response. When a participant is of the opinion that he or she understands the

meaning of the word “self-awareness”, the response is regarded as positive and when a participant is of the opinion that he or she does not understand the meaning of the word “self-awareness”, the response is regarded as negative. The chi-square test reflects the strength of the relationship between these perceptions during pre- and post-evaluation. The greater the chi-square statistic, the stronger the relationship and the lower the probability (Babbie & Mouton, 2001). The null hypothesis assumes that there is no relationship between workshop attendance and perceptions regarding understanding of the meaning of the word “self-awareness”.

The chi-square statistic is 2.0. The p -value is 0.157. This result is not significant at $p < 0.05$.

The null hypothesis asserts the independence of the variables under consideration. Since a p -value of 0.157 is greater than the conventionally accepted significance level of 0.05 (i.e., $p > 0.05$), we fail to reject the null hypothesis. In other words, there is no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they understood the meaning of the word “self-awareness” before and after the workshop. There was an increase in the number of participants who thought they understood the meaning of the word “self-awareness”, from 73% to 80% between pre- and post-evaluation. This implies that 7% more participants thought that they knew what self-awareness meant after the workshop. This is a statistically insignificant difference as supported by the Chi-square calculation. Some of the participants (13%) did not give responses to this item during the pre-evaluation and more participants (20%) did not respond to whether they think they understood the meaning of the word “self-awareness” after the workshop. This implies that 7% more participants did not respond to whether they understood the term self-awareness after the workshop. This may be attributed to a level of uncertainty and misunderstanding of the content presented in the workshop and the

participants who did not give responses may not have learnt what was intended for the workshop with regard to the meaning of self-awareness. The fact that the number of participants who did not respond to this item increased after the workshop may be due to the reason that they may have found the questionnaires to be too long and due to being tired from engagement in the workshop, omitted responses. Most participants (80%) were of the opinion that they had gained a better understanding of the meaning of the word “self-awareness” after the workshop. This is evident from the definitions given after the workshop as compared to those given before the workshop. Table 4.4 presents themes indicating opinions regarding knowledge of the meaning of self-awareness.

Table 4.4
Themes indicating perceptions regarding their knowledge of the meaning of self-awareness

Theme	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Focus attention		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Focusing attention on yourself”.(Participant 03)</i> • <i>“...focusing attention on yourself on aspects like...self-disclosure and self-understanding”. (Participant 10)</i>
Self-knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Knowing who you are, your thoughts, feelings, reasoning and reactions, also actions based on thinking before you act”. (Participant 04)</i> • <i>“It means knowing your reflections of your life and yourself”. (Participant 06)</i> • <i>“Self-awareness means having a clear perception of yourself including your personality, strengths, weaknesses etc.” (Participant 10)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Knowing who and what you are and being able to describe your holistic you”.(Participant 10)</i> • <i>“Knowing yourself very well...” (Participant 01)</i> • <i>“...focusing attention on yourself on aspects like self-knowledge...” (Participant 03)</i>

The two themes that were identified were focusing attention on the self and self-knowledge. These themes are in line with the meaning of the word “self-awareness” as defined during the workshop. During pre-evaluation, the descriptions given by the participants were more about self-knowledge as opposed to both self-knowledge and focusing attention on the self during post-evaluation. Precise definitions were given during post-evaluation as focusing attention on the self, which was not the case during pre-evaluation. The definitions that were provided before the workshop seem to be generalised, long, but accurate, whilst definitions given after the workshop seem to be precise and share common terminology. However, the description “knowing yourself” seems to be common in both pre- and post-evaluation. This gives clarification of knowledge and also forms part of skill-related knowledge. Themes such as self-disclosure which emanated during post-evaluation also show that the participants have gained knowledge of the terminology related to the meaning of the word “self-awareness”. In summary, the workshop seems to have equipped participants with the correct factual information about self-awareness, particularly the meaning of self-awareness, and there has been a change in opinion regarding knowledge in terms of terminology as a result of participating in the self-awareness workshop, although the difference was found to be statistically insignificant.

With the aim of assessing whether the participants thought they knew how to become more self-aware, participants were asked to give their opinion on this and to give a description thereof. Table 4.5 presents the participants’ pre- and post-evaluation frequencies for perceptions given with regard to whether they knew how to become more self-aware.

Table 4.5
I know/don't know how to become more self-aware (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: I know how to become more self-aware	9	60%	13	87%
Negative response: I don't know how to become more self-aware	5	33%	0	0%
No response	1	7%	2	13%

The Chi-square statistic is 5.698 and the p -value is 0.017. This result is significant at $p < 0.05$. The null hypothesis asserts the independence of the variables under consideration. Since a p -value of 0.017 is less than the conventionally accepted significance level of 0.05 (i.e. $p < 0.05$), we reject the null hypothesis. In other words, there is a statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they knew ways of how they could become more self-aware after the workshop as compared to before the workshop. This is evident in the results presented below. Most of the participants (87%) were of the opinion that they knew the ways on how they could become more self-aware after the workshop as compared to some of the participants (60%) before the workshop. This indicates that the workshop was successful in ensuring that more participants thought that they knew how to become self-aware as proven by the Chi-square statistic of six, and a 27% difference supports a statistically significant difference. Compared to the previous item, an increase in the Chi-square statistic when the participants were asked if they understood the meaning of self-awareness is evident. This is evident in the decrease from 33% to 0% of the participants who were of the opinion that they did not know how to become more self-aware after the workshop.

The number of participants who did not give a response increased from 7% to 13% during post-evaluation. This may be due to lack of understanding of the content and pre-misconceptions about the subject as well as omitting responses due to fatigue and finding the questionnaire to be too long. Table 4.6 presents the themes on how to become more self-aware. Note that all themes listed below are positive responses.

Table 4.6
Themes indicating how to become more self-aware

Theme	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Introspection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Ask myself questions like what do I want in life and how am I going to make it happen”. (Participant 02) • “By surveying all the actions and thoughts that cross my mind also feelings. In a way just always think clearly before acting in order to know what to do”. (Participant 05) • “Studying yourself and your attitude around others is a great way to know yourself”. (Participant 10) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Evaluating my every move and how I talk to people or approach them”. (Participant 01) • “Introspection...” (Participant 03) • “...examine my thoughts, feelings and also action...” (Participant 10) • “Look at myself closely to find any new things that I did not know about myself...” (Participant 15)
Observing yourself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...observing myself, explaining myself to others”. (Participant 02) • “Spending time identifying who you know, what you like and what you do not like, accepting yourself the way you are and know when to act or say something”. (Participant 08) • “Studying yourself and your attitude around others is a great way to know yourself.” (Participant 11) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...observing myself...” (Participant 03)
Comparing yourself		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...comparing myself to others...” (Participant 03) • “...comparing myself in a good way not in a bad way”. (Participant 05) • “...Compare my background to other people background”. (Participant 10)
Seeking feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Socialise with more people”. (Participant 09) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...seeking feedback”. (Participant 06) • “Interact with other people with different backgrounds...” (Participant 13)

Considering the identified themes, introspection emerged during pre- and post-evaluation. This theme involves examining one's thoughts, feelings, and motives before taking action, and was mostly described during pre-evaluation as compared to post-evaluation, but the word "introspection" was precisely mentioned during post-evaluation. Other themes that are common in both instances include observing yourself, seeking feedback from others about what kind of a person you are, and interacting with others from different backgrounds. The theme on comparing yourself to others only appeared during post-evaluation. This indicates that all the themes with the exception of comparing yourself to others were present both during pre- and post-evaluation, suggesting that the basic terminology used to label these themes mentioned by the participants changed during post-evaluation. This is supported by the finding of a statistically significant relationship...

Furthermore, the participants were asked whether they had ever heard of Johari's window and to mention the four main aspects of Johari's window. Their frequencies on their perceptions during pre- and post-evaluation are presented in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7
I have/ haven't heard about the phrase Johari's window (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: I have heard about the phrase Johari's window	2	13%	13	87%
Negative response: I haven't heard about the phrase Johari's window	13	87%	1	7%
No response	0	0%	1	7%

The chi-square statistic is 18.339 and the p -value is 0.000018 and the result is significant at $p < 0.05$. The null hypothesis asserts the independence of the variables under consideration. Since the p -value is less than the conventionally accepted significance level of 0.05 (i.e., $p < 0.05$) we reject the null hypothesis. In other words, there is a statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who had heard of the phrase “Johari’s window” between pre- and post-evaluation. A Chi-square statistic of 18 is quite high and suggests a highly significant relationship between negative and positive perceptions given before and after the workshop. This explains the 74% difference in the number of participants who had heard of Johari’s window after the workshop. Most of the participants (87%) had heard of Johari’s window after the workshop, although only a few participants (13%) had heard about it before the workshop. It is noteworthy that all the participants responded to this question during pre-evaluation, this may be due to the nature of the question, which is direct and the unequivocal nature of the word “Johari’s window”. Despite having heard about Johari’s window in the workshop, a few participants (7%) said that they had never heard of Johari’s window and a few participants did not give any response after the workshop. It shows that a few participants thought that they had never heard of Johari’s window after the workshop, which may be attributed to ignorance and lack of concentration. The participants’ responses with regard to the four main aspects of Johari’s window are presented below:

Pre-evaluation:

“Things people know about you, things you know about yourself, things people don’t know about yourself, things you don’t know about yourself”.

“You and yourself, you and the teacher, you and the friend, you and the family member”

Post-evaluation:

“Knowing yourself, understanding yourself and that at first nobody knows you the way you do but at the end you have a relationship and gap closes”

“Free to self and others, Blind to self, free to others, free to self, hidden to others, unknown to self and others”

“Free to self and others, blind to self, free to others, unknown to self and others”

“The known and unknown aspects when you start a relationship and how this changes...”

Table 4.8 below presents the common themes identified regarding the four aspects of Johari’s window by the participants.

Table 4.8
Themes indicating the four aspects of Johari's window

Themes	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Free Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Things people know about you, things you know about yourself...” (Participant 01)</i> • <i>“You and yourself, you and the teacher, you and the friend, you and the family member”.</i>(Participant 07) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Knowing yourself, understanding yourself and that at first nobody knows you the way you do but at the end you have a relationship and gap closes”. (Participant 04)</i> • <i>“Free to self and other...” (Participant 10)</i> • <i>“The known ... aspects when you start a relationship and how this change...” (Participant 13)</i>
Hidden Area		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Known to self and ...not known to others...” (Participant 03)</i> • <i>“...hidden to others...and free to self”. (Participant 07)</i>
Blind Area		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“... Blind to self, free to others...” (Participant 06)</i>
Unknown Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“...things people don't know about yourself, things you don't know about yourself”. (Participant 03)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“...unknown to self and other”. (Participant 08)</i>

From the above mentioned descriptions of the four aspects of Johari's window, the common themes identified during pre-evaluation include the free area, which refers to information known to the self and others. It also includes information that is unknown to the self and others. Only those participants who had heard about Johari's window identified the two common themes mentioned above. More detail was given after the workshop as per the following identified themes: Hidden and Blind areas where the Hidden area included information that is known to the self but hidden to others, and the

Blind area was said to refer to information that is known to others but not known to the self. Based on the descriptions by the participants, the four aspects of Johari's window were all covered during post-evaluation, as opposed to only brief and generalised outlines of only two aspects of Johari's window during the pre-evaluation. This proves that the participants learnt what was intended, which is the only instance where there is indeed direct evidence that there was a change in knowledge as a result of having learnt about Johari's window.

With the aim of evaluating the impact of the workshop on participants' opinions about their knowledge in terms of understanding the meaning of the word "self-acceptance", participants were asked what their opinions were in this regard. Table 4.9 presents the participants' frequencies on the perceptions whether they knew what was meant by self-acceptance before and after the workshop.

Table 4.9
I know/ don't know what is meant by self-acceptance (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: I know what is meant by self-acceptance	15	100%	15	100%
Negative response: I don't know what is meant by self- acceptance	0	0%	0	0%
No response	0	0%	0	0%

It is not possible to perform a Chi-square statistic as the marginal row totals are zero. All the participants were of the opinion that they knew the meaning of self-acceptance both before and after the workshop. This may be attributed to the participants'

different conceptions about what self-acceptance is before versus after the workshop. It indicates that at the beginning of the workshop, all the participants believed that they knew what self-acceptance meant and at the end of the workshop, they all continued to believe that they knew what self-acceptance meant, but they may have changed their ideas about what self-acceptance meant. This is the only item where all the participants gave the same answer in both instances. This may be due to the confidence they have in their answers and the common understanding of the word as well as the non-ambivalent nature of the word. From their descriptions, self-acceptance was described as the following:

Pre-evaluation:

“You have to love who you are and never change yourself to be somebody else. Or to please those around you”

“Accepting yourself for who you are regardless of what other people think”

“It means accepting yourself the way you are and accepting the gender you are”.

Post-evaluation:

“You have to Love yourself the way you are and never change yourself because someone says you don’t look great”

“Accepting yourself for who you are and not who other people want you to be”.

Table 4.10 presents the themes identified from the participants’ responses, which reveal their opinions regarding understanding of the meaning of self-acceptance.

Table 4.10

Themes indicating the opinions regarding understanding of the meaning of self-acceptance

Theme	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Satisfied with yourself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “You have to love who you are and never change yourself to be somebody else...” (Participant 01) • “Accepting yourself for who you are regardless of what other people think”. (Participant 03) • “It means accepting yourself the way you are and accepting the gender you are”. (Participant 09) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “You have to Love yourself the way you are and never change yourself because someone says you don’t look great”. (Participant 09)
Not critical of yourself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...Or to please those around you”. (Participant 02) • “... Regardless of what other people think”. (Participant 08) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...because someone says you don’t look great”. (Participant 04) • “Accepting yourself for who you are and not who other people want you to be”. (Participant 03)

Drawing from these descriptions, the common theme is satisfaction. During pre-evaluation, the participants identified the following sub-themes as those with which they are satisfied with: yourself and your gender, whilst during post-evaluation, the participants identified the following sub-themes: Yourself and your looks. The descriptions placed an emphasis on being satisfied with yourself and your actions, which was the precise definition given during the workshop. The participants understood the term due to its simplicity and commonality. Participants were further asked why self-acceptance was important and the following were their reasons:

Pre-evaluation:

“So that you can be able to go out and stand in front a bunch of people feeling comfortable”

“So that you do not think about bad things and also dangerous thing like committing suicide and so that you can have pride”.

“The importance in that you accept who and what you are you can accomplish almost anything that you put your mind and heart to without hesitation”

“To be able to love and accept other people as they are”.

Post-evaluation:

“So that people can also accept yourself and so that you can be comfortable with whom you are”

“Is important because you need to acknowledge yourself and being proud of yourself”

“When accepting yourself you increase the chances of others accepting you. You always know what to do next when coming to personal problems”

“It is importance because it helps you know your limitations, your strengths, weaknesses personality, values etc.”

Table 4.11 presents the identified themes from the participants’ descriptions of their opinion on why self-acceptance is important.

Table 4.11
Themes indicating perceptions regarding the importance of self-acceptance

Theme	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Self-disclosure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “It is importance because it helps you know your limitations, your strengths, weaknesses personality, values etc.” (Participant 10)
Acceptance of others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “To be able to love and accept other people as they are”. (Participant 12) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “When accepting yourself you increase the chances of others accepting you...” (Participant 05)
Being liked by others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “So that you can be able to go out and stand in front a bunch of people feeling comfortable”. (Participant 04) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “So that people can also accept yourself and so that you can be comfortable with whom you are”. (Participant 04) “Is important because you need to acknowledge yourself and being proud of yourself”. (Participant 11)
Good psychological health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “So that you do not think about bad things and also dangerous thing like committing suicide and so that you can have pride”. (Participant 02) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “...You always know what to do next when coming to personal problems” (Participant 02)

The common themes that are identified from these descriptions include self-disclosure, acceptance of others, being liked by others and good psychological health. The theme on self-disclosure came up only after the workshop and included disclosing one’s

limitations, strengths, weaknesses, personality, and values. This shows that the participants' opinions changed as a result of having attended the workshop. The acceptance of others theme came up both during pre- and post-evaluation. It was mentioned during post-evaluation that self-acceptance increases the chances of others accepting you; however, during pre- and post-evaluation, it was emphasised that one needs to be comfortable around people first in order to be accepted. Sub-themes that emanated from the good psychological health theme during pre-evaluation included no suicidal ideation, and during post-evaluation, it was said that self-acceptance will improve personal problem solving skills. Clear and more concise terminology emanated from the post-evaluation, which proves that there was a change in opinion regarding knowledge in terms of why self-acceptance is important.

In order to further assess participants' opinion regarding knowledge in terms of self-acceptance, they were asked whether it was possible to increase/improve self-acceptance and to give ways in which self-acceptance could be improved. Table 4.12 presents the participants' frequencies on responses with regard to their opinions on whether it was possible to increase self-acceptance.

Table 4.12
Self-acceptance can/cannot be increased/ improved (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: Self-acceptance can be increased/ improved	10	67%	14	93%
Negative response: Self-acceptance cannot be increased/ improved	2	13%	0	0%
No response	3	20%	1	7%

The Chi-square statistic is 2.53 and the p -value is 0.112. This result is not significant at $p < 0.05$. Since a p -value of 0.112 is greater than the conventionally accepted significant level of 0.05 (i.e., $p > 0.05$). We fail to reject the null hypothesis. In other words, there is no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that self-acceptance could be increased before and after the workshop. An overwhelming majority of the participants (93%) were of the opinion that self-acceptance could be increased or improved during post-evaluation as compared to some participants (67%) who also agreed that self-acceptance could be improved, in pre-evaluation. This is a 26% increase, which could have been better considering the non-ambivalent nature of the topic as the Chi-square is very low. The change in opinions is attributed to the information acquired during the workshop. This is supported by the fact that after the workshop, none of the participants were of the opinion that self-acceptance could not be improved, as opposed to some participants (13%) who, during pre-evaluation, were of the opinion that self-acceptance could not be improved. During pre-evaluation, there were more participants (20%) who did not respond to this item as compared to 7% after the workshop. This decrease in the number of people who did not respond is an improvement, as it shows that only a few participants may have been uncertain of their answers. The participants' responses with regard to the different ways in which self-acceptance could be improved were as follows:

Pre-evaluation:

“Accept yourself and know that God created you this way because it suits you so don't change yourself”

“Not looking at the negative side people say always telling yourself that you are beautiful/handsome as you are”

“It can be increased by having confidence in yourself and improved by always trying to be that best person you can be in your suitable position”

“Be positive about yourself; ask what people think about you”

“Believing in yourself, having confidence, always Love yourself, and believing that you are perfect that was you are”

“Knowing your strengths and weaknesses, knowing your personality, Knowing your likes and dislikes”.

Post-evaluation:

“Being comfortable with yourself and loving yourself. Accepting who you are and that you not going to change anytime”

“Using verbal communication not judging or comparing yourself to others, looking into the feedback given and change the negative aspects given about you”

“Reflection, basic reflection, condition yourself”

“It can be improved by comparing yourself to others and finding out how they differ from you”.

Table 4.13 presents the themes identified from the different ways in which self-acceptance could be improved as mentioned by the participants above.

Table 4.13
 Themes indicating the various ways in which self-acceptance could be improved

Theme	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Be positive about yourself; ask what people think about you”. (Participant 06)</i> • <i>“Knowing your strengths and weaknesses, knowing your personality, Knowing your likes and dislikes”. (Participant 07)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Reflection, basic reflection, condition yourself”. (Participant 07)</i> • <i>“...looking into the feedback given and change the negative aspects given about you”. (Participant 10)</i>
Basic self-acceptance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Accept yourself and know that God created you this way because it suits you so don’t change yourself”. (Participant 04)</i> • <i>“Not looking at the negative side people say always telling yourself that you are beautiful/handsome as you are”. (Participant 05)</i> • <i>“It can be increased by having confidence in yourself and improved by always trying to be that best person you can be in your suitable position”. (Participant 08)</i> • <i>“Believing in yourself, having confidence, always Love yourself, and believing that you are perfect that was you are”. (Participant 12)</i> • <i>“Believing in yourself, having confidence, always Love yourself, and believing that you are perfect that was you are”. (Participant 13)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Being comfortable with yourself and loving yourself. Accepting who you are and that you not going to change anytime”. (Participant 04)</i>
Self-evaluation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“It can be improved by comparing yourself to others and finding out how they differ from you”. (Participant 09)</i> • <i>“Using verbal communication not judging yourself ...” (Participant 11)</i>

During pre-evaluation, reflection and basic acceptance were the two themes that were described and are common to those described after the workshop. This indicates that the participants had a pre-understanding of the concept before the workshop. However, one can deduce that the workshop gave the participants a change in opinion as self-evaluation was another theme that emerged only after the workshop. In summary, the participants said that taking into consideration how others perceive you (reflection) and accepting yourself with no conditions (basic self-acceptance) are the two ways in which self-acceptance could be improved in both pre- and post-evaluation and comparing yourself to others (self-evaluation) is also important in improving self-acceptance during post-evaluation.

With the aim of evaluating whether the workshop had an impact of the participants' opinion regarding knowledge, participants were asked to indicate whether it was important for them to be self-aware. The frequencies of the responses given about whether it was important in their opinion to be self-aware are presented in Table 4.14.

Table 4.14
Importance of Self-awareness (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: It is important for us to be self-aware	14	93%	13	87%
Negative response: It is not important for us to be self-aware	1	7%	0	0%
No response	0	0%	2	13%

The Chi-square statistic is 0.899 and the p -value is 0.343. This result is not significant at $p < 0.05$. Since a p -value of 0.343 is greater than the conventionally accepted significance level of 0.05 (i.e., $p > 0.05$). We fail to reject the null hypothesis, that is, there is no statistically significant difference in the portion of participants who were of the opinion that it was important to be self-aware before and after the workshop. There was a decrease in the number of participants who thought it was important to be self-aware from 93% to 87% during pre-evaluation and post-evaluation respectively, which is a 6% difference. This explains why there is no statistically significant difference and the Chi-square statistic is extremely low. This shows that prior to the presentation of the workshop, an overwhelming majority of participants (93%) believed that it was important to be self-aware. One can deduce that they had high expectations of the workshop. The decrease in the number of participants who thought it was important to be self-aware, may be attributed to the fact that their high expectations had not been met or that they found the content not to be of relevance to their personal development. One participant (7%) thought it was not important for him or her to be self-aware before the workshop, but there was no participant who thought it was not important to be self-aware after the workshop, which means that there was a change in opinions after the workshop. Some of the participants (13%) did not give responses during post-evaluation; this may be attributed to indecision, confusion, finding the questionnaire to be long, and failure to apply the information to their personal lives. To further assess whether there was a change in opinion in the participants regarding self-awareness, they were asked what the importance of self-awareness was, and these were their responses:

Pre-evaluation:

“Confidence and self- understanding”

“A balanced self-managed person who know what to expect of his/her self at certain times”

“Knowing yourself”.

Post-Evaluation:

“Better you and understanding the hidden you”

“Self-Knowledge, a self-disclosure, self-understanding”

“Making friends (Socialising), Presenting yourself”

“Confidence”.

Table 4.15 presents the themes identified as key to self-awareness.

Table 4.15

Themes indicating opinions regarding the importance of self-awareness

Theme	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Self-knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“A balanced self-managed person who know what to expect of his/her self at certain times”.</i> (Participant 10) • <i>“Knowing yourself”.</i> (Participant 13) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Self-Knowledge...”</i> (Participant 13)
Self-understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Confidence and self-understanding”.</i> (Participant 03) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Better you and understanding the hidden you”.</i> (Participant 02) • <i>“... Self- understanding”.</i> (Participant 03) • <i>“...Confidence...”</i> (Participant 13)
Self-disclosure		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“...a self– disclosure...”</i> (Participant 10) • <i>“Making friends (Socializing), Presenting yourself”.</i> (Participant 14))

The common themes that were identified included: self-knowledge, self-disclosure,

and self- understanding as key to self-awareness. Self-knowledge and self-understanding are themes that emanated during the pre- and post-evaluation; this indicates that most of the participants had a change in opinion regarding why it was important for them to be self-aware before the workshop. Self-disclosure was the only theme that arose during post-evaluation and phrases such as “hidden” aspects and “presenting yourself” support this notion from the above-mentioned responses during post-evaluation. All the participants’ responses reveal that the participants had made changes in their opinions of knowledge towards reasons why they thought it was important for them to be self-aware, though this is an insignificant difference. The participants’ responses for both pre-and post-evaluation are similar with regard to the common themes identified, with the exception of self-disclosure, which only emerged after the workshop.

With the aim of assessing the impact of the workshop on whether the participants were of the opinion that the workshop had an impact on their knowledge, participants were asked whether they knew what the benefits of self-awareness were and to mention these benefits. Table 4.16 presents the participants’ frequencies in terms of whether they knew what the benefits of self-awareness were.

Table 4.16
I know/don't know the benefits of self-awareness (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: I know the benefits of self-awareness	13	87%	14	93%
Negative response: I know the benefits of self-awareness	1	7%	0	0%
No response	1	7%	1	7%

The Chi-square statistic is 1.037 and the p -value is 0.309. This result is not significant at $p < 0.05$. Since a value of 0.309 is greater than the conventionally accepted significance level of 0.05 (i.e., $p > 0.05$). We fail to reject the null hypothesis. There is no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they knew the benefits of self-awareness. An overwhelming majority of participants (93%) were of the opinion that they knew what the benefits of self-awareness were after the workshop, as opposed to most participants (87%) after the workshop, which is again only a 6% difference; this explains why the chi-square statistic is very low. One participant (7%) did not respond to this question neither before nor after the workshop. This may be attributed to not knowing what the benefits of self-awareness are before the workshop and may also be due to lack of understanding of the benefits of self-awareness after the workshop. The participants' responses regarding the benefits of self-awareness were as follows:

Pre-evaluation:

"It can boost self-esteem"

"Self-confidence, standing for yourself"

"To be well managed, people knowing the real you, thinking clearly and know when there is a change of mood why"

"To deal with different situations differently based on your actions, increase your ability to communicate affectively".

Post-Evaluation:

"Knowing yourself, knowing your values, knowing yourself to the extent that you can help yourself when you have problem knowing"

“Knowing how to deal with problems of life, being able to communicate effectively”

“Knowing you, Socializing, being confident”.

Table 4.17 presents the participants’ responses on what the benefits of self-awareness are.

Table 4.17
Perceived knowledge acquired from the benefits of self-awareness

Theme	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Appropriate actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“To deal with different situations differently based on your actions, increase your ability to communicate affectively”. (Participant 14)</i> 	
Communicate effectively	<p><i>“To deal with different situations differently based on your actions, increase your ability to communicate affectively”. (Participant 10)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Knowing how to deal with problems of life, being able to communicate effectively”. (Participant 15)</i>
Suitable presentation of yourself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Self-confidence, standing for yourself” (Participant 07)</i> <p><i>“To be well managed, people knowing the real you, thinking clearly and know when there is a change of mood why” (Participant 03)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Knowing you, Socializing, being confident” (Participant 03)</i>
Self-understanding and personal problem solving		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>“Knowing yourself, knowing your values, knowing yourself to the extent that you can help yourself when you have problem knowing”(Participant 01)</i> <i>“Knowing how to deal with problems of life...” (participant 15)</i>

The common themes that were identified for the benefits of self-awareness

included appropriate actions, effective communication, suitable presentation of yourself, self-understanding, and personal problem solving. The words that describe the “appropriate actions” theme were absent during post-evaluation but were present during pre-evaluation, which supported by the low chi-square statistic. The “suitable presentation of yourself” theme was described in both pre- and post-evaluation, but more descriptions were given before the workshop. This indicates that the workshop was not successful in ensuring that this theme was conceptualised. The “Effective communication” theme was found in both instances and equally described. The “Self-understanding and personal problem solving” theme only emanated during post-evaluation and shows that the workshop was successful in describing that self-awareness helps to understand oneself to a point where one knows how to solve one’s personal problems.

The participants were asked what their opinion is regarding whether they knew what the dangers of self-awareness were and to mention these dangers. Table 4.18 presents the participants’ frequencies in responses as to whether they knew what the dangers of self-awareness were.

Table 4.18
I know/don’t know the dangers of self-awareness (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: I know the dangers of self- awareness	5	33%	12	80%
Negative response: I don’t know the dangers of self- awareness	10	67%	1	7%
No response	0	0%	2	13%

The Chi-square statistic is 10.155 and the p -value is 0.001. This result is significant at $p < 0.05$. Since a p -value of 0.001 is less than the conventionally accepted significance level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). We therefore reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they knew the dangers of self-awareness before and after the workshop. There was an increase in the number of participants, from 33% to 80% during pre- and post-evaluation respectively, who were of the opinion that they knew what the dangers of self-awareness were. This is the second highest increase (47%) compared to all the other items that were assessed in the workshop. This may be attributed to the workshop being successful in ensuring that the participants comprehend the information regarding the dangers of self-awareness after the workshop. This is evident in only one participant (7%) who was of the opinion that he or she did not know what the dangers of self-awareness are. The participants may not have expected the workshop to have any negative impact and may not have had insight in this regard, thus only some participants (33%) were of the opinion that they knew the dangers of self-awareness. It is also a positive point to raise that all the participants responded to this item during the pre-evaluation, but due to uncertainty and indecision, some of the participants (13%) did not give their responses during the post-evaluation. This is evident in the following detailed descriptions of the dangers of self-awareness:

Pre-evaluation:

“End up comparing yourself to others, judging your actions according to what others do, End up having a low self-esteem”

“You can be discourage of what you are”

“Being to self-absorbed can lead to unproductive self-awareness, A person

can end up being depressed because of failure”.

Post-evaluation:

“You could be surprised to know who you are and what people actually see of you”

“May lead to be depressed as a result of not living up to one’s own standards: difference between the real you and ideal you”

“Unproductive self-awareness, may lead one to be low self-esteem”

“Low self-esteem, judging yourself, comparing yourself to others”

“Being too depressed of failure, being too self-absorbed leading to unproductive self- awareness”

“Sometimes you are aware of something that I wrong with you and it makes you to lose confident in yourself and focus on what you cannot do”.

Table 4.19 below presents the common themes identified from the participant responses regarding the dangers of self-awareness.

Table 4.19
 Themes indicating the dangers of self-awareness

Themes	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Depression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “...A person can end up being depressed because of failure” (Participant 03) • “End up comparing yourself to others, judging your actions according to what others do, End up having a low self-esteem” (Participant 05) • “You can be discourage of what you are”(Participant 07) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “May lead to be depressed as a result of not living up to one’s own standards: difference between the real you and ideal you” (Participant 03) • “Being too depressed of failure...” (Participant 10)
Self-absorbed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Being to self-absorbed can lead to unproductive self-awareness...” (Participant 03) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Unproductive self-awareness, may lead one to be low self-esteem” (Participant 11) • “Low self-esteem, judging yourself comparing yourself to others”(Participant 15) <p>“...being too self-absorbed leading to unproductive self-awareness”(Participant 10)</p>

The two themes that were identified as dangers of self-awareness were depression and self-absorption. On the “depression” theme, more general descriptions were given during the pre-evaluation as opposed to the concise descriptions after the workshop. More descriptions were given after the workshop on the “self-absorbed” theme, which supports the statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they knew the dangers of self-awareness after the workshop.

To further assess whether the participants had acquired any change in knowledge in terms of uncovering hidden and free areas, they were asked what their opinions were with regard to whether it was possible to uncover hidden and free areas and to subsequently describe ways in which hidden and free areas could be uncovered.

Table 4.20
Is it possible to uncover hidden and free areas (n=15)

Responses	Pre-evaluation frequency	Percentage	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response: It is possible to uncover hidden and free areas	8	83%	11	73%
Negative response: It is not possible to uncover hidden and free areas	7	17%	2	13%
No response	0	0%	2	13%

The Chi-square statistic is 3.125 and the p -value is 0.077. This result is not significant at $p < 0.05$. Since a p -value of 0.077 is greater than the conventionally accepted significance level of 0.05 (i.e., $p > 0.05$), we therefore fail to reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that it was possible to uncover hidden and free areas during pre- and post-evaluation. As per the outline in Table 4.20, the percentage of participants who were of the opinion that it was possible to uncover hidden and free areas dropped from 83% during pre-evaluation to 73% after the workshop. This explains why the relationship is not significant and the Chi-square statistic is low. The workshop was, in this case, not successful in changing the participants' opinion regarding knowledge; this may be attributed to lack of understanding of the concept and negative pre-misconceptions. Before the workshop, some participants (17%) were of the opinion that it was not possible to uncover hidden and free areas. However, this value dropped to 13% after the workshop. All the participants responded to this item during the pre-evaluation, but after the workshop, a few of the participants (13%) did not give responses. This may be due to uncertainty and finding the questionnaire to be long.

The participants' responses on what the ways of uncovering hidden and free areas were are recorded below:

Pre-evaluation:

"Try new things"

"Character, the way looking at you self, attitude"

"By revealing what others do not know about you and then letter on taking the risk of judging yourself comparing what or how others act"

"When you start socializing and open up to people they can get to know you, your free areas will therefore be reduced"

"Creating art like pictures, music"

"Knowing what you like most, knowing how to control all of your emotions knowing what makes you not to be free and being able to say who you are without doubt".

Post-evaluation:

"By talking to people who are close to me and always making sure what I talk and express"

"Trying to figure out exactly who you are and what you are feeling and trying out new things"

"Using words and actions, pictures, also hearing feedback"

"Ask others about what they think about you and tell them about you"

"Feedback, self -identification, understand yourself, accepting yourself, introspection"

"Spending time with those people, being open, always wanting to know"

what others think about yourself”

“By asking feedback from audience or experimenting”

“Observing your behavior when in contract with other people, seek feedback from others about you”

“As one gets to build relations with people”.

Table 4.21 below presents the common themes identified regarding uncovering hidden and free areas in the responses by the participants.

Table 4.21
Perceived knowledge acquired from uncovering hidden and free areas

Theme	Pre-evaluation	Post-evaluation
Self-disclosure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Character, the way looking at you self, attitude”. (Participant 03)</i> • <i>“By revealing what others do not know about you and then letter on taking the risk of judging yourself comparing what or how others act”. (Participant 07)</i> • <i>“When you start socializing and open up to people they can get to know you, your free areas will therefore be reduced”. (Participant 09)</i> • <i>“Knowing what you like most, knowing how to control all of your emotions knowing what makes you not to be free and being able to say who you are without doubt”. (Participant 12)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“By talking to people who are close to me and always making sure what I talk and express”. (Participant 3)</i> • <i>“Trying to figure out exactly who you are and what you are feeling and trying out new things”. (Participant 09)</i> • <i>“... self-identification, understand yourself, accepting yourself, introspection”. (Participant 11)</i>
Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Creating art like pictures, music”. (Participant 10)</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Using words and actions, pictures, also hearing feedback”. (Participant 15)</i>
Seeking feedback		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“By asking feedback from audience or experimenting”. (Participant 03)</i> • <i>“Observing your behavior when in contract with other people, seek feedback from others about you”. (Participant 06)</i> • <i>“As one gets to build relations with people”. (Participant 10)</i> • <i>“Spending time with those people, being open, always wanting to know what others think about yourself”. (Participant 12)</i> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>“Ask others about what they think about you and tell them about you”. (Participant 15)</i></p>

The themes that were identified were self-disclosure, communication, and seeking feedback. The “self-disclosure” and “communication” themes were described both during the pre- and post-evaluation and the “seeking feedback” theme was described only after the workshop. This indicates that there was a difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that it was possible to uncover hidden and free areas during the pre-and post-evaluation; however, the difference was insignificant.

The participants were asked whether the workshop assisted them in being more self-aware. Their responses are presented in Table 4.22.

Table 4.22

Whether the workshop assisted the participants in being more self-aware (n=15)

“I am more self-aware”	Post-evaluation frequency	Percentage
Positive response	13	87%
Negative response	2	13%
No-response	0	0%

Most of the participants (87%) said that the workshop assisted them in being more self-aware. It is a good sign that only a few participants (13%) thought that the workshop did not assist them in being more self-aware. All the participants responded to this item.

The participants were asked to mention areas about themselves that the workshop assisted them to be more self-aware of. Their responses are recorded below:

“Fast runner, Good soccer player, punctual and a good advisor”

“That I’m sometimes tempered (short temper), that I’m amazing, and I’m willing to help others”

“Personality, character, behavior, feelings and thinking”

“My values and dislikes.”

From the above-mentioned descriptions, the identified areas of becoming more self-aware are outlined in Table 4.23.

Table 4.23
Areas where the participants became more self-aware

Theme	Post-evaluation
Psychological health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Fast runner, Good soccer player ...” (Participant 11)</i> • <i>“That I’m sometimes tempered (short temper), that I’m amazing,” (Participant 15)</i>
Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“...and a good advisor”. (Participant 06)</i>
Personal development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“...punctual...”. (Participant 11)</i> • <i>“Personality, character...”. (Participant 03)</i> • <i>“My values and dislikes”. (Participant 10)</i>
Interacting with others	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“...behavior, feelings and thinking”. (Participant 03)</i> • <i>“...I’m willing to help others”. (Participant 15)</i>

For most of the variables, almost all the participants already believed, before the workshop, that they understood the concept being asked about. There was therefore little scope for further improvement, resulting in small statistically non-significant changes in the proportion of participants who said that they understood a concept. There was a tendency from the participants to think, even before the workshop started, that they knew what the concepts meant, which explains why in many cases there was no statistically significant change. However, this lack of change in the proportion of participants who thought that they understood a concept does not mean that what they understood about the

concept did not change. In fact, in several cases, there appears to be a shift in the participants' understanding, considering the thematic analysis of the open-ended comments. Table 4.24 presents a summary of all the items where the participants gave either a positive or a negative response, in order to assist in drawing conclusions.

Table 4.24
Summary of the Reaction and Learning levels

Reactions Response	Pre-evaluation percentage		Post-evaluation percentage		Chi-square
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	
Was the workshop helpful in facilitating your understanding of self-awareness			93%	0%	Not calculated
Aspects of the workshop			80%	7%	Not calculated
Knowledge					
Understanding the meaning of self-awareness	73%	13%	80%	0%	Chi-square=2 $p=0.157$
Knowing the ways of how to become more self-aware	60%	33%	87%	0%	Chi-square = 6 $p=0.017$ *
Ever heard of Johari's window	13%	87%	87%	7%	Chi-square = 18 $p=0.000018$ *
Understanding the meaning of self-acceptance	100%	0%	100%	0%	Not calculated
Self-acceptance can be increased	67%	13%	93%	0%	Chi-square=3 $p=0.112$
It is important to be self-aware	93%	7%	87%	0%	Chi-square=1 $P=0.343$
I know the benefits	87%	7%	93%	0%	Chi-square=1

Reactions	Pre-evaluation percentage		Post-evaluation percentage		Chi-square
	Positive	Negative	Positive	Negative	
of self-awareness					$p=0.309$
I know the dangers of self-awareness	33%	67%	80%	7%	Chi-square=10 $p=0.001$ *
Whether it was possible to uncover hidden and free areas	83%	17%	73%	13%	Chi-square=3 $p=0.077$
Whether the workshop was helpful in becoming more self-aware			87%	13%	Not calculated

Note: Statistically significant results are indicated with an asterisk.

The knowledge components which were found to be statistically significant included whether the learners were of the opinion that they knew the ways of becoming more self-aware; whether they had ever heard of Johari's window, and whether they were of the opinion that they knew the dangers of self-awareness. The Chi-square statistic for participants who were of the opinion that they knew the ways of becoming self-aware was 5.698 and the p -value was 0.017. This result was found to be significant at $p<0.05$. In other words, there was a statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they knew the ways on how they could become more self-aware after the workshop compared with their opinions before the workshop. Most of the participants (87%) were of the opinion that they knew the ways on how they could become more self-aware after the workshop, compared with only some of the participants (60%) before the workshop. This indicates that the workshop was successful in ensuring that more participants thought that they knew how to become self-aware. The fact that 60% of the participants were of the opinion that they knew how they could become more self-aware before the workshop, may have lowered the Chi-square statistic. The number of

participants who did not give a response increased from 7% to 13% during the post-evaluation, which may also have affected the significance level. This may be due to a lack of understanding of the content and pre-misconceptions about the subject as well as omitting responses due to fatigue and finding the questionnaire too long. The themes on how to become more self-aware were introspection, observing yourself, comparing yourself, and seeking feedback.

Furthermore, the participants were asked whether they had ever heard of Johari's window and to mention the four main aspects thereof. The Chi-square statistic was 18.339, the p -value was 0.000018, and the result is significant at $p < 0.05$. In other words, there was a statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who had heard of the phrase, "Johari's window" between the pre- and post-evaluations. A Chi-square statistic of 18 is quite high and suggests a highly significant relationship between negative and positive perceptions given before and after the workshop. This explains the 74% difference in the number of participants who had ever heard of Johari's window after the workshop. Most of the participants (87%) had heard of Johari's window after the workshop, although only a few participants (13%) had heard about it before the workshop. The 13% explains why the significance level is very high. It is noteworthy that all the participants responded to this question during the pre-evaluation, which may be due to the nature of the question being direct, and the unequivocal nature of the word "Johari's window". The common themes identified by the participants regarding the four aspects of Johari's window were free area, hidden area, blind area, and unknown area. The hidden and blind areas were not mentioned during the pre-evaluation.

The participants were asked what their opinion was regarding whether they knew what the dangers of self-awareness were and to mention these dangers. The Chi-square

statistic was 10.155 and the p -value 0.001. This result is significant at $p < 0.05$. In conclusion, there was a statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they knew the dangers of self-awareness before and after the workshop. There was an increase (from 33% to 80% during the pre- and post-evaluations respectively) in the number of participants who were of the opinion that they knew what the dangers of self-awareness were. This is the second highest increase (47%) compared to all the other items that were assessed in the workshop. This may be attributed to the fact that the workshop was successful in ensuring that the participants comprehended the information with regard to the dangers of self-awareness after the workshop. This is evident in the response by only one participant (7%) who was of the opinion that he/she did not know what the dangers of self-awareness were. The participants may not have expected the workshop to have any negative impact and may have not had insight in this regard, thus, only some participants (33%) were of the opinion that they knew the dangers of self-awareness. Also, a positive point to raise is that all the participants responded to this item during the pre-evaluation, but due to uncertainty and indecision, some of the participants (13%) did not give their responses during the post-evaluation. The common themes identified among the responses by the participants regarding the dangers of self-awareness, were depression and self-absorption.

The majority of the participants' reactions towards aspects of the workshop were positive, their knowledge with regards to the meaning of self-acceptance, and how it can be increased were also positive. The perceived knowledge acquired from the workshop was also said to be positive with regards to the benefits of self-awareness. A higher percentage of negative responses were received regarding perceived acquired knowledge with regard to uncovering hidden and free areas, as well as whether the workshop was helpful in becoming more self-aware.

For most of the variables, almost all the participants already believed, before the workshop, that they understood the concept being asked about. There was therefore little scope for further improvement, resulting in small, statistically non-significant changes in the proportion of participants who said that they understood a particular concept. There was a tendency for the participants to think, even before the workshop started, that they knew what the concepts meant, which explains why in many cases there was no statistically significant change. However, this lack of change in the proportion of participants who thought they understood a concept, does not mean that what they understood about the concept did not change. In fact, in several cases, there appears to be shifts in the participants' understanding when considering the thematic analysis of the open-ended comments.

A slight decrease in the number of participants who said that it was possible to uncover hidden and free areas, was evident. This explains why the relationship was found to be statistically insignificant. During post-evaluation, most of the participants were of the opinion that self-acceptance could be increased or improved, even though the relationship was statistically insignificant. Most of the participants were of the opinion that the workshop assisted them in being more self-aware; this was also statistically insignificant. They further identified helpful aspects of the workshop in understanding self-awareness as Johari's window, self-awareness, self-acceptance, and the benefits and dangers of self-awareness. A total of 15 participants were sampled in the current study. The study focused on evaluating the participants' experiences of the training and their knowledge after the training. It is suggested that for future research, Kirkpatrick's Behaviour and Results levels be investigated in order to obtain full insight into the workshop. An evaluation of other workshops offered by the ERF is recommended, based on the methodology employed in the current study. In future, the sample size could be

increased and the method of data collection changed to focus interviews and focus group discussions so as to strengthen the quality of the data. The facilitator should also be interviewed. A comparative study between learners who have participated in the ERF workshops and those who have not participated could be conducted in order to evaluate the difference made by the workshops in the participants' behaviour, attitudes, and skills. Future studies on the ERF should be based on the specific outcomes and objectives of the organisation. The study has shown that the participants were of the opinion that they had gained knowledge on self-awareness.

4.4 Conclusion

In summary, data were analysed through thematic, content, and statistical analysis with reference to Kirkpatrick's Reaction and Learning levels. Regarding Kirkpatrick's Reaction level, the participants were requested to give their opinion about aspects of the workshop, where it was found that most participants (80%) liked the workshop, whilst a few (7%) disliked the workshop and some (13%) suggested that more information on self-acceptance and Johari's window should be added; more time should be allocated and a larger venue should be considered. An overwhelming majority of participants (93%) found the workshop to be helpful in understanding self-awareness. The common topics which assisted participants in understanding self-awareness included the benefits and dangers of self-awareness, Johari's window, the meaning of self-awareness, and self-acceptance.

In Kirkpatrick's learning level, the extent to which participants experienced a change in opinion in terms of knowledge as a result of having undergone the training was evaluated. The conclusion is based on the positive responses. It was found that most of the participants (80%) were of the opinion that they had gained a better understanding of

the meaning of the word “self-awareness” after the workshop compared to a lesser number of participants (73%) who responded similarly before the workshop. The relationship was found to be statistically insignificant with a low chi-square statistic of two. In other words, there is no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they understood the meaning of the word “self-awareness” before and after the workshop. Most of the participants (87%) were of the opinion that they knew the ways on how they could become more self-aware after the workshop compared with only some of the participants (60%) who thought so before the workshop. This relationship was found to be statistically significant, with a moderately high Chi-square statistic of six. This is supported by the identified themes, which were common during the pre- and post-evaluations. These included introspection, observing yourself, and seeking feedback, while the comparing yourself theme was present only during the post-evaluation.

After the workshop, most of the participants (87%) were of the opinion that they had heard of Johari’s window, although a few participants (13%) were of the opinion that they had heard about it before. This was found to be the highest statistically significant difference with a Chi- square statistic of 18, which presents evidence that the workshop was successful in giving participants knowledge with regard to Johari’s window. The free area and the unknown area were the two themes that were identified as aspects of Johari’s window before and after the workshop and the hidden and blind areas are the two themes that were present only during the post-evaluation.

Furthermore, the participants were asked if they thought that they knew what was meant by self-acceptance. All the participants were of the opinion that they knew the meaning of self-acceptance, both before and after the workshop, which made it impossible to explore whether the relationship was statistically significant or not. However, the

common themes that were identified during the pre- and post-evaluations included being satisfied with yourself and not being critical of yourself. The themes that were identified when the participants were asked why self-acceptance was important, included self-disclosure, which only emerged during the post-evaluation, as opposed to the following three themes which were common during both the pre- and post-evaluations. These include acceptance of others, being liked by others, and good psychological health. When asked whether self-acceptance could be increased, during post-evaluation an overwhelming majority of participants (93%) were of the opinion that self-acceptance could be increased, compared to the pre-evaluation when some participants (67%) agreed that self-acceptance could be improved. The relationship was found to be statistically insignificant with a very low Chi-square statistic of three. This is evident in that fewer and more general descriptions were given during the post-evaluation regarding the ways in which self-acceptance could be improved. The common themes that were identified were: reflection, basic acceptance, and self-evaluation (only present during post-evaluation). In summary, in both the pre- and post-evaluations, the participants said that taking into consideration how others perceive you (reflection) and accepting yourself with no conditions (basic self-acceptance) are the two ways in which self-acceptance could be improved and that comparing yourself to others (self-evaluation) is also important in improving self-acceptance.

In order to evaluate whether the participants are of the opinion that the workshop had an impact on their knowledge, the participants were asked whether it was important for them to be self-aware. There was a decrease in the number of participants who thought it was important to be self-aware from 93% to 87% during pre- and post-evaluation respectively. This explains why this item has the lowest chi-square statistic and the relationship is not significant. However, the themes that were identified as indicating the

importance of self-awareness were self-knowledge and self-understanding, which were common in both instances. Self-disclosure was only mentioned after the workshop which shows improvement, though insignificant.

In order to evaluate whether the workshop had an impact on the participants perceived knowledge, the participants were asked whether they were of the opinion that they knew the benefits of self-awareness. An overwhelming majority of participants (93%) were of the opinion that they knew what the benefits of self-awareness were after the workshop as opposed to most participants (87%) who thought so before the workshop, which is again only a 6% difference. This explains why the Chi-square statistic is very low.

In this chapter, the results of the evaluation of the self-awareness workshop by employing the Kirkpatrick's model were presented.

The results indicate that the objectives of the workshop were achieved and the methods of delivering the workshop were satisfactory, resulting in the participants changing their opinions regarding their knowledge in terms of self-awareness. In the chapter that follows, the strengths and weaknesses of the workshop, the recommendations of the study, as well as the limitations and suggestions for further research, are presented.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 Introduction

This chapter concludes the evaluation of the self-awareness workshop by reflecting on the strengths and limitations of the programme and the current study in order to inform future practise. The self-awareness workshop was selected from the nine personal development workshops outlined in Chapter 1, because of its fundamental nature in terms of personal growth, self-improvement and introspection. This was the only workshop of the nine where the researcher was present to observe the presentation of the workshop and to distribute the questionnaire. Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating training programmes, which focused on the reaction and learning levels, was used as a framework for evaluating the self-awareness workshop. The present study evaluated the participants' experiences of undergoing the training and the change in opinion regarding knowledge gained after the intervention of the self-awareness workshop. According to Kirkpatrick's model, the participants' feelings towards the training are assessed through formative evaluation, which constitutes the Reaction level of the model, whilst the Learning level assesses the participants' knowledge, attitudes, and skills after the intervention (Kirkpatrick, 1959).

5.2 Brief Overview of the Dissertation

In Chapter 1, the notion of self-awareness was introduced and the motivation for the study was discussed. The mission and objectives of the Educhange and Research Foundation (ERF) were outlined with an emphasis placed on the psycho-social intervention of the scholarship component, which comprised a series of monthly workshops throughout the year. Johari's window was used as a self-assessment tool to

increase self-understanding of the individuals. Johari's window was criticised for its need to be used within the context of a group and its limited nature in generating ideas about what to do next. Chapter 2 furnished a description of self-awareness as a key concept in context and different theoretical perspectives in explaining the concept systematically. Chapter 3 contained a description of the research process and research method that were to form the basis of the study in both collecting data and analysing it. This research method section is followed by Chapter 4, where the elicited co-construction of the meaning concerning the participants' experience of the notion of self-awareness was presented.

5.3 The Impact of the Programme on Participants' Reactions

The main objective of the study was to investigate the impact of the self-awareness workshop on learners, and to get their perspective in understanding what the concept means to their lives. Most participants liked the workshop and found it to be fun and exciting. The exercises were found to be enjoyable and made it easier for the participants to understand concepts. However, one participant disliked the workshop and found it difficult to comprehend. As evident from the results, the programme goals were achieved and some recommendations for improvement were made by the participants. It was recommended that more information on self-acceptance should be given. It was also suggested that time should be managed more effectively to cover all aspects of the workshop in detail, for example, Johari's window. Most of the participants were satisfied with the programme in general.

5.4 The Impact of the Programme on Participants' Learning

In general, three variables out of eight were statistically significant whilst the other five did not change. This shows that there were too few concepts for which there was a statistically significant change. At first glance, this looks as if the workshop was not too

successful, but in interpreting this, one should bear the following in mind:

- In most cases, where there was no significant change, the proportion of participants believing that they understood the concept was very high, leaving little scope for improvement that could be sufficiently large to be statistically significant.
- The sample size was small, making it more difficult to detect statistically significant differences; however, all the changes occurred in the expected direction.
- There is some evidence in the qualitative analysis that the details of what participants understood about the concepts they were asked about did change to more closely reflect what was taught in the workshop.

The results reveal that the intervention was successful in ensuring that the participants acquired a change in opinion regarding factual information about concepts related to self-awareness. The manner in which the information was presented also facilitated the learning, thereby offering guidance on how the programme needs to be presented in order to produce effective results. In terms of the impact of the workshop on the participants' opinions regarding their knowledge about concepts of self-awareness, a statistically significantly larger proportion of participants were of the opinion after the workshop that they knew how to become more self-aware. Likewise, a statistically significantly larger proportion of participants were of the opinion after the workshop that they had heard of the term "Johari's window". Similarly, a statistically significantly larger proportion of participants were of the opinion after the workshop that they knew the dangers of self-awareness.

On the contrary, there was no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they understood the meaning of the word “self-awareness” before and after the workshop. Likewise, a statistically insignificantly larger proportion of participants were of the opinion after the workshop that self-acceptance could be increased. Similarly, there was no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion after the workshop that it was important to be self-aware. Likewise, there was no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they knew the benefits of self-awareness before and after the workshop. Similarly, there was also no statistically significant difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that it was possible to uncover hidden and free areas before and after the workshop.

To evaluate the success of the workshop in terms of learning, one can conclude that there was no significant difference between the pre- and post-evaluations of most items. The workshop appears to have had some impact, as there was a significant difference in a few variables, but its impact regarding whether the workshop was helpful in facilitating participants’ understanding of self-awareness is doubtful. Aspects of the workshop which were helpful in understanding self-awareness, understanding the meaning of self-acceptance and whether the workshop was helpful in becoming more self-aware have not been unequivocally determined

5.5 The Strengths of the Study

Evaluating a programme has some positive consequences. Evaluation reveals inadequacies or ineffectiveness as well as the strengths of the programme. The following positive implications were observed in the present programme:

- The use of both the qualitative and quantitative research approaches have complemented each other to analyse the data.
- The results indicate clearly which concepts have had significant differences and which ones have not.
- The study indicates the change in opinion regarding other concepts of self-awareness.
- The study was cost-effective as data were gathered in a group setting. It takes less time to analyse group generated data.
- Questionnaires save time, which would have been required for transcription should interviews have been conducted.
- This research project acknowledges the fundamental contributions of theories in the literature review and Kirkpatrick's model of evaluating training programmes, which increases the credibility of the study and allows evaluation of participants' knowledge and reactions.
- Others can learn from this example for future practise.
- This study gave the learners space to air their opinions and knowledge regarding self-awareness, which adds to their existing knowledge.

5.6 The Limitations of the Study

- The study focussed on one non-governmental organisation based in Gauteng. Therefore, the results may not be able to be generalised to learners outside this organisation, area, and region.
- The participants' understanding of concepts before and after the workshop

were not directly measured, so we do not know quantitatively if they actually learnt anything, except that for some concepts, more of them thought that they understood the concept after the workshop than before the workshop.

- While the number of participants who participated in the programme was sampled to take part in the study, there were only a few participants as this was a small workshop. These samples represent only a small proportion of learners and therefore cannot be generalised to a larger population. This does not confirm that the study is not valid, but rather, that the information gathered is applicable to only the learners as participants in the study.
- It would have been helpful to interview the participants, as it would have elicited more meanings and assumptions about the research topic, in order to obtain richer descriptions of the experiences of the concept self-awareness of the participants.

5.7 Suggestions for Improving the Self-Awareness Programme

The content covered by the self-awareness programme was found to be generally satisfactory by the participants. However, as outlined above, the time was said to be insufficient for topics such as self-acceptance and Johari's window. It is therefore suggested that more time be allocated to the programme. This suggestion might, however, have financial implications as there might be a need to reserve accommodation should the training take longer.

5.8 Suggestions for Future Research

It would be valuable to undertake a study similar to this, but including a control group so as to have a comparative study and to improve the generalisability of the

research. The Results level of Kirkpatrick's model could be explored a year after the intervention in order to obtain meaningful results. By doing so, one would acquire a holistic understanding from different people of different categories. It is also suggested that the changes in knowledge should be directly tested rather than just asking for changes in opinion about whether the participants' knowledge had changed as a result of having participated in the workshop. Individual interviews should be conducted with the participants and the facilitator in order to garner detailed information about self-awareness.

5.9 Conclusion

The results of the present study reveal that there was a change in opinion regarding other concepts of self-awareness in the learners. Other related programmes could be designed from the self-awareness programme. The strengths and limitations of the study were discussed and suggestions for future research were offered. The results reveal that the learners have changed their opinions with regard to their knowledge of the self-awareness concepts, especially Johari's window, which yielded the highest Chi-square statistic. This is evident in the more precise description of concepts during post-evaluation. However, it is necessary to point out that there were a few learners who gave precise descriptions during the pre-evaluation. This may be attributed to preparation before the workshop as some of the participants have access to the internet.

Definitions of self-awareness during the post-evaluation were very precise. Although the participants used their own words to show their own understanding of the meaning of the word self-awareness and the importance of self-awareness during pre-evaluation, it was evident in their definitions that the concept was understood prior to the intervention. The difference in the proportion of participants who were of the opinion that they understood the meaning of self-awareness before and after the workshop was

statistically insignificant. Duval and Wicklund (1972) state that self-awareness is a key to self-control. Most descriptions supported this notion. Most of the participants did not know what the dangers of unproductive self-awareness were during the pre-evaluation. The workshop was successful in ensuring that most participants were of the opinion that they knew the ways of how they could become more self-aware before and after the workshop; the relationship was statistically significant.

The workshop was based on Johari's window and the majority of the participants had never heard of the term Johari's window before the workshop. During the post-evaluation, the participants were able to mention the four aspects of Johari's window, namely the free, hidden, blind and unknown areas. It was easier for the learners to enlarge their open area as they came from the same schools or proximal to each other. When asked if they ever heard of Johari's window, the difference in the proportion of participants who thought they had ever heard of Johari's window after versus before the workshop was statistically significant and the chi-square statistic was the highest. It was easier for the learners to enlarge their open area as they came from the same schools or were proximal to each other. When asked if they had ever heard of Johari's window, the difference in the proportion of participants who thought that they had ever heard of Johari's window after versus before the workshop was statistically significant and the Chi-square statistic was the highest. A slight decrease in the number of participants who said it was possible to uncover hidden and free areas was experienced. This explains why the relationship was found to be statistically insignificant. During the post-evaluation, most of the participants were of the opinion that self-acceptance could be increased or improved, although the relationship was statistically insignificant. Most of the participants were of the opinion that the workshop assisted them in being more self-aware; this was also statistically insignificant. A total of 15 participants were sampled in the current study. It is suggested

that for future research, Kirkpatrick's Behaviour and Results levels be investigated in order to obtain full insight into the workshop. An evaluation of other workshops offered by the ERF, based on the methodology employed in the current study, is recommended. In future, the sample size could be increased and the method of data collection be changed to focus interviews and focus group discussions, so as to strengthen the quality of the data. The facilitator should also be interviewed. A comparative study between learners who have participated in the ERF workshops and those who have not participated could be conducted in order to evaluate the difference made by the workshops in the participants' behaviour, attitudes, and skills. Future studies on the ERF should be based on the specific outcomes and objectives of the organisation. The study has shown that the participants were of the opinion that they had gained knowledge on self-awareness.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2002). *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/ethics/code2002.pdf>.
- Babbie, E., & Mouton, B. (2001). *The practice of social research*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Babbie, E. (1989). *The practice of social research*. London: Wadsworth.
- Banister, P., Burman, E., Parker, I., Taylor, M., & Tindall, C. (1994). *Qualitative methods in psychology: A research guide*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bates, R. (2004, August 27). Evaluation & program planning. A critical analysis of evaluation practice: The Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0149718904000369>
- Biesta, G. (2009). Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(1), 33-46.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brook, A., & DeVidi, R. (2001). *Self-reference and Self-Awareness*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2010). *Essential social psychology*. London: Sage.
- Crosson, B. C., Barco, P. P., Velozo, C. A., Bolseta, M. M., Werts, D., & Brobeck, T.

- (1989). Awareness and compensation in post-acute head injury rehabilitation. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*, 4(3), 46-54.
- Carver, C. S. (2002). Self-awareness. In M. R. Leary, & J. P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 179-196). New York: Guilford Press.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1998). *On the self-regulation of behavior*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Chernev, A. (2003). Product assortment and individual decision processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(1), 62-151.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano. V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed method research*. London: Sage.
- David, M., & Sutton, C. (2011). *Social research: An introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Deniz, E. (2002). Evaluation of training: Theory & practice. Retrieved from <http://www.businessballs.com/kirkpatricklearningevaluationmodel.htm>.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *Qualitative research* (4th ed.). London: Sage.
- De Vos, A. S. (2002). Programme evaluation. In A. S. de Vos (Ed.). *Research at grass roots* (2nd ed., pp. 373-393). Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Duval, T. S., & Wicklund, R. A. (1973). Effects of objective self-awareness on attributions of causality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 9(7), 17-31.

Duval, T. S., & Wicklund, R. A. (1972). *A theory of objective self-awareness*. New York: Academic Press.

Educhange and Research Foundation. (2010). *Annual report*. Pretoria: Author

Fenigstein, A., Scheier, M. F., & Buss, A. H. (1975). Public and private self-consciousness: Assessment and theory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 36*(3), 1241-1250.

Fleming, J. M., Strong, J., Ashton, R. (1996b). Self-awareness of deficits in adults with traumatic brain injury: How best to measure? *Brain Injury, 10*, 1-15.

Forgas, J. P. (2011). Affective influences of self-disclosure: Mood effects on the intimacy and reciprocity of disclosing personal information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100* (3), 449-461.

Franzoi, S. L. (1996). Self-consciousness and self-awareness: An annotated bibliography of theory and research. *Social and Behavioral Sciences Documents, 16*(1), listing 2744, 1-53.

Froming, W. J., Corley, E. B. & Rinker, L. (1990). The influence of public self-consciousness and the audience's characteristics on withdrawal from embarrassing situations. *Journal of Personality, 58* (4), 603-622.

Fynn, A. W. R. (2011). *An appreciative inquiry of the Educhange and Research Foundation*. (Unpublished masters dissertation). University of South Africa, Pretoria.

Gibbons, F. X. (1983). Self-attention and self-report: The veridicality hypothesis. *Journal of Personality*, 51(3), 517-542.

Hernandez, C. A., Bradish, G. I., Laschinger, H. K. S., Rodger, N. S., & Rybansky, S. I. (2003). Guidance & counselling. *Evaluation of a self-awareness intervention for adults with type 1 diabetes*, 19(1), 28-36.

Holton, E. F. (2006, November 8). The flawed four-level evaluation model. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/hrdq.3920070103/epdf>

Hull, J. G., & Levy, A. S. (1979). The organizational functions of the self: An alternative to the Duval and Wicklund model of self-awareness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(5), 756-768.

Jackson, S., & Kulp M. J. (1978). Designing guidelines for evaluating the outcomes of management training. *Determining the payoffs of management training*, 26(2), 1-42.

Joinson, A. N. (2001). Self-disclosure in computer-mediated communication: The role of self-awareness and visual anonymity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31(1), 177-192.

Johari's window. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.businessballs.com/johariwindowmodel.htm>

Johnson, D. (2006). *Reaching out: Interpersonal effectiveness and self-actualization* (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson A & B.

Kirkpatrick, D. (1996). Revisiting Kirkpatrick's model. *Training and Development*, 50(1), 54-59.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1959). Techniques for evaluating training programs. *Journal of American Society for Training and Development*, 13 (11), 3-9.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1959). Learning and training evaluation on theory: *Training model-the four levels of learning evaluation*, 13 (11) 10-12. Retrieved from <http://www.businessballs.com/kirkpatricklearningevaluationmodel.htm>

Legrain, L., Cleeremans, A., & Destrebecqz, A. (2011). Distinguishing three levels in explicit self-awareness. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 20(5), 578–585.

Lewis, M., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (1979). Self knowledge and emotional development. In M. Lewis & J. Rosenblum (Eds.). *The development of affect: The genesis of behavior* (pp. 205-226). New York: Plenum Press.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation & personality*. Oxford: Harper & Row.

Matoane, M. C. (2008). *The impact of the UNISA HIV/AIDS programme on learners and their community involvement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of South Africa, Pretoria.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence based inquiry* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Mertens, D. M. (2010). Research and evaluation in education and psychology. *Integrating diversity with qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Miller, L. C. (1990). Disclosure liking effects at the individual and dyadic level: A social

- relations analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59(4), 50-60.
- Moon, Y. (2000). Intimate exchanges: Using computers to elicit self-disclosure from consumers. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27(4), 323-339.
- Mullen, B., Migdal, M., & Rozell, D. (2003). Self-awareness, deindividuation, and social identity: unravelling theoretical paradoxes by filling empirical lacunae. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 29 (9), 1071-1081.
- Murphy, J. (1980). *Getting the facts*. California: Goodyear.
- Neuman, N. (2000). *Social research methods: Qualitative and Quantitative approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon
- Noe, R. A. (1999). *Employee training and development*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Owensworth, T. L., McFarland, K., Young, R. M. (2000). Self-awareness and psychosocial functioning following acquired brain injury: An evaluation of a group support programme. *Neuropsychological Rehabilitation*, 10(1), 465-484.
- Perry, P. (2010). *Couch fiction*, pp.123-124
- Phileppe, R. (2003). Five levels of self-awareness as they unfold early in life. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 12 (4), 717-731.
- Prentice-Dunn, S., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). Effects of public and private self-awareness on deindividuation and aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(2), 503-513.

Rose, P. (2006). NGO roles as education providers. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative & International Education*, 29(3), 220-233.

Silvia, P. J., & Duval, T. S. (2001). Objective self-awareness theory: Recent progress and enduring problems. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5(1), 230-241

Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1998). Self-focused attention and the experience of emotion: Attraction, repulsion, elation, and depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(3), 625-636.

Shepard, L. A. (1978). Self-acceptance: The evaluative component of the self-concept construct. *American Educational Research Journal*, 16(2), 139-160.

Steward, H., Davies, A., & Dick, B. (1999). *The Johari Window and the dark side of organisations*. Southern Cross University: University Press.

Trapnell, P. D., & Campell, J. D. (1999). Private self-consciousness and the five-factor model of personality: Distinguishing rumination from reflection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 76(2), 284-304.

Warr, P., Bird, M. & Rackham N. (1970). *Evaluation of management training*. London: Gower Press.

Wahba, M. A. & Bridwell, I. G. (1976). Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 15(1), 212-240.

- Williams, E. (2003). The relationship between momentary states of therapist self-awareness and perceptions of the counselling process. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, 33 (3), 177-186.
- Wicklund, R. A., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (1987). The fallacy of the private-public self-focus distinction. *Journal of Personality*, 55(3), 491-523.
- Zell, A., & Baumeister, R. F. (2013). How religion can support self-control and moral behaviour? In R. F. Paloutzian, & C. L. Park (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of religion and spirituality* (2nd ed., pp. 498-518). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

The different ways in which self-acceptance can be increased/improved upon are:

10. What is the importance of self-acceptance?

THANK YOU

13. If you have suggestions of what the facilitator could have done to make you understand goal setting better, please provide them below

14. Any other additional comments not included in the information provided above?

THANK YOU



Appendix C

Participant Information Sheet

THE IMPACT OF THE ERF SELF-AWARENESS PROGRAMME ON LEARNERS' REACTIONS AND LEARNING

INTRODUCTION

My name is Nkateko Lowane. I am a masters student in research psychology at the University of South Africa (UNISA). I am inviting you to permit me to conduct evaluation on self-awareness workshop. This information sheet is to help you to decide if you would like to participate. Before you agree to take part in this study you should fully understand what the study involves. You are welcomed to ask any questions should you seek clarity in the information given herein. Please ensure that you understand completely all the procedures involved. Below are some questions you might have about the study and brief answers thereof.

WHY ARE WE DOING THIS?

Learning evaluation is a widely researched area. This is understandable since the subject is fundamental to the existence and performance of education around the world, not least universities, which of course contain most of the researchers and writers. We are conducting this research to find out: Does the programme increase the level of self-awareness?

WHAT DOES THE STUDY INVOLVE?

This study will be conducted through questionnaires, interviews and a rating scale. You

will be requested to complete all forms which will be evaluating the workshop

HOW LONG WILL THE STUDY LAST FOR?

The entire study will last for up to four months, the questionnaires will take 20 minutes at most

WHAT ARE YOUR RIGHTS AS A PARTICIPANT IN THIS STUDY?

Your decision to give me permission to conduct the observations is entirely voluntary. You can refuse or withdraw your permission at any time without stating any reason.

WILL ANY OF THE STUDY PROCEDURES RESULT IN DISCOMFORT OR INCONVENIENCE?

No, you will not feel uncomfortable at any stage of the research

WHAT ARE THE RISKS INVOLVED IN THIS STUDY?

There are no risks anticipated to be associated with participation in this study

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS INVOLVED IN THIS STUDY?

The benefits to the participants will be the opportunity to speak about their lives to an independent researcher. The research is expected to be beneficial to the schools and the ERF.

WHERE CAN YOU GET MORE INFORMATION IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR PROBLEMS?

If you have any questions or problems concerning this study, you can contact Miss

Nkateko Lowane, tel. (012) 429 8513; e-mail: lowanne@unisa.ac.za

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information obtained during the course of this study is strictly private and confidential.

The written information will be stored in locked cabinets when not in use and the transcriptions will be stored in the computers which require passwords.

If you are happy to allow me to conduct the research, please read and sign the attached consent form.

Appendix D

Informed Consent Form to Participate in the Study

I hereby confirm that I have been informed by the investigator, Nkateko Lowane about the nature, conduct, benefits and risks of the study. I have also received, read and understood the above written information (participant information sheet and informed consent) regarding the study.

I am aware that the results of the study, including any personal details regarding my sex, age, date of birth, initials, and address will not be stated in any study reports.

I understand that I may, at any stage, withdraw my consent and participation in the study, without having to give a reason. I am aware that I will not suffer any consequences if I withdraw my permission at any time. I have had sufficient opportunity to ask questions. I freely declare myself prepared to participate in the study.

_____ (Please print)

Participant's name

Participant's signature

Date

(Please print)

Investigator's name

Investigator's signature

Date

I, Miss Nkateko Eudora Lowane, herewith confirm that the above participant has been informed fully about the nature, conduct and risks of the above study.

(Please print)

Witness's name

Witness's signature

Date