INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

**ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600**

UMI[®]

Personal Projects Analysis and Well-Being: Cultural Explorations

by

Kelly Richardson B.A. (Hons.)

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Carleton University
Ottawa, ON
August 17, 2001
© 2001, Kelly Richardson

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-66848-7

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Acceptance of the thesis:

"Personal Projects Analysis & Well-Being: Cultural Explorations"

submitted by

Kelly Richardson

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Chair

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
August, 2001

Acknowledgements

Well...after roughly 12,000 kilometers of traveling across Canada (resulting from my neurotic and somewhat paranoid thought patterns) this document is finally done travelling with me. It would likely still be in my back-pack following me everywhere I go without the following support system. Thank you to.....

My supervisor Dr. Brian Little for sparking the original interest and refueling the fire when necessary. Working with you the past 5 years has been an incredible honour.

My committee members for sharing the crucial final moments of your summer vacations with me.

Katariina Salmela-Aro and Monique Fornari for collecting the Finnish and French data.

Dr. Neil Chambers, it's been a great time and your assistance with EVERYTHING from stats to edits to Gitanes means the world to me. You'll always be my most reliable 'encyclopedia'.

Dr. Bill Petrusic whom I will always remember, thank you for your never ending kindness and generosity. I will forever look at MDS with a brand new set of eyes.

Dr. Laura Goodine and Dr. Tim Pychyl who both go above and beyond the call of duty, your essential assistance in the somewhat early stages of this project was greatly appreciated.

Carleton's psychology department (particularly those of you situated in the 5th floor offices, you know who you are...) for your smiling faces and open arms during any and all crises.

Friends at work (Cherami, Kelley, Sara, Tina, Chantal, Donna, Ben and Paul) for your brains, patience and understanding in my moments of insanity.

To Jen for your commitment to coding, your 3-hour read during the plane ride, your on-going support and encouragement, but mostly your friendship.

To Warren for helping me through a second degree and for marrying me in the middle of it. At least this one was less frustrating than the first.

And finally to my parents, Brenda and Carl for your encouragement and love. Like I always say...without the two of you, I wouldn't be me.

Personal Projects Analysis & Well-Being: Cultural Explorations

Kelly Richardson

Abstract

Cross-cultural psychologists are increasingly examining subjective well-being, that is, how people evaluate their lives from culture to culture. Research evidence supports the contention that human well-being is closely linked with people's appraisals of their ongoing pursuits and goals. This study advances such research by employing Personal Projects Analysis (PPA) to explore similarities and differences among the well-being of undergraduate students from Canada, Finland and France. The study is innovative due to the operationalization of several dimensions deemed to be important for cross-cultural comparisons. Aspects of social capital, finance and emotion for example are pertinent in the area of cross-cultural research. Analyses focus on differences between these three samples, interrelationships between personal projects, overall perceived well-being and variability in the well-being accounted for by Personal Projects Analysis. Although there are no significant differences in life satisfaction or depression across the countries, findings suggest that Canada is higher in negative affect as compared to Finland and France. In addition, social capital, finance and emotion are all confirmed as being relevant for future cross-cultural studies. Finally, comparable project systems emerge for each country and support for PPA in ongoing research is provided, as the methodology continues to account for a significant amount of the variability in well-being. Limitations are discussed and areas important for future research are addressed.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
List of Tables.....	vii
List of Figures	viii
Introduction	1
<i>Subjective Well-Being (SWB)</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Measuring Subjective Well-Being.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Personal Projects Analysis</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Personal Projects Analysis and Cross-Cultural Findings.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Personal Projects Analysis and Well-Being: Expanding the Focus.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>The Current Study.....</i>	<i>17</i>
Methods.....	19
<i>Subjects.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Assessment Instruments</i>	<i>21</i>
Personal Projects Analysis (PPA).	21
Personal Projects System Rating Scale (PPSRS).	23
Life Satisfaction Scale.	24
Centre for Epidemiological Studies in Depression (CES-D).	24
Diener & Emmons' Affect Scale.	24
<i>Procedure</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Analytic Strategy.....</i>	<i>25</i>
Results.....	28
<i>The Project Systems of Canadian, Finnish & French Students.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Personal Project Appraisals and Subjective Well-Being.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Which group(s) of students are generally 'doing well'?</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Factor Structures for Canada, Finland & France.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Predictive Ability of PPA: Factor Structures, Depression and Life Satisfaction</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>The Personal Projects of Canadian, Finnish and French Undergraduate Students</i>	<i>38</i>
Discussion	41

Personal Projects Analysis

<i>The Well-Being of Canadian, Finnish and French Students</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Social Ecological Framework with a cultural spin</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>In Comparison to the Pilot Study.....</i>	<i>47</i>
Well-Being.....	47
Variability Accounted for in Well-Being by Personal Projects Analysis.	48
The Consequence of Efficacy.....	48
Replicating the Relevance of Ad Hoc Dimensions.....	49
<i>The Sustained Value of Ad Hoc Dimensions in the Measurement of Well-Being.....</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Are the project systems of Finnish and French students typical?.....</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Emerging Concerns: The definition and measurement of well-being.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Limitations</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Summary and Conclusions</i>	<i>56</i>
References	58
Appendix A—Breakdown of Major Discipline by Country	69
Appendix B—Project Categorization Format.....	71
Appendix C—Intercorrelations Between 17 Project Dimensions—Canada, Finland and France	74
Appendix D—Principle Components Analysis—Canada, Finland, France.....	77
Appendix E—Correlational Support for Theoretical Factor Structures	80
Appendix F—Random Sample of Personal Projects by Category	81
Appendix G—Sample Packages—Canada, Finland and France.....	83
<i>Canadian Package.....</i>	<i>83</i>
<i>Finnish Package.....</i>	<i>96</i>
<i>French Package.....</i>	<i>107</i>

List of Tables

Table 1: Predictors of Life Satisfaction by Country	12
Table 2: Means of the Project Dimensions by Country	29
Table 3: Correlations Supporting the Relevance of Emotions and Social Capital	30
Table 4: Relations Between the Project Dimensions and Outcome Variables	32
Table 5: Mean Scores on Outcome Measures.....	33
Table 6: Mean Scores of the PPSRS Values.....	35
Table 7: Factor Names by Country	36
Table 8: Frequency and Percentage of Personal Projects Listed by Respondents by Major Project Categories	39

List of Figures

Figure 1: A Social-Ecological Framework for the Study of Person-Environment Interaction (Little, 2000).....	8
Figure 2: Significant Differences in Negative Affect	34
Figure 3 : Significant Differences in Project System Meaning and Project System Support	35
Figure 4: Project Category Percentages by Country	41
Figure 5: Cross-Cultural Social Ecological Model	46

Personal Projects Analysis & Well-Being: Cultural Explorations

Introduction

It's 8:30 a.m. in Ottawa, Canada, 3:30 p.m. in Helsinki, Finland and 2:30 p.m. in Paris, France. In Ottawa, Susan and David are eating breakfast in the residence cafeteria discussing their plans for summer vacation. It appears that Susan is going canoeing in Algonquin Park and David plans on hiking in the Rocky Mountains. Meanwhile in Helsinki, Kata and Mikka have just finished their telecommunications class and are having a similar discussion; they are both headed to their *kesamokki* for summer vacation. In Paris, Marie-Laure and Jean-Marc are at a café just off campus sharing their plans while enjoying a glass of wine. Marie-Laure is headed *à la mer* while Jean-Marc hopes to go *à la montagne*.

Their summer projects sound exciting and eventful, however each of these individuals are also students in the middle of their academic careers. Before progressing to their summer vacations they have more immediate projects to achieve. Susan and David need to complete current OSAP (Ontario Student Assistance Program) arrangements in order to ensure funding for the upcoming academic year. Kata and Mikka on the other hand are not concerned with funding as the Finnish government is subsidizing their education; they do, however, have final exams to prepare for in order to maintain their academic status. Marie-Laure and Jean-Marc have a somewhat different focus. They are in *classes préparatoires* completing their *Baccalauréat* and preparing for *un concours* in order to gain entrance into '*L'Ecole polytechnique*'.

Such personal projects are ubiquitous in daily life. Sometimes without even realizing it, our personal projects are influenced by the people around us (Mikka for

example would rather be going to Kata's *kesamokkis* but has been reminded that he needs to spend time with his grandmother this summer). Personal projects are simply the projects we take on each day, some of which we have chosen for ourselves, and some of which have been chosen for us. They can be long-term projects (e.g., 'graduate from *L'Ecole polytechnique* one day'), short-term projects (e.g., 'meet Marie-Laure this afternoon'), fully enjoyable (e.g., 'scale the Rocky Mountains') or anxiety provoking (e.g., 'be examined for *un concours* '). We approach and feel differently about each of them and they are the ingredients that form the process of our lives. They are the personal actions in which a person is currently engaged. They are impacted by and impact upon the social ecology inevitably leaving 'imprints and residues'. Most importantly they are intimately related to one's happiness and quality of life (Little, 1999a). The vignettes from above exemplify aspects of the project systems of students from Canada, Finland and France. The following study considers the personal project systems of students from these countries by examining the impact project systems have on life satisfaction and depression and how these are different or similar from country to country.

Cross-cultural psychologists have a long-standing interest in whether happiness and well-being arise from sources common to humankind or reflect different values that vary across cultures. Smith and Bond (1999) define culture as "a *relatively organized* system of shared meanings" (p. 39). Greenfield (1997) views culture as a socially interactive process that consists of two main components, shared meaning, consistent with Smith and Bond, and shared activity. She views shared meaning as the culture's interpretation and shared activities as the culture's practices.

Lonner and Adamopoulos (1997) state that personality and culture are inextricably intertwined and they raise the issue of whether this has a direct or indirect impact on human behaviour. Segall, Dasen, Berry and Poortinga (1990) introduce an eco-cultural framework in which culture (the man-made aspects of the environment) **indirectly** influences human behaviour and ecological factors (biological characteristics) **directly** impact human behaviour. The idea underlying the development of their framework emerges from recognition of the interaction between the situation, the person and the behaviour.

The interactionist approach emphasizes the interaction between the person and the situation. Little (1987) introduced Personal Projects Analysis (PPA) as a framework with an interactional nature and argued for the relevance of considering the “person X environment” interaction while studying human behaviour. The current work examines cross-national differences in well-being by applying a social ecological framework and using PPA as its methodology for exploration.

Subjective Well-Being (SWB)

SWB has been defined as “people’s cognitive and affective evaluation of their lives” (Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995, p.851). A great deal of research has examined cross-cultural differences in well-being, suggesting that factors such as economy (Diener, 1994; Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995; Diener, Shao, Diener, & Suh, 1996), emotional state (Diener, Shao, Diener, & Suh, 1996; Suh, Diener, Oishi, & Triandis, 1998), individualism, human rights and societal equality (Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995) are consistently correlated with SWB.

Research examining SWB commonly includes four components: negative affect,

positive affect (or the relative absence of negative affect), life satisfaction, and depression (e.g., Andrews & Withey, 1976; Bradburn, 1969; Diener, 1994; Diener & Emmons, 1985; Dowden, Chambers, Hunt, Richardson-Taylor, Hargrave & Little, 2001). For the purposes of this study SWB will be defined as including the above mentioned components with negative affect and depression acting as inverse indicators. Any reference to well-being in a general sense implies the inclusion of one or more of the components. In addition, specific components will be looked at in isolation where appropriate.

Although there is agreement regarding the components of SWB, approaches to its measurement vary. Some argue that SWB is dependent upon one's traits, and the simple completion of a personality inventory provides a window into an individual's SWB (Costa & McCrae, 1980). Those higher in neuroticism for example, experience lower SWB, while those higher in extraversion experience higher SWB. A social ecological framework (Little & Ryan, 1979) recognizes the capacity of traits and acknowledges them as a critical component of well-being. However, it also acknowledges the importance of contextual features of our environment as an essential element in the measurement of well-being.

Those familiar with emic (behaviour studied within a system that uses internally valid criteria) and etic (behaviour studied from outside a system that uses external or absolutely valid criteria) research approaches (Triandis & Lambert, 1980) may recognize the use of trait inventories in isolation as highly etic as they impose subject matter upon individuals which may or may not be personally salient. What such inventories fail to consider is the context in which the person lives.

Measuring Subjective Well-Being

There is increasing research evidence supporting the contention that human well-being is closely linked with people's appraisals of their on-going pursuits and goals. Specific units of analysis such as personal projects (Little, 1983), life tasks (Cantor, 1990), current concerns (Klinger, 1977), and personal strivings (Emmons, 1986), have been and continue to be used to examine this relationship in the hope of providing greater explanatory clarity regarding such a link.

Substantial bodies of research have demonstrated that human well-being is centrally related to the pursuit of one's personal projects (Little, in press, 1983, 1998, 1999, 1999a). Little (1983) and Palys and Little (1983) maintain that project dimension scores from the Personal Projects Analysis (PPA) methodology successfully predict indicators of subjective well-being. Omodei and Wearing (1990) offer further evidence that the extent to which a person's projects are satisfying his/her needs is predictive of higher life satisfaction. McGregor and Little (1998) reason that there may be two types of well-being, happiness and meaning, both of which can be elucidated using PPA. Furthermore, research shows that the core conceptual domains of stress (made up of the project dimensions of stress, difficulty and challenge) and efficacy (consisting of the project dimensions progress and outcome) are central to life satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Altogether, the single best predictor of life satisfaction and depressive affect¹ has been found to be project outcome (the anticipation of a successful outcome of his/her project) (Little, 1988). Wilson (1990) completed a meta-analysis which examined

¹ This study will consider depression as representative of a negative aspect of well-being, an inverse index of well-being.

the relationship between the standard project dimensions² and life satisfaction, finding significant individual mean effect sizes for stress ($r = -.38$), the structure dimension of control ($r = .34$), and the efficacy dimensions of expected outcome ($r = .29$) and progress ($r = .28$). Dowden *et al.* (2001) reported that stress ($r = .33$), outcome ($r = -.31$) and control ($r = -.28$) are significantly related to depression.

It is argued that to the extent one is pursuing meaningful, manageable, supported, efficacious and relatively unstressful projects, one is more likely to express satisfaction with their life and less likely to experience depressive affect (Little, 1998). Given that PPA is inherently personal and therefore culturally salient and has proven to have adaptable ecological validity, it has been chosen to be the unit of analysis for this study. The investigator argues that it is an emic approach to research in SWB, as it permits the consideration of the environment in which the individual is immersed. The unit of analysis is content that the participant has provided, and there is no imposition of subject matter that may be unfamiliar to those from various cultures; it is derived by the participant and is therefore emic in nature³.

Personal Projects Analysis

PPA was created to complement and partially challenge the hegemony of trait units in personality psychology (Little, in press) by providing a window into both individual differences and environmental affordances as they coalesce in influencing

² The standard project dimensions include: importance, enjoyment, difficulty, visibility, control, initiation, stress, time adequacy, outcome, self-identity, other's view, value congruency, positive impact, negative impact, progress, challenge and absorption.

³ The dimensions provided for the participants may be seen as less emic than the projects they list. However Cameron's findings (1984) provide support for the emic nature of project dimensions (addressed further in the discussion).

human action. Personal projects are formally defined as "extended sets of personally salient activity" that can range from "trivial pursuits" to "magnificent obsessions" (Little, 1989). Feeding my cat, for example, may be one of my trivial pursuits while obtaining my Ph.D. may be one of my magnificent obsessions. PPA considers the "person X environment" interaction by looking at an individual's purposive actions in a variety of different contexts. The social ecological model (Little & Ryan, 1979) is a perspective which postulates that human well-being is influenced by both stable aspects of the person (i.e., traits) and stable aspects of the environmental context (Figure 1).

Figure 1: A Social-Ecological Framework for the Study of Person-Environment

Interaction (Little, 2000)

Human well-being (Block F) is influenced by stable aspects of the person, such as trait and temperamental variables (Block A), and stable aspects of the environmental context (Block B). Personal projects (Block E) are influenced by both personal and contextual variables in dynamic interaction. Blocks C & D emerged as it became clear that the linkages between persons, projects and environments were unable to handle some of the subtleties and potentially important nuances of person-environment interactions (Little, 2000). B. R. Little (personal communication, July 6, 2001) describes Block C, ‘dynamic personal features’, as handling important facets of the self, such as free traits, and Block D, ‘dynamic contextual features’, as handling anticipated (or sometimes unanticipated) aspects of the environment, such as personal contexts.

Personal Projects Analysis and Cross-Cultural Findings

Although most studies examining personal project appraisals and well-being have

been carried out in Canada and the USA, an increasing number have been undertaken outside of North America (e.g. Chatterjee, 1981 (Bangladesh); Xiao, 1985 (China); Yamamoto, Sauvada, Minami, Ishii, & Inour, 1992 (Japan); Yetim, 1993 (Turkey); Salmela-Aro, & Nurmi, 1996, 1996a (Finland); Terkel, 1997 (Israel); Omedei & Wearing, 1990 (Australia); Beck, 1996 (Switzerland)).

Chatterjee (1981) examined similarities and differences between university students in Bangladesh and Canada in their perceptions of life satisfaction, quality of life, and stress. She found that students from Canada had greater perceived life satisfaction and present and future quality of life than the students from Bangladesh. For the Canadian sample, perception of life satisfaction depended largely on visibility, control, and initiation, while in the Bangladeshi sample life satisfaction was associated with progress and likelihood of success.

Loh (1981) examined the resettlement and adaptation of Indochinese refugees in Canada, including Vietnamese, Cambodian and Chinese. For the Vietnamese, present quality of life was related to how they perceived their life in the past, recent past and future. The higher their quality of life in the past and recent past, the lower their present quality of life. The Cambodians saw their present quality of life as being related to importance, initiation, time adequacy, and outcome of projects and negatively related to quality of life past. The present quality of life for the Chinese was associated with the enjoyment and positive impact of their personal projects.

Xiao (1985) explored the meaning and content of the daily lives of Chinese and Canadian undergraduates in each country. Xiao's principal focus was not on life satisfaction; however, overall the Chinese found their projects to be more enjoyable, less

difficult, less stressful, less challenging, and felt less responsible for having initiated their projects in comparison to the Canadians. The primary variable in distinguishing between the two groups was enjoyment, followed by initiation and difficulty. Canadian students also reported more stress than Chinese students.

Yetim (1993) studied Turkish respondents in hopes of confirming Little's (1983) and Palys and Little's (1983) findings about the relationship between personal project systems and life satisfaction within a different socio-cultural level. The study involved two separate samples, a university sample and a professional sample. All told, greatest life satisfaction for the university sample was achieved when projects were perceived as under their control, seen by others as valuable, viewed as having a higher expectation about outcome and progressing well. In contrast, the professionals achieved greatest life satisfaction when their projects did not induce stress, and were not hindered by many obstacles.

Salmela-Aro *et al.* (1996a) looked at the association between Finnish students' appraisals of their interpersonal projects and different aspects of their self-reported social relationships and subjective well-being. Specifically, they compared young women who appraised their interpersonal projects as uncertain and anxiety provoking with those who appraised them in terms of confidence. Results indicate that the "socially confident group" appraised their interpersonal projects as being characterized by positive affect and confidence concerning the evaluation of project achievement, whereas the "socially uncertain group" displayed high levels of negative affect and uncertainty about outcome attainment of their interpersonal projects. Overall, this study found that for a Finnish subset of female students, well-being was related to the personal appraisals of

interpersonal projects.

Terkel (1997) considered how the cultural context within which Israelis live may influence the types of goals and personal projects they pursue. With regard to well-being, personal projects high in efficacy were significantly positively correlated with overall life satisfaction, however project stress was not significantly negatively correlated with overall life satisfaction.

Richardson (1999) explored similarities and differences between the well-being of Canadian and Finnish students and found substantial differences in SWB. Finnish undergraduates were higher in life satisfaction while their Canadian counterparts were higher in depression and negative affect. In addition, more relationships between project appraisals and well-being appeared significant for the Finnish students than the Canadian students as compared to previous research in the area. Furthermore, relative to the Canadian students, a larger percentage of the variability in well-being was accounted for by the appraisal of personal projects of the Finnish students. Finally, results provided support for the use of additional project dimensions that may demonstrate cross-national variability such as financial constraint (*the extent to which people feel their personal financial situation hinders or negatively effects each project*) and social capital, which was examined by including the dimensions of community (*the extent to which each project contributes toward a sense of togetherness and harmony with others in their environment*) and community benefit (*the extent to which one takes part in a project primarily for the well-being of others*), and alternatively, discrete emotion dimensions (angry, joyful, proud, anxious) that show broad cross-national generalizability. This study served as a pilot project for the current study. Table 1 provides the predictors of

life satisfaction for the above-mentioned countries.

Table 1: Predictors of Life Satisfaction by Country

	Bangladesh	Cambodia	China	Israel	Turkey	Canada (Traditional)	Canada (Pilot)	Finland (Pilot)
Project Dimensions								
Meaning								
Enjoyment			X					
Value Congruency					X			
Importance		X						
Structure								
Initiation		X						X
Control					X	X		
Time Adequacy		X						
Positive Impact			X					
Community								
Support								X
Other's View					X			
Stress								
Difficulty								X
Stress						X		X
Efficacy								
Progress	X			X	X	X		X
Outcome	X	X		X	X	X		X
Discrete Emotions								
Angry							X	X
Joy								X
Ad Hoc								
Financial Constraint								X

Note: Vietnam's predictors were related to past, recent past and future quality of life and have therefore not been included. (Traditional) represents results traditionally found in Canadian research examining life satisfaction with PPA. (Pilot) represents the results found for Canada and Finland in the above-mentioned pilot study. An X represents a significant predictor of life satisfaction for the appropriate country.

Overall, dimensions from the efficacy domain appear to be strong predictors for all countries excluding China, however, results for the Canadian sample (pilot study) reveal that the efficacy dimensions did not emerge as significant predictors of life satisfaction. The domains of meaning and structure are also predictive for various countries and are therefore interesting, while the domains of community and stress are significant for only Turkey, Canada, and Finland. In addition, a large number of project dimensions emerge as significant for Finland, as compared to other countries, and the discrete emotions of anger and joy, along with the *ad hoc* dimension of financial constraint were significant for Finland and Canada (pilot study). These patterns attest to the variability in predictors of well-being among countries⁴ however, these findings must be viewed cautiously as they are based on studies which used a variety of procedural methods.

The methodology for studying personal projects is a modular one which encourages researchers to augment a set of core appraisal dimensions with *ad hoc* ones relevant to the particular social ecology under investigation. This modular flexibility has the advantage of allowing indigenous concerns to be identified in the country being studied. However, adoption of different project appraisal dimensions somewhat restricts the ability of a researcher to make direct comparisons between countries in the relationship between their personal projects and well-being.

Personal Projects Analysis and Well-Being: Expanding the Focus

An innovative aspect of this study is the operationalization of several constructs

⁴These studies were completed with university students and are not generalizable to the population as a whole. In fact, the higher education levels place a strong restrictive clause on the apparent strength of the efficacy dimensions.

deemed to be important for cross-cultural comparisons. The expectation is that there will be a set of project appraisal dimensions that will have broad cross-national generalizability in predicting well-being, while there will be other dimensions that will be culture specific. One set of dimensions to be included in this study which are expected to have applicability across a broad range of cultures is that of the emotional states experienced in pursuing one's personal projects.

Chambers, Goodine and Little (1999) have recently argued for the relevance of discrete⁵ emotions within the rating of project systems. They maintain that in addition to traditional positive and negative affect, discrete emotions provide the respondent with an alternative, affective method of summarizing their perceptions of their projects. These emotions have also been shown to relate systematically to how individuals appraise their projects. Although traditionally, personal project appraisal dimensions have tended to be weighted more heavily toward a cognitive perspective (with the exception of stress and enjoyment), the findings of Chambers *et al.* prompted the inclusion of the following affective dimensions: angry, anxious, proud and joyful. It is anticipated that pursuing projects which frequently evoke joy rather than anger, for example, will be substantially related to well-being in all countries.

Richardson (1999) found that the discrete emotions significantly predicted well-being for both Canada and Finland. In fact, the inclusion of these affective dimensions may change the patterns of the respondents' appraisal of their projects. These findings provide support for the claims made by Chambers *et al.* (1999), that is, emotions are

⁵ Discrete emotions are specific emotional states that differ along cognitive lines as opposed to general positive and negative affect.

related to how individuals' appraise their projects. For example, Pearson correlation coefficients for the Canadian sample revealed that there were significant relationships with at least one of the emotions variables for all 13 non-affective project dimensions (except the dimension of initiation). Although to a somewhat lesser extent, the Finnish sample also had a great deal of significant correlations.

Dimensions relating to agency (a term used that implies a sense of independence or individualism) vs. communion (a term used that implies a sense of interdependence or collectivism), on the other hand might be expected to show more cross-national variability in their linkage with well-being. The project dimensions of community and community benefit have been included in the hopes of assessing aspects of social capital (Putnam, 1995). Putnam, following Coleman (1990) defines social capital as amenities of social organization including networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. He argues that over the past decade North America's social capital has been declining, and consequently social connectedness, support groups, and group membership are disappearing. Seligman's (1991) results are consistent with Putnam's claims as he argues that today's epidemic levels of depression stem partly from impoverished social connections in increasingly individualistic Western societies. Accordingly, it is anticipated that one's overall well-being may be modified by variations in social capital. In turn, this study will explore the possible implications of low levels of social capital.

Richardson (1999) did not find the *ad hoc* dimensions of community and community benefit to be significantly related to well-being. However, they were significantly interrelated with a number of the other dimensions and did differ

significantly between countries. The findings exemplify cross-national variability and support further investigation of these *ad hoc* dimensions.

One final dimension that may show cross-national variability is one that considers the economy in which the individual lives. Both Makinen (1996) and Yetim (1993) have shown that the financial burden of project pursuit is a significant predictor of lowered well-being, particularly for older students and young professionals. Makinen examined perceived economic climate and well-being. Results revealed that economic hindrance is related to the dimensions of stress (positively) and structure (negatively). Students whose projects are hindered by the economy have low levels of perceived well-being. Although there was some variability across age groups⁶, Makinen argued that pursuing this line of inquiry may be productive. In addition, Yetim noted the importance of a country's economic development and stability. He found that obstacles to project completion may be attributable to "poor wage and improper wage policy," "high inflation," and "unpredictability and uncertainty of job and career promotion." Furthermore, Diener (1994) examined the correlates of subjective well-being across nations and argued that "income and its correlates are replicable predictors of SWB" (p. 325). In turn, the *ad hoc* dimension of financial constraint explores the possible application of personal economy to project appraisals and well-being.

Richardson (1999) found that financial constraint was related to the well-being of

⁶Economic hindrance was related to academic and life satisfaction for mature students but not younger students. Vocational projects were stressful for mature students, likely due to their later stage in life, as they felt more pressure to find employment than their younger counterparts. Administrative projects were more stressful for younger students as they were in the process of arranging economic support for the upcoming academic year.

the Finnish sample, but not the Canadian sample. Cross-national variability was anticipated with regards to this dimension, however considering the similarities between Canadian and Finnish economies, it was surprising that this was predictive for one country without being predictive for the other. This finding exemplifies that even two countries both seen as relatively affluent may have underlying cultural structures that impact the individual's appraisals of their project systems.

The Current Study

Focusing on Canadian, Finnish, and French students, the current study uses a common set of appraisal dimensions and identical measures of well-being. The major goal of this study is to determine the cross-national generalizability of personal project appraisals and their links with well-being while at the same time addressing concerns raised by the pilot study⁷ and replicating some of its findings.

There are both theoretical and practical implications of this research.

Theoretically, there is long-standing interest, particularly in cross-cultural psychology (e.g. Berry, Poortinga, Segall & Dasen, 1992; Markus & Kitayama, 1991), about whether human happiness and well-being arise from sources common to humankind or reflect different values that vary across cultures. For example, some cultures place a heavy emphasis upon agentic and individualistic values and pursuits, whereas others emphasize a sense of community and interrelatedness. The successful pursuit of agentic personal projects thus might predict well-being for individuals in one country, but be only marginally related in another.

⁷ Concerns raised by the pilot study include variability in the mean ages between countries and a heterogeneous Canadian sample. Please see Richardson (1999).

There were several reasons for the choices of Canada, Finland and France as the comparison countries for this study. Canada was an obvious choice as it is the country where most of the personal project studies have been conducted and is the home country of the investigator. France and Finland were chosen for both practical and theoretical reasons. First, investigators from both countries had expressed interest in using PPA as a means of examining the lives of French and Finnish students. Finnish investigators have been in the forefront of studies examining personal projects and well-being (Salmela-Aro & Nurmi, 1996, 1996a; Nurmi, Pulliainen & Salmela-Aro, 1992; Salmela-Aro, 1992) and expressed considerable interest in collaborative comparative studies. PPA has also been utilized quite extensively in Quebec (e.g., Little & Chambers, 2000) and a French researcher also expressed interest in collaborative studies. The investigator suspected that it would be of particular interest for future studies to compare French results with previous PPA studies completed with Francophone students in Quebec (Bouffard, Bastin & Lapierre, 1996; Lapierre, Bouffard & Bastin, 1992-1993). Second, there are interesting cultural differences between France, Finland and Canada, as discussed below.

First, Finland and France provide substantially greater financial support for students than does Canada. Secondly, Finland and France are more culturally homogeneous countries than Canada. Third, it is suspected that France has more social capital than Finland or Canada. However, it is important to emphasize that, in some senses, there are similarities that make this a fairly conservative test of cross-national differences. All are industrialized and relatively affluent countries with well-educated citizens.

Due to the exploratory nature of this study, specific hypotheses have not been

elaborated. However, the investigator expects that project systems that are meaningful, manageable, supported, efficacious and relatively unstressful, are more likely to result in higher levels of well-being for each of the countries involved. Nevertheless, the individual project dimensions that contribute to each of these domains are expected to vary across countries.

Discrete emotion project dimensions are anticipated to account for a large percentage of the variance in the appraisal of project systems. Due to the similarities in the countries selected, the investigator does not anticipate significant differences with regard to the *ad hoc* dimension of financial constraint. However, as with the pilot study, underlying cultural structures may play more of a role than anticipated, and financial constraint may emerge as a significant dimension for further inquiry. With regard to the *ad hoc* dimensions of community and community benefit, based on differences found between Canadian and Finnish students, it is anticipated that differences between the countries with regards to these dimensions will emerge.

Methods

Identical assessment packages were completed by Canadian, French and Finnish students. The Canadian data were collected during the fall term of the 2000/2001 academic year while the archival Finnish and French data were collected during the 1998/1999 academic year during the mid winter term and toward the end of the winter term respectively.

Subjects

Within the Canadian sample, subjects were recruited from a pool of students registered in introductory psychology courses. Those students who chose to complete the

study received course credit in exchange for participating. One hundred and forty eight students received packages, of those, 144 (97%) were returned. One hundred and six were retained while 34 were excluded as a result of language requirements set forth in this study⁸. Four were omitted as a result of incomplete data. The Canadian sample was recruited from Carleton University and consisted primarily of Arts and Social Science students (47%), followed by students from Public Affairs and Management (39%). Eight percent of the students came from other major disciplines including industrial design, computer science, engineering and science, and six percent of the students had not declared a major. These participants ranged in age from 17-46 years ($M=21$, $SD=4.34$). Seventy-nine females (75%) and twenty-seven males (25%) participated.

The Finnish and French samples were archival data and accessed through the Social Ecology Assessment Data Bank (SEAbank). The original samples of Finnish and French participants were recruited in a similar fashion to that of the Canadian sample, and the participants also received credit for participation in the study. The Finnish students were recruited from the University of Helsinki. Fifty one percent failed to complete the question concerning their academic major. Of the remaining students, 24% were in telecommunications/informatics programs, 10 % electrical programs, 10% engineering programs and 5% other programs including adult education, occupational psychology and production economy. The participants from Finland ranged in age from 19-48 years ($M=23$, $SD=5.26$) and the sample consisted of 11 females (18%) and 50 males (82%), 61

⁸ Obtaining a more homogeneous Canadian sample was a goal of this study. In turn, a requirement was English being both the native and spoken language of the participant. Those not meeting this requirement were excluded.

students in all.

The French students were recruited from a number of different academic institutions including Etablissement Jeanne d'Albret, Lycée Florent-Schmidt, Lycée Saint-Louis, Université Paris X Nanterre, and Université de Versailles. Thirty six of the students were in 'classes préparatoires' (preparing for university entrance), thirty seven were in university and 11 were in a specialized accounting and management school. The majority of these students came from math programs (35%), followed by Public Affairs and Management (24%), Arts and Social Sciences (22%), Engineering (9%) and other programs (8%) including Veterinarian programs and physical education programs. Two percent of the students did not complete this question⁹. The age of the French participants ranged from 16-22 years ($M=19$, $SD=1.25$) years, there were fifty females (58%) and thirty-six males (42%) ($n=86$).

Assessment Instruments

A battery of self-administered questionnaires was assembled all of which had been previously administered by various researchers in the Social Ecology Laboratory. These include Little's (1983) "Personal Projects Analysis" (PPA), and "Personal Projects System Rating Scale" (PPSRS), Radloff's (1977) Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D Scale), Diener and Emmon's (1985) Affect Scale, Atkinson's (1977) life satisfaction scale and a general background information page (Appendix G).

Personal Projects Analysis (PPA).

PPA is a methodological tool developed from a social-ecological perspective

⁹ For a complete breakdown of the major disciplines by country please refer to Appendix A.

(Figure 1) and its Kellian roots (Kelly, 1955) are based on a credulous approach in which the researcher starts with the assumption that individuals have privileged status regarding their important activities. The traditional PPA begins with the elicitation of projects. Respondents are provided with a definition of a personal project along with several project examples. On average, respondents generate fifteen projects, from which they select ten based on greatest personal saliency; they then rate these projects on a 0 to 10 scale on 17 dimensions chosen on the basis of their theoretical and applied importance.

Five core conceptual domains are postulated to underlie the standard 17 dimensions of PPA (Little, 1988). The domains are meaning (assesses the worth or worthlessness of projects), structure (taps into the organization or disarray of projects), community (evaluates the extent of support provided by others), stress (questions if the demands of projects exceed the capabilities of coping with them) and efficacy (appraises whether projects have been and will be progressing well)¹⁰. These domains offer a somewhat more general conceptualization rather than the specificity provided by the seventeen dimensions. Past research in the Social Ecology Laboratory has consistently linked several project dimensions with various indices of subjective well-being. In particular, the dimensions of efficacy and stress emerge as being related to scores in depression, negative affect and life satisfaction (Little, 1988; Wilson, 1990; Dowden *et al.*, 2001).

¹⁰ The domains consist of the following project dimensions: *meaning*: enjoyment, importance, self-identity, value congruency, absorption; *structure*: initiation, control, time adequacy, positive impact, negative impact; *community*: visibility, other's view, support; *efficacy*: progress, outcome, competency; and *stress*: stress, difficulty, challenge.

New dimensions can be added, or standard ones removed in order to operationalize concerns appropriate to a given set of respondents. The elicitation list may be analyzed both ipsatively, normatively, quantitatively and qualitatively¹¹. In addition to the standard project dimensions of PPA, seven dimensions were included because of their particular relevance to this study. These *ad hoc* dimensions are financial constraint, community, community benefit, and affective dimensions including angry, anxious, proud, and joyful.

Personal Projects System Rating Scale (PPSRS).

As detailed above, appraisals of personal projects can be aligned into five theoretical factors: project meaning, structure, community (or support), efficacy, and stress (Little, 1989). In contrast with PPA, the PPSRS is an assessment tool explicitly designed to elicit aspects of this theoretical framework. Each theoretical factor is rated on a scale from 0 - 10 with lower scores representing decreased levels in each domain and higher scores representing increased levels in each domain. This measure can be used as a predictor or outcome measure depending on the needs of the researcher. The PPSRS consistently demonstrates highly significant correlations with several outcome measures such as life satisfaction, well-being, social competence and depression (negatively) (Little, 1988; Lecci, 1990; Pychyl, 1995). The factors of efficacy and stress are typically the best predictors of life satisfaction and depression, however stepwise regression analysis demonstrate that each of the five factors account for separate portions of the variance in outcome measures (Little, 1988).

¹¹ For a comprehensive review of the PPA methodology please refer to Little (1983).

Life Satisfaction Scale.

The Life Satisfaction Scale (Atkinson, 1977) provides a measure of the respondents overall perceived satisfaction with life. It is one question measured on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (completely dissatisfied) to 10 (completely satisfied). This scale consistently shows strong relationships with project variables (Little, 1988).

Centre for Epidemiological Studies in Depression (CES-D).

The CES-D is a twenty-item self-report scale designed to measure depressive symptomatology in the general population (Radloff, 1977). It is constructed to assess the current frequency of depressive symptoms, with emphasis on depressed affect or mood (Robinson, Shaver & Wrightsman, 1991). Each item is rated on a four point Likert scale with ratings ranging from 'rarely or none of the time', to 'most or all of the time'. Past research has consistently linked high depression (as measured with the CES-D) with a lack of project control, initiation and time adequacy (i.e., structure), progress and outcome (i.e., efficacy), self identity and enjoyment (i.e., meaning), visibility (i.e., community) and high levels of stress, difficulty and negative impact (i.e., stress) (Little, 1988).

Diener & Emmons' Affect Scale.

This affect scale (Diener & Emmons, 1985) is a nine-item instrument designed to measure positive and negative affect. Four of the items are positive (happy, joyful, pleased, and full of fun) and five of the items are negative (frustrated, worried/anxious, angry/hostile, unhappy, and depressed). A total score of the positive items provides a measure of positive affect and the negative items a measure of negative affect. Hedonic balance (Diener & Suh, 1999) can be calculated by subtracting one's negative affect from

their positive affect and this scale taken together with the life satisfaction scale provides a measure of subjective well-being. The affect scale is one of the most commonly used measures within the Social Ecology Laboratory and shows consistent relationships with project dimensions and the outcome measures of depression and life satisfaction (Goodine, 1999; Chambers, 2001).

Procedure

The Canadian sample completed their package on a take home basis. Upon picking up the package they were provided with contact information and encouraged to discuss problems or concerns with the investigator if and when they arose by calling a "PPA hot line". Respondents generally returned the package within seven days of receiving it, at which time they were debriefed on the nature and purpose of the study. The French data collection was also completed on a take home basis, similar to that of the Canadian sample. Again, upon return of the package participants were debriefed on the nature and purpose of the study. During the original collection of the Finnish data, the participants completed the package in a group context and were given one hour to do so. After this they were provided with a debriefing and were actively encouraged to discuss comments and concerns with the investigator.

Analytic Strategy

The measures used in this study were intended to investigate the project dimensions as predictor variables and associations between depression and life satisfaction as outcome variables. For comparison purposes, measures of association amongst the seventeen dimensions were necessary. In particular the investigation focused on similarities and differences that arose between the Canadian, French and

Finnish samples.

Interrelationships among all project dimensions were calculated using a Pearson product moment correlation matrix generated for all mean ratings of project dimensions (see Appendix C). In order to reduce the project dimensions to a smaller set and to determine more clearly the interrelation among them, a principle components analysis (PCA with varimax rotation) was performed for each country. An unequal and varied set of factor structures emerged. However, the emerging structures coincide with theoretical expectations, in turn offering support for the use of these structures for further analyses. To provide additional support for the factor structures, correlations between the factor loadings for each country were calculated.

Because differences among countries, and the ability of the factor structures to predict both depression and life satisfaction are of interest, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on the outcome variables. Outcome variables were then regressed on the factor scores for each country. In addition, the outcome variables were further regressed on the five system rating scale variables (meaning, structure, community, stress and efficacy) in order to assess the predictive power of these global ratings. These ratings provide a self-evaluation of the person's global project system and are of particular theoretical relevance concerning previous Finnish studies regarding depression (Salmela-Aro *et al.*, 1996). As well, a MANOVA was conducted on the five system rating scale variables to ascertain potential differences between countries in these global ratings.

Finally, a content analysis was conducted on the personal project systems, providing the opportunity for an in-depth analysis of variation or similarity across

citizens from each country. Individual projects were categorized based on a format developed in the Social Ecology Laboratory (See Appendix B). Previous studies have demonstrated good inter-rater reliability using this coding scheme with average concordance rates of 88% (Cohen's Kappa = .87) for categorization by major category (e.g., Little, 1988; Wilmut, 1993). In this study, independent judges from the relevant countries, the principal investigator, and colleagues from the social ecology laboratory coded each country's projects. The Canadian concordance rates were 84%, the Finnish concordance rates 84% and the French concordance rates 82%.

It should be noted that detailed analyses of gender differences were not conducted as a result of past research examining PPA, gender and well-being. Wilson (1990) found no systematic differences in well-being across gender and argued that no further studies examining gender differences, PPA and well-being need to be conducted. In addition, Seldon, Gee and Little (2001) maintain that project space is consistent across gender. Furthermore, in the current study, there was no significant multivariate interaction ($F_{(6,488)}=1.80, p>.05$) between gender and country.

Results

The Project Systems of Canadian, Finnish & French Students

An investigation of differences between mean project dimension scores was conducted by submitting the dimensions to a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA)¹² with country of origin as a fixed factor. As a result of the low n to variable ratio, a very conservative alpha was set ($p < .001$). This alpha level is more conservative than the requisite Bonferonni correction ($.05/17 = p < .003$). The multivariate test revealed that there were significant differences among the groups ($F_{(34,446)} = 12.84, p < .001$) and the between-group tests revealed that the difference lay in the project dimensions of control ($F_{(2,242)} = 44.04, p < .001$), initiation ($F_{(2,242)} = 23.37, p < .001$), stress ($F_{(2,242)} = 21.53, p < .001$), progress ($F_{(2,242)} = 17.72, p < .001$), anger ($F_{(2,242)} = 12.08, p < .001$), anxiety ($F_{(2,242)} = 12.64, p < .001$), and joy ($F_{(2,242)} = 12.14, p < .001$). Specific pairwise comparisons for each of the three groups revealed the following differences. France has significantly lower scores in project control and project stress with higher scores in project joy as compared to Canada and Finland. In addition, the French have lower project progress than Canada, whereas Canada has significantly lower scores in project initiation and higher scores in anger when compared to both countries. Finally, the Finnish are lower in project anxiety than both Canada and France (All of these

¹² Assumptions for all MANOVAs conducted for this research project were analyzed and met. Examination of the normal probability plots revealed univariate normality, no specific tests for multivariate normality were conducted based on the contention that in practice, multivariate normality is likely detected by studying the univariate normality of the observations on each variable (Gnanadesikan, 1977). Homogeneity of the covariance matrices were analyzed via Box's M, and were tenable in each analysis.

differences are significant at $p < .001$) (See Table 2 for overall means and standard deviations).

Table 2: Means of the Project Dimensions by Country

Project Dimensions	Canada		Finland		France	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Importance	7.72	1.28	7.36	1.10	7.67	1.18
Difficulty	6.08	1.70	5.63	1.38	5.87	1.52
Visibility	5.83	1.78	5.29	1.58	5.45	1.73
Control	7.44 (b)	1.42	7.95 (b)	1.18	5.82 (a)	1.54
Initiation	7.21 (a)	1.86	8.57 (b)	1.27	8.56 (b)	1.34
Stress	5.54 (b)	1.91	5.11 (b)	1.46	3.99 (a)	1.52
Outcome	7.28	1.56	6.99	1.30	6.67	1.42
Self Identity	6.93	1.69	6.84	1.20	7.49	1.52
Progress	5.43 (b)	1.91	4.89	1.41	3.86 (a)	1.74
Support	5.72	2.37	4.60	1.70	5.28	2.33
Financial Constraint	3.15	2.14	2.51	1.82	2.62	1.94
Community	4.74	2.29	5.59	1.62	5.27	2.29
Community Benefit	3.41	2.33	3.37	1.84	3.27	2.10
Angry	2.76 (a)	1.99	1.64 (b)	1.33	1.61 (b)	1.80
Anxious	4.79 (b)	2.00	3.18 (a)	1.62	4.57 (b)	2.06
Proud	6.70	2.19	5.49	2.07	6.02	2.42
Joyful	6.91 (b)	2.14	6.59 (b)	1.93	8.09 (a)	1.64

Note: (a) is significantly different from (b), $p < .001$.

The Pearson product moment correlation matrices generated for all mean ratings of project dimensions reveal (Appendix C), several significant findings that are consistent for all three countries. It appears that for Canada, Finland and France project importance and self-identity are significantly correlated at $p < .001$ ($r = .48$, $r = .32$, $r = .37$ respectively). Not surprisingly, project control and project outcome ($r = .47$, $r = .48$, $r = .39$), stress and anxiety ($r = .62$, $r = .55$, $r = .41$), and pride and joy ($r = .77$, $r = .73$, $r = .50$) are all significantly related at $p < .001$. Finally, support is related to project visibility ($r = .29$, $r = .48$, $r = .45$) and a sense of community ($r = .27$, $r = .40$, $r = .29$) for each country, once again, all at $p < .001$.

Additional significant correlations emerged that provide further support for the strength of the *ad hoc* emotional dimensions and social capital dimensions. A sense of community is related to pride and joy for both Canada and Finland and anger is also related to anxiety and stress for both of these countries. Furthermore, for Canada and Finland project control is also related to joy. Aspects of social capital are evident in the above mentioned correlations and further findings indicate that community is related to community benefit for both Canada and France. Several additional significant correlations emerged for the individual countries supporting the relevance of these *ad hoc* dimensions (please refer to Appendix C). Table 3 summarizes these findings.

Table 3: Correlations Supporting the Relevance of Emotions and Social Capital

Intercorrelations	Correlations		
	Canada	France	Finland
Stress & Anxiety	.62	.41	.55
Pride & Joy	.77	.50	.73
Support & Community	.27	.29	.40
Community & Community Benefit	.61	.44	-
Control & Joy	.27	-	.44
Difficulty & Stress	.61	-	.42
Stress & Anger	.38	-	.33
Support & Community Benefit	.25	-	.46
Community & Pride	.32	-	.43
Community & Joy	.34	-	.47
Anger & Anxious	.50	-	.51

Note: All correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

Personal Project Appraisals and Subjective Well-Being

In order to determine the relationships between personal project appraisals and subjective well-being, the seventeen standard dimensions were correlated with life satisfaction, positive affect, negative affect and depression across all respondents in all

countries. All of the following correlations are significant at $p < .001$. It is clear that project stress is related to well-being for all countries. Additional similarities amongst the countries include, projects low in difficulty being related to high life satisfaction for Finland ($r = -.39$) and projects low in difficulty being related to positive affect for France ($r = -.29$). Projects high in anger are related to negative affect ($r = .30$) and inversely related to positive affect ($r = -.27$) for Canada. For France, projects high in anger contribute to higher levels of depression ($r = .34$). French students with low project outcome experience higher negative affect ($r = .34$) and for the Finnish students outcome is also related to positive affect ($r = .44$), depression ($r = -.43$) and life satisfaction ($r = .61$). Finally joy is related to positive affect ($r = .39$), and life satisfaction ($r = .40$), for Canada and to positive affect ($r = .39$), and life satisfaction ($r = .38$) for Finland. These results and additional relations between the project dimensions and outcome variables are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4: Relations Between the Project Dimensions and Outcome Variables

Country	Dimensions	Positive Affect	Negative Affect	Depression	Life Satisfaction
Canada	Self-Identity	.29			.30
	Stress		.39	.28	
	Community Benefit				.27
	Financial Constraint			.27	
	Joyful	.39			.40
	Proud	.43			.29
	Anxious		.41	.27	
	Angry	-.27	.30		
Finland	Outcome	.44		-.43	.61
	Stress		.35	.40	
	Control	.34			.46
	Difficulty				-.39
	Progress				.34
	Joyful	.39			.38
France	Outcome		-.34		
	Difficulty	-.29			
	Stress		.29		
	Initiation		-.29	-.32	
	Angry			.34	

Note: All correlations are significant at $p < .001$.

Which group(s) of students are generally 'doing well'?

To test if there were overall differences in subjective well-being, the four outcome variables (positive affect, negative affect, life satisfaction and depression) were submitted to a MANOVA with country of origin as a fixed factor¹³. The multivariate test revealed that there were significant differences among the groups ($F_{(8,484)}=8.333$, $p<.001$) and the between-group tests revealed that the difference lay in negative affect ($F_{(2,248)}=17.77$, $p<.001$). Specific pairwise comparisons for each of the three groups revealed that Canada is significantly higher in negative affect ($p<.001$) as compared to France and Finland. There are no significant differences between France and Finland on any of the outcome measures. Table 5 provides the means and standard deviations of the outcome variables and Figure 2 provides a graphic representation of the differences in negative affect.

Table 5: Mean Scores on Outcome Measures

Outcome Measures	Canada		Finland		France	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Positive Affect	19.52	4.60	19.00	4.22	18.06	5.15
Negative Affect	19.87 (b)	5.92	15.84 (a)	6.42	15.23 (a)	4.96
Depression	17.66	10.01	14.60	9.02	17.51	8.80
Life Satisfaction	6.87	1.91	7.41	1.88	7.28	2.30

Note: (a) is significantly different from (b), $p<.001$ ¹⁴.

¹³ As anticipated, the affective variables were somewhat skewed, however given findings that the probability of type I error in MANOVA is robust to non-normality, no transformations were made (Stevens, 1996).

¹⁴ The minimum and maximum scores for each of the outcome measures are as follows: Positive Affect (min.: 4, max.: 28), Negative Affect (min.: 5, max.: 35), Depression (min.: 0, max.: 60), Life Satisfaction (min.: 0, max.: 10).

Figure 2: Significant Differences in Negative Affect

To ascertain potential differences between countries in the global ratings provided by the PPSRS, the five global ratings (meaning, structure, support, unstress and progress) were submitted to a one-way MANOVA with country as the fixed factor. The multivariate test revealed that there were significant differences among the groups ($F_{(5,10)}=4.012, p<.001$). Between-group comparisons revealed significant differences on project system meaning ($F_{(2,248)}=5.417, p<.01$) and project system support ($F_{(2,248)}=7.261, p=.001$). Pairwise comparisons reveal that Canadian student's projects are significantly lower in meaning than those of French students ($p<.01$), and Canadians are significantly higher in support than the Finnish ($p=.001$). Table 6 provides the means and standard deviations of the PPSRS mean values and Figure 3 provides a graphic representation of the differences in project system meaning and project system support.

Table 6: Mean Scores of the PPSRS Values

Outcome Measures	Canada		Finland		France	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Meaning	7.99 (a)	1.74	8.51	1.15	8.67 (b)	1.31
Structure	5.30	2.30	5.36	2.10	5.27	2.49
Support	6.77 (a)	2.13	5.33 (b)	2.06	6.28	2.83
Unstress	4.26	2.42	4.34	2.20	4.51	2.49
Progress	6.72	1.80	6.67	1.63	6.36	2.06

Note: (a) is significantly different from (b).

Figure 3 : Significant Differences in Project System Meaning and Project System Support

Factor Structures for Canada, Finland & France

To ascertain whether similar factor structures would emerge for each of the countries and to reduce the 17 dimensions to a more manageable unit of analysis, a principal components analysis with Varimax rotation (Kaiser Normalization) was conducted. The 17 dimensions resulted in five underlying factors for Canada and Finland and six underlying factors for France¹⁵. Given the results of the pilot study, there are interesting and surprising similarities between the countries and it's noteworthy that the emerging factors coincide with the theoretical foundations of personal projects (Little, 1989) (see Appendix D).

Results indicate that each country has a factor that clearly represents positive affect, another negative affect, and a third efficacy. In addition, Canada and France have an emergent social capital factor. Furthermore, Finland and France have an emergent factor strongly representative of agency. Table 7 summarizes the PCA by providing the prospective names of each factor for each country.

Table 7: Factor Names by Country

Country	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
Canada	NA	PA	Efficacy	Support & Visibility	Social Capital	---
Finland	Efficacy	PA	---	NA	Agency	---
France	Efficacy	NA	Social Capital	Agency	PA	Finance

Note: NA=Negative Affect, PA=Positive Affect

¹⁵ Those components whose eigenvalues were greater than 1 were retained.

Even with this strong theoretical basis, the factor loadings fail to indicate that the factors are reliable, as guidelines set out by Guadagnoli and Velicer (1988) are not met¹⁶.

This is likely the result of the small sample size for each country. Factor loadings for each of the factors were also inter-correlated for all countries. Results confirmed the theoretical structures that emerged in the PCA (Appendix E).

Predictive Ability of PPA: Factor Structures, Depression and Life Satisfaction

Overall the factor structures generated from the mean project ratings accounted for 23% of the variability in life satisfaction for Canada ($p < .001$) and 41% for Finland ($p < .001$). The entire factor structure did not account for a significant amount of the variability in life satisfaction for the French students. When examining depression, the factor structures accounted for 18% of the variability for Canada ($p < .01$), 25% of the variability for Finland ($p < .01$) and 30% of the variability for France ($p < .001$). Examination of the regression equations and consideration of the individual components of the factor structures, revealed the following for each country.

Canada. A regression equation predicting life satisfaction revealed that positive affect (standardized $\beta = .34$, $p < .001$) was the strongest predictor, followed by social capital (standardized $\beta = .23$, $p = .01$) and negative affect (standardized $\beta = -.21$, $p = .01$). When considering the prediction of depression, negative affect was the strongest predictor (standardized $\beta = .30$, $p < .01$), followed by support and visibility (standardized $\beta = -.24$,

¹⁶ For interpretation, critical values of .512 (Canada), .722 (Finland) and .572 (France) are appropriate (Stevens, 1996). Given the strong theoretical support for each factor, loadings over .50 were used for each country.

$p=.01$). Although positive affect was a weaker predictor (standardized $\beta=-.17$), it was approaching significance ($p=.06$).

Finland. A regression equation predicting life satisfaction revealed that efficacy was the strongest predictor (standardized $\beta= .53$, $p<.01$), followed by positive affect (standardized $\beta=.25$, $p<.05$). Efficacy was also the strongest predictor (negatively) (standardized $\beta= -.33$, $p<.01$), of depression followed by negative affect (standardized $\beta=.32$, $p<.01$).

France. A regression equation predicting life satisfaction revealed that efficacy was the strongest predictor (standardized $\beta=.33$, $p<.01$) for the French students. Negative affect was the strongest predictor (standardized $\beta=.41$, $p<.001$), of depression followed by efficacy (standardized $\beta=-.26$, $p=.01$).

The Personal Projects of Canadian, Finnish and French Undergraduate Students

In order to further investigate the nature of the student project systems in each country the individual projects were categorized based on a format developed in the Social Ecology Laboratory (See Appendix A). As can be seen from Table 8, interesting differences emerged for each country. For the Canadian students the most frequent project types were academic (20.8%, $n=154$), interpersonal (19.3%, $n=143$) and intrapersonal (19.1%, $n=142$). Intrapersonal projects are followed by administrative (14.6%, $n=108$), leisure (14.3%, $n=106$) and health & body (9.4%, $n=70$) projects. The least frequently reported projects were occupational (1.8%, $n=13$).

Finnish students most frequently listed administrative projects (23.4%, $n=100$), academic projects (22%, $n=94$) and leisure projects (18.7%, $n=80$). Leisure projects were followed by projects of an interpersonal nature (14.1%, $n=60$), and an intrapersonal

nature (11.9%, n=51). The least frequently reported projects were health & body (7.3%, n=31) and occupational (2.6%, n=11).

French students most frequently endorsed intrapersonal (22.2%, n=135), leisure (21.2%, n=129) and interpersonal (19.9%, n=121) projects. Interpersonal projects were followed closely by academic (15.3%, n=93) projects which were followed by administrative (7.9%, n=48), occupational (7.1%, n=43) and health & body (5.3%, n=32) projects. Examples of projects from the different project domains are presented in Appendix F¹⁷ and a graphic representation of project category by country is provided in Figure 4.

Table 8: Frequency and Percentage of Personal Projects Listed by Respondents by Major Project Categories

Project Category	Canadian Projects (n=742)		Finnish Projects (n=427)		French Projects (n=609)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
Academic	154	20.8	94	22.0	93	15.3
Interpersonal	143	19.3	60	14.1	121	19.9
Intrapersonal	142	19.1	51	11.9	135	22.2
Administrative	108	14.6	100	23.4	48	7.9
Leisure	106	14.3	80	18.7	129	21.2
Health & Body	70	9.4	31	7.3	32	5.3
Occupational	13	1.8	11	2.6	43	7.1
Other	6	.8	0	0	0	0

¹⁷ Examples of occupational projects are not provided given the minimal role these projects play in the students project systems.

Academic projects are strongly reflected in the individual project systems of Canadian and Finnish students; 88% of the Canadian participants and 92% of the Finnish participants have at least one academic project. However, academic projects were not as strongly reflected in the project systems of the French students. Only 82% of the participants have at least one academic project. Intrapersonal and interpersonal projects were highly represented in the project systems of both the Canadian and French samples but this is not replicated with the Finnish sample. 74% of Canadian students and 79% of French students have at least one of these projects, while only 54% of the Finnish students have these project types. The amount of administrative projects subsumed in the Finnish project systems is also different as compared to the Canadian and French. Eighty-nine percent of Finns had at least one administrative project while 70% of Canadians and 43% of French had at least one administrative project. Finally, the students from each country reported few occupational projects. However, French students appear to have more occupational projects. Only 12% of Canadians, and 16% of Finns had at least one occupational project, whereas 45% of French had at least one occupational project.

A Chi Square analysis omnibus test revealed that there is an overall significant difference in the number of project categories between countries ($\chi^2 (12, N = 1764) = 113.89, p < .0001$). A qualitative examination of the frequencies for each category reveals that Finland has more administrative projects and less inter/intrapersonal projects, while France has more occupational projects and less academic projects.

Figure 4: Project Category Percentages by Country

Discussion

The Well-Being of Canadian, Finnish and French Students

Overall, there are no significant differences in positive affect, life satisfaction or depression between any of the countries involved. Results do indicate that Canadian undergraduate students are higher in negative affect as compared to French and Finnish students, however there are no significant differences between the French and Finnish students. In addition, Canadians appear to have a lower sense of meaning in their project systems than the French, and a higher sense of support when compared to students from

Finland. A lower sense of meaning amongst the Canadian students may explain higher levels of negative affect. Evidence suggests that the efficacious pursuit of *meaningful* projects is critical for our sense of well-being (Little, 1998; Elliot & Sheldon, 1998). In addition, Canadians are significantly lower in project initiation as compared to the Finnish and French. This provides a likely explanation as to why they experience lower project meaning. Often those projects that are chosen for us are less meaningful than the projects we choose for ourselves.

The higher sense of support experienced by Canadian students does not seem to lend credence to the negative affect they experience and appears contradictory to evidence regarding the impact of support on overall well-being. There is however evidence suggesting that the timing of the support we receive is central to well-being (LeClair, Chambers & Little, 2001) and too much support in the wrong contexts may reflect a lack of autonomy, which can be detrimental (Lu, 1997; Silverstein, Chen & Heller, 1996). A detailed examination of the support dimension reveals that support is significantly related to anxiety for the Canadian students. Apparently Susan and David have a strong support network, however this network is also perceived as anxiety provoking. Perhaps the Canadian students are seeking independence as a life task and the higher levels of social support they are receiving conflicts with this goal.

It is interesting to note that the dimension of stress is the only dimension that correlates with well-being across all three of the countries. However, a few dimensions show additional relationships with well-being across at least two of the countries. The level of difficulty when completing projects and the likelihood of project success are

important factors in the measurement of well-being for both Finland and France, while projects that induce anger are important for Canada and France and projects that induce joy are important for Canada and Finland.

In a broader sense, the factor scores allow one to consider the overall project systems of the participants. While examining project systems at a macro level¹⁸, it is clear that affect and efficacy are critical issues to consider when measuring the well-being of French and Finnish students. Affect is also significant for Canadians, however efficacy does not emerge as such a vital component, as is the case for the French and Finnish. Results suggest that the concept of social capital is in fact a component in the measurement of well-being that should be more closely examined when studying Canadian students. Although social capital did not clearly emerge as an important predictor of well-being for France and Finland, underlying properties of this theme suggest that its significance is yet to be fully revealed. A subsequent section addressing the value of *ad hoc* dimensions will address this remark.

When considering the more affective dimensions, the French students experience higher levels of joy and lower levels of stress than their Canadian and Finnish counterparts, the Finns experience lower levels of anxiety as compared to the French and Canadian students, and Canadians experience more anger than both the French and Finnish. Interestingly, Kata and Mikka take great pleasure in enjoying the Sauna, not surprising given the fact that they grew up with this as a routine component of their lives.

¹⁸ From this point forward, 'macro-level' comments will be in reference to analyses done with the factor scores and 'micro-level' statements will refer to analyses done with the dimension scores.

Perhaps the higher levels of anxiety experienced by Marie-Laure, Jean-Marc, Susan and David would subside if they could partake in more sauna excursions. Moreover, the high level of joy experienced by French students may be in part, a result of their liberal and free attitudes and *joie de vivre* approach to life, perhaps Kata, Mikka, Susan and David would benefit by learning to ‘mellow out’¹⁹. This is not to imply such simplistic explanations for these differences but rather to suggest that it’s possible that the ‘little things in life’ impact us more than we realize.

Social Ecological Framework with a cultural spin

As previously introduced, the person by environment (P X E) interaction is looked at as a critical component from a social ecological perspective. P X E is essential to the study of culture as it forces the researcher to acknowledge and accept an individual’s social ecology, what *should* be an evident component when conducting cross-cultural research. Little and Ryan introduced the social ecological model (1979) and Little has more recently (2000) expanded on its development (Figure 1).

The expanded model introduces what Little (2000) refers to as ‘missing links’, that is the concepts of free traits and personal contexts. Free traits are defined as “culturally scripted patterns of conduct that are carried out as part of a person’s goals, projects, and commitments, independent of that person’s ‘natural’ inclinations” (p. 92-93). Personal contexts are defined as “idiosyncratically construed objects, situations, settings, and circumstances of our daily lives” and they are designed to “personalize contextual assessment” (p. 93). These missing links were operationalized in order to

¹⁹ Not to imply that ‘we’ Canadians or Finns are more uptight than the French.

identify some of the subtleties and potentially important nuances of person-environment interactions. Both of these ‘links’ represent examples of dynamic personal features (free traits) and dynamic contextual features (personal contexts) (B. R. Little, personal communication, July 6, 2001).

‘Personal context’ is described as potentially including “the prevailing atmosphere of misery in our country” (Little, 2000) for example, and predictably, culture (or as exemplified above, the prevailing atmosphere of one’s country) is encompassed most recognizably within Box B, ‘stable contextual features’. However for the purposes of the upcoming series of cross-cultural studies, and future research subsumed in a cultural context, the researcher argues that the concept of culture needs to be emphasized as an essential component in several aspects of this model. Cultural context can be seen as largely relevant to the ‘stable contextual features’ box, however it undoubtedly plays minor roles within Boxes A (stable personal features), C (dynamic personal features) and D (dynamic contextual features) also (see Figure 6).

Figure 5: Cross-Cultural Social Ecological Model

The cultural context, crucial for recognition in cross-cultural research, is comprised of distal elements that can range from ‘my country doesn’t fund my education’ to ‘how do I ensure my husband isn’t drafted for the war’? Emphasizing this element ensures that the overarching cultural system is not lost within the micro level concerns of daily lives. Its placement in the model shows its links to stable personal features, stable contextual features, dynamic personal features and dynamic contextual features²⁰. Its impact upon each of these components should not be underestimated and the potential of ‘reverse impact’ should be viewed as an interesting possibility for on-going consideration.

²⁰ Emphasis on the importance of the cultural context and its underlying contribution to the social ecological model may seem peculiar given the conservative and somewhat similar findings of this study. However, provided with a more diverse set of comparison groups (countries), this component will likely play a major role and is therefore now being emphasized as an important consideration for future research.

In Comparison to the Pilot Study...

Well-Being.

One of the goals of this study was to replicate the findings of the pilot study (Richardson, 1999). The good news is that Canadian students are looking somewhat more contented than the results of the pilot study had suggested. That is, Canadian students were reportedly higher in depression and negative affect when compared to Finnish students and the Finns were also higher in life satisfaction as compared to the Canadians. Not all of these findings were replicated in the current study. The Canadian students remain higher in negative affect when considering differences between Canada, Finland and France, however there are no differences in life satisfaction or depression.

As discussed above, the lower sense of meaning and the higher levels of potentially maladaptive support experienced by the Canadian students provide explanations for the high levels of negative affect experienced. When considering differences regarding depression and life satisfaction, the following explanations emerge: the significantly higher level of depressive affect experienced by the Canadian pilot sample may have been a result of the heterogeneity of the sample. Goodine (1999) cautions that a heterogeneous sample may have a deleterious impact in measuring well-being. The current sample is more homogeneous and perhaps more reflective of a typical Canadian sample. In addition, the discrepancy between the level of life satisfaction among the Finnish students in the pilot study and the current study may have been a result of age differences in the samples. Wilson (1990) reported that life satisfaction tends to increase with age and the Finnish sample from the pilot study was significantly

older than the Canadian sample. Once again, the similar ages across the three countries in this study were not significantly different and perhaps the current findings are more reflective of a young adult university sample.

Variability Accounted for in Well-Being by Personal Projects Analysis.

The pilot study also revealed that the variability accounted for by one's project systems in depression and life satisfaction was much greater for Finland than Canada. This finding was supported by the current results and it is noteworthy that in comparison to Canada and Finland, PPA accounts for the highest amount of variability in depression for France. This lends credence to the applicability of Personal Projects Analysis within these different countries and supports its validity in cross-cultural research.

The Consequence of Efficacy.

The efficacy domain is of particular interest due to a history of significant findings for the Finnish (Salmela-Aro *et al.*, 1996) and Canadian students (Wilson, 1990). The pilot study supported the relevance of this dimension while at the same time raising some interesting concerns surrounding this domain. That is, the efficacy dimensions accounted for the largest amount of variability within well-being for the Finnish students. Interestingly, the efficacy dimensions did not emerge as significant in the variability accounted for within well-being for the Canadian students. Once again, the efficacy dimensions and domain emerge as significant in the study of well-being with Finnish students. In addition, as with the pilot study and somewhat more surprisingly, the factor of efficacy and the efficacy dimensions of control and progress did not emerge as significant predictors of the well-being of Canadian students. This finding is

contradictory to past research with PPA (e.g., Wilson, 1990; Little, 1998; Dowden *et al.*, 2001) and would most likely be seen as an anomalous result by researchers familiar with studies examining project systems.

Recent studies conducted with PPA may provide an explanation for this seemingly uncharacteristic finding. McGregor, McAdams and Little (2001) argue that time of data collection may act as a moderator in the ratings of project systems. Whether projects are seen as likely to succeed may be influenced by the time in the term (early in the school year vs. later in the school year) the data were collected. In addition, Chambers and Little (2001) found “sample-wide differences in level of affect” (p. 25), which they suggested may also be a result of time of data collection.

As previously mentioned, the Canadian data collection took place much earlier in the school year than the Finnish or French data collection. It is possible that the Canadian samples were not able or ready to form impressions regarding the likelihood of project outcome or project progress (efficacy dimensions), in turn influencing the relevance of the efficacy domain. This ‘time of year effect’ may have impacted the results as Susan and David were just beginning to settle into their academic year. Conversely, Marie-Laure, Jean-Marc, Kata and Mikka were all well on their way to finishing the academic term and therefore more likely to readily form impressions about the status of the outcome and progress of their projects.

Replicating the Relevance of Ad Hoc Dimensions.

As with the pilot study, the emotion dimensions and their links with well-being and our project systems as a whole are clearly identifiable. When considering the

dimensions of community and community benefit and the construct of social capital, slight changes from the pilot study can be noted. In the pilot study, no significant relationships emerged between community, community benefit and the well-being measures; however, the current study reveals that community benefit is related to life satisfaction for Canadians. Why? Outside of the heterogeneity of the Canadian pilot sample and potential differences in cultural beliefs in the value of community benefit, no further speculations are set forth due to the exploratory nature of this study.

There are no significant findings with regard to well-being and these dimensions for France and Finland. However, underlying support for social capital being linked to well-being for France and Finland is provided due to the fact that community benefit is significantly related to stress for the French which in turn is related to negative affect. Also, community and joy are significantly related for the Finnish, and joy is related to both positive affect and life satisfaction for this country. These indirect links provide support for the relevance of these ad hoc dimensions in the measurement of well-being.

The pilot study showed that financial constraint was related to life satisfaction (negatively) for Finland while unrelated for Canada. Results of the current study revealed that financial constraint was not related to life satisfaction for Finland but was related to depression (positively) for Canada. Failure to replicate findings from the pilot study may be a result of the age differences between the pilot and current Finnish samples. As mentioned, participants from the pilot study were older as compared to a typical university sample. It is possible that the link between financial constraint and life satisfaction for the pilot study was due to the financial obligations inherent in an older

sample (children, mortgages, etc.), an explanation that would confirm findings of Yetim (1993) and Makinen (1996). Conversely, the current Finnish sample is younger and less likely to have similar financial obligations. In addition, when considering the Canadian participants, detailed examination reveals that for Canadian students, financial constraint is related to difficulty, stress and anger. These relationships provide a clear picture as to why financial constraint is related to depression for Canadians. Furthermore, although financial constraint is not directly linked to well-being for the Finnish, it is significantly related to control, which is in turn related to life satisfaction for Finnish students. The results from the pilot study introduced this financial constraint/life satisfaction connection. All in all, we see that these relationships provide indirect support for the findings of the pilot study and for the utility of this dimension in the study of well-being.

The Sustained Value of *Ad Hoc* Dimensions in the Measurement of Well-Being

The value of the emotion dimensions in the measurement of well-being is particularly apparent. At a macro level, affect accounts for the largest amount of variability in depression and life satisfaction for Canada. Affect plays a somewhat lesser role for the Finnish and French as a sense of efficacy emerges as critical for both countries, however it is clear that affect is also relevant for France and Finland. At a micro level the affective dimensions are most critical for Canada but once again clearly emerge as extremely relevant for France and Finland as well.

As discussed above, the value of financial constraint remains somewhat questionable. Past cross-cultural research (e.g., Diener, 1994; Diener, Diener, & Diener, 1995; Makinen, 1996; Yetim, 1993) clearly supports the relevance of such a dimension in

the examination of well-being, however findings of both the pilot study and the current study fail to provide conclusive support. Such findings could be a direct result of ever changing economic conditions amongst the student participants. Notwithstanding, given that the relation between financial satisfaction and life satisfaction is dependent on the income of a country (Diener & Diener, 1995) it is recommended for continued use in this series of cross-cultural research which will inevitably include the study of more diverse countries.

When turning to the concept of social capital and the dimensions of community and community benefit, a slightly clearer picture arises. Numerous links between the social capital dimensions and the other dimensions are apparent in both the pilot study and the current study and in addition to this, the current study reveals a direct link between community benefit and life satisfaction for Canadian students, which provides further support for their utility. The investigator argues strongly for the maintenance of these dimensions in future studies conducted for this series of cross-cultural research. Studies involving countries with more diverse backgrounds in regard to concepts such as collectivism and individualism, for example, would likely yield rich findings.

Are the project systems of Finnish and French students typical?

Academic and interpersonal projects commonly emerge as the two most frequent project themes amongst students (Little, 1989). When considering the types of projects listed by the students from each country, the Finnish appear to have a significantly higher number of administrative projects and less inter/intrapersonal projects, while the French were higher in occupational and lower in academic. These atypical project systems are

possibly the result of a 'time of year' effect. That is, the Finnish and French data were collected during the winter term as opposed to the fall term (as was the case with the Canadian sample), in turn, the students were in job search and apartment seeking modes, which are classified as occupational and administrative projects respectively. The low intra/interpersonal projects for the Finnish students are possibly a result of the fact that the Katas and Mikkas of the sample are preparing for their term end and summer responsibilities, in turn, not having as much time for more intra/interpersonal projects.

Emerging Concerns: The definition and measurement of well-being

This study has defined well-being as 'people's cognitive and affective evaluation of their lives' and it has measured well-being with four general components: negative affect, positive affect, depression and life satisfaction. More specifically, depression and life satisfaction have represented the overarching indicators of well-being. What the investigator now raises is the pertinence of these indices. Cross-cultural researchers are continuously cautioned regarding the generalizability of 'Americanized' concepts to non-American cultures. Granted, measures of depression have been used in and argued to be appropriate for use with, non-American cultures (e.g., Bonicatto, Dew, & Soria, 1998; Iwata & Roberts, 1996; Iwata, Roberts & Kawakami 1995; Iwata, Saito & Roberts 1994; Naughton & Wiklund 1993), however is it really clear that depression in all countries represents and results in similar outcomes to that of the American culture? Much of the current research examining well-being uses the outcome measures of positive affect, negative affect (hedonic balance) and life satisfaction (e.g., Suh, Diener, Oishi, & Triandis, 1998; Diener & Suh, 1999) while excluding depression as an inverse indicator

of well-being. For consistency and ease of comparison with on-going cross-cultural research, future studies in this series should consider the possibility of using only the outcome measures of positive affect, negative affect and life satisfaction.

In addition, it is possible that some may question the applicability of the actual definition of well-being; 'people's cognitive and affective evaluation of their lives'. The relevance of the affective component of this definition seems apparent based on the previous discussion and findings of this study, however 'cognitive evaluation' may represent a component that requires further consideration. Diener, Suh, Smith and Shao (1995) argue that some nations have a general positive or negative response bias. This is confirmed by more current research as Okazaki (2000) reports that there are consistent ethnic differences between White Americans and Asian Americans in the levels and types of distress they report. Fernandez, Carrera, Sanchez, Paez, and Candia (2000) argue that collectivistic and high power distance countries more typically communicate good feelings to other people. These findings are important as they remind researchers of moderating variables that should be considered while conducting cross-cultural research with more diverse samples.

Limitations

The project dimensions may be seen by some, as etic in nature, however the methodology is clearly accounting for a significant amount of the variability in well-being, in each of the countries. In turn the investigator argues that the project dimensions are in fact emic and applicable across a wide range of cultures. Additionally, Cameron (1984) looked at the extent of correlation among people's idiosyncratic constructs and the

theoretically derived dimensions of meaning most often used in the PPA methodology.

Her findings provide support for the emic nature of PPA as she confirmed that the dimensions used are reflected to a considerable degree in the personal constructs people use to give meaning to their everyday activities and concerns, that is their personal projects. This ‘mappability’ as Cameron phrased it, demonstrates that theory-based dimensions are substantially representative of participant derived personal constructs.

Also noteworthy, as previously mentioned, the proposed countries of study are relatively similar in nature and thus result in a relatively conservative test of cross-national differences. Furthermore, the number of countries being examined limits the study. Obviously a study considering a greater number of countries, with greater cultural variation would be desirable.

As discussed briefly, the social ecological model (Little & Ryan, 1979; Little, 2000) recognizes the capacity of traits and their unmistakable role in an individual’s well-being. A great deal of research has considered the link between traits, culture and well-being (e.g., Diener, 1996; MacDonald, 1998). Unfortunately, this study did not include a trait measure, which precludes consideration of this component throughout its analyses. A recent study examining the relationship between PPA, traits and well-being (McGregor, McAdams, & Little, 2001) found that undergraduate students whose personal goals (personal projects) were thematically compatible with their personality traits experienced the highest levels of well-being.

Future studies may consider the implementation of a trait measure in order to examine such findings further. The NEO-PI-R, for example, has been used extensively in

cross cultural research (e.g., Caprara, Barbaranelli, Hahn, & Comrey, 2001; Draguns, Krylova, Oryol, Rukavishnikov, & Martin, 2000; Heuchert, Parker, Stumpf, & Myburgh, 2000; Van Hiel, Kossowska, & Mervielde, 2000). Given the extensive representation of the NEO-PI-R in cross-cultural research, it is proposed as the trait measure for prospective research in this area.

Summary and Conclusions

Berry (1969) discusses the importance of etic and emic approaches in cross-cultural research. Etic approaches are seen as imposed on the individual without consideration of the personal or cultural saliency. This study utilizes an emic approach by using the methodology of Personal Projects Analysis, which is both personally and culturally salient. In addition, PPA accounts for a significant amount of the variance in the measurement of well-being and as a result of its modular flexibility is appropriate for application in a cross-cultural setting.

Although past cross-cultural research with PPA has elicited a somewhat varied set of predictors of well-being, the researcher recognizes that the diverse methodological approaches have likely impacted these results. This study has the advantage of using a common set of appraisal dimensions, and identical measures of well-being, in turn, overcoming past methodological differences in such research, thereby allowing for the direct comparison of countries.

A common issue in cross-cultural research is individualism vs. collectivism; this was addressed through the *ad hoc* dimensions of community and community benefit, which had striven to elicit aspects of Putnam's social capital (1995). This construct is

clearly supported for use in future research. In addition, economic conditions deemed as an appropriate consideration when researching different cultures were examined, with the *ad hoc* dimension of financial constraint allowing further investigation of this issue.

Although findings regarding financial constraint are more complex than social capital, the construct of finance is clearly important in the study of cultural differences and should be used in future analyses. Finally, emotional dimensions were implemented to further investigate the value of affect. The impact of the emotional aspects of project pursuit on well-being is exceptional, and the importance of this construct is clearly confirmed.

This study built upon the pilot study and addressed some of its limitations, while at the same time advancing the development of a standard methodology for the planned series of cross-national and cross-cultural comparisons of the relationships between personal project appraisals and well-being. A major goal of this study was to determine the cross-national generalizability of personal project appraisals and their links with well-being, while at the same time addressing concerns raised in the pilot study and replicating some of its findings. Results clearly indicate the generalizability of PPA and support its applicability in future cross-cultural research. The investigator argues that even with its limitations, this study has proven fruitful as a continued line of research within the planned series of cross-national and cross-cultural comparisons.

References

- Andrews, F. M., & Withey, S. G. (1976). Social Indicators of Well-Being: America's Perception of Life Quality. New York: Plenum Press.
- Atkinson, T. (1977). Is satisfaction a good measure of the perceived quality of life? Paper presented at the annual American Statistical Association meeting.
- Beck, P. (1996). Personliche Projekte: Ein empirische annaherung an komplexes Handeln (Personal Projects: An empirical investigation of complex action). Heidelberg: Roland Asanger Verlag.
- Berry, J. W. (1969). On cross-cultural comparability. International Journal of Psychology, 4, 119-128.
- Berry, J. W., Poortinga, Y. H., Segall, M. H. & Dasen, P. R. (1992). Cross-cultural Psychology: Research and Applications. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Bonicatto, S., Dew, A., & Soria, J. (1998). Analysis of the psychometric properties of the Spanish version of the Beck Depression Inventory in Argentina. Psychiatry Research, 79, 277-285.
- Bouffard, L., Bastin, E., & Lapierre, S. (1996). Future time perspective according to women's age and social-role during adulthood. Sex Roles, 34, 253-285.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). The Structure of Psychological Well-Being. Chicago: Aldine.
- Cameron, L. (1994). A personal projects rep grid. Unpublished bachelor's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Cantor, N. (1990). From thought to behavior: "having" and "doing" in the study of personality and cognition. American Psychologist, 45, 735-750.

Caprara, G., Barbaranelli, C., Hahn, R., & Comrey, A. (2001). Factor analyses of the NEO-PI-R Inventory and the Comrey Personality Scales in Italy and the United States. Personality and Individual Differences, 30, 217-228.

Chambers, N.C. (2001). Time and personal action: Tenses and aspects of project pursuit. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Chambers, N. C., Goodine, L. A. & Little, B. R. (1999, August). Discrete emotional responses in goal vs. event-based appraisal. Poster presentation at the annual American Psychological Association Conference, Boston, MA.

Chambers, N. C., & Little, B. R. (2001). Project pursuit beyond the temporal flux: A syntax-based theory of time and timelessness. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Chatterjee, J. (1981). Personal project correlates of life satisfaction in Bangladesh and Canada: a social ecological analysis. Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Coleman, J. (1990). Foundations of Social Theory. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy & unhappy people. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 668-678.

Diener, E. (1994). Subjective well-being in cross-cultural perspective. In H. Grad, A. Blanco, & J. Georgas (Eds.) Key issues in cross-cultural psychology: Selected papers from the twelfth international congress of the international association for cross-cultural psychology. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.

Diener, E. (1996). Traits can be powerful, but are not enough: Lessons from subjective well-being. Journal of Research in Personality, 30, 389-399.

Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, 653-663.

Diener, E., & Emmons, R. A. (1985). The independence of positive and negative affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47, 1105-1117.

Diener, E., Diener, M., & Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 851-864.

Diener, E., Shao, L., Diener, C., & Suh, E. (1996). Subjective well-being: National similarities and differences. International Journal of Psychology, 31, 2325-2325.

Diener, E. & Suh, E.M. (1999). National differences in subjective well-being. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener., & N. Schwarz (Eds.), Well-Being: The Foundations of Hedonic Psychology (pp. 434-450). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Diener, E., Suh, E.M., Smith, H., & Shao, L. (1995). National differences in reported subjective well-being: Why do they occur?. Social Indicators Research, 34, 7-32.

Dowden, C., Chambers., N, Hunt, J., Richardson-Taylor, K., Hargrave, A, & Little, B.R. (2001). Personal projects appraisals & depressive affect: A meta-analysis.

Manuscript submitted for publication.

Draguns, J., Krylova, A., Oryol, V., Rukavishnikov, A., & Martin, T. (2000).

Personality characteristics of the Nenets in the Russian Arctic: A comparison with ethnic Russians by means of NEO-PI-R and POI. American Behavioral Scientist, 44, 126-140.

Elliot, A.J., & Sheldon, K.M. (1998). Avoidance personal goals and the personality-illness relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 1282-1299.

Emmons, R. A. (1986). Personal strivings: an approach to personality and subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1058-1068.

Fernandez, I., Carrera, P., Sanchez, F., Paez, D., & Canadía, L. (2000). Differences between cultures in emotional verbal and non-verbal reactions. Psicothema, 12, 83-92.

Gnanadesikan, R. (1977). Methods for Statistical Analysis of Multivariate Observations. New York: Wiley.

Goodine, L. (1999). Personal projects perspective on commitment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Greenfield, P.M. (1997). Culture as process: Empirical methods for cultural psychology. In Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Volume 1: Theory and method. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Guadagnoli, E., & Velicer, W. (1988). Relation of sample size to the stability of component patterns. Psychological Bulletin, 103, 265-275.

Heuchert, J., Parker, W., Stumpf, H., & Myburgh, C. (2000). The five-factor model of personality in South African College Students. American Behavioral Scientist, 44, 112-125.

Iwata, N., & Roberts, R. (1996). Age differences among Japanese on the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale: An ethnocultural perspective on somatization. Social Science and Medicine, 43, 967-974.

Iwata, N., Roberts, C., & Kawakami, N. (1995). Japan-US comparison of responses to depression scale items among adult workers. Psychiatry Research, 58, 237-245.

Iwata, N., Saito, K., & Roberts, R. (1994). Responses to a self-administered depression scale among younger adolescents in Japan. Psychiatry Research, 53, 275-287.

Kelly, G. (1955). The psychology of personal constructs. New York: Norton.

Klinger, E. (1977). Meaning and void: Inner experience and the incentives in people's lives. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Publishers.

Lapierre, S., Bouffard, L., & Bastin, E. (1992-1993). Motivational goal objects in later life. International Journal of Aging & Human Development, 36, 279-292.

Lecci, L. (1990). Personality, personal projects and adaptation to university. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

LeClair, M., Chambers, N., & Little, B.R. (2001). Social support and well-being through the stages: a test of a moderator hypothesis. Poster presentation to be given at the 62nd annual conference of the Canadian Psychological Association, Québec City, Canada (June).

Little, B. R. (1983). Personal projects: A rationale and method for investigation. Environment and Behavior, 15, 273-309.

Little, B.R. (1987). Personality and the environment. In D. Stokols & Altman (Eds.) Handbook of environmental psychology (pp. 205-244). New York: Wiley.

Little, B. R. (1988). Personal projects analysis: Theory, method and research. Ottawa: Final Report to Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

Little, B. R. (1989). Personal projects analysis: trivial pursuits, magnificent obsessions, and the search for coherence. In D. Buss & N. Cantor (Eds.) Personality Psychology: Recent Trends and Emerging Directions. (pp. 15-31) New York: Springer-Verlag.

Little, B. R. (1998). Personal project pursuit: Dimensions and dynamics of personal meaning. In P.T.P. Wong & P.S. Fry (Eds.). The human quest for meaning: A handbook of psychological research and clinical applications (pp. 193-212). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Little, B. R. (1999). Persons, contexts and personal projects: Assumptive themes of a methodological transactionalism. In S. Wapner, J. Demick, H. Minami & T. Yamamoto (Eds.), Theoretical perspectives in environment-behavior research: Underlying assumptions, research problems and methodologies. New York, NY: Plenum.

Little, B. R. (1999a). Personality and motivation: Personal action and the conative evolution. In L. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality theory and research (2nd edition pp. 501-524). New York, NY: Guilford.

Little, B.R. (2000). Free traits and personal contexts: Expanding a social ecological model of well-being. In W.B. Walsh, K.H. Craik, & R.H. Price (Eds.) New directions in person-environment psychology. Hillsdale: New York.

Little, B. R. (in press). Personality psychology: Havings, doings and beings in context. In S. Davis & J. Halonen (Eds.) The many faces of psychological research in the twenty first century. New York.

Little, B.R. & Chambers, N.C. (2000). Personal projects analysis: An integrative framework for clinical and counselling psychology (Analyse des projets personnels: Un cadre intégratif pour la psychologie clinique et le counselling). Revue Québécoise de Psychologie, 21, 153-190.

Little, B.R., & Ryan, T.J. (1979). A social ecological model of development. In K. Ishwaran (Ed.), Childhood and Adolescence in Canada (pp. 273-301). New York: McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited.

Loh, P. F. (1981). Personal projects, social networks and the adaptation of Indochinese refugees in Canada. Unpublished bachelor's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Lonner, W.J., & Adamopoulos, J. (1997). Culture as antecedent to behavior. In J.W. Berry, Y.H. Poortinga & J. Pandey (Eds.) Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Volume 1: Theory and method. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lu, L. (1997). Social support, reciprocity, and well-being. The Journal of Social Psychology, 137, 618- 628.

MacDonald, K. (1998). Evolution, culture, and the five-factor model. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29, 119-149.

McGregor, I. & Little, B. R. (1998). Personal projects, happiness, and meaning: On doing well and being yourself. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 494-512.

McGregor, I., McAdams, D. P., & Little, B. R. (2001) Personal projects, life-stories and happiness: On being true to one's traits. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Makinen, Judy. (1996). Perceived economic climate & well-being: A project-analytic perspective. Unpublished bachelor's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Markus, R. M. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychological Review, 98, 224-253.

Naughton, M.J., & Wiklund, I. (1993). A critical review of dimension specific measures of health related quality of life in cross-cultural research. Quality of Life Research, 2, 397-432.

Nurmi, J., Pulliainen, H. & Salmela-Aro, K. (1992). Age differences in adults' control beliefs related to life goals and concerns. Psychology and Aging, 7, 194-196.

Okazaki, S. (2000). Asian American and white American differences on affective distress symptoms: Do symptom reports differ across reporting methods?. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 31, 603-625.

Omedei, M. M. & Wearing, A. J. (1990). Need satisfaction and involvement in personal projects: Toward an integrative model of subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 762-769.

Palys, T. S. & Little, B. R. (1983). Perceived life satisfaction and the organization of personal project systems. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1221-1230.

Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. Journal of Democracy, 6, 65-78.

Pychyl, T. (1995). Personal projects, subjective well-being and the lives of doctoral students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1, 385-401.

Richardson, K. (1999). Personal Projects Analysis and Well-being: A cross-national comparison. Unpublished bachelor's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Robinson, J.P., Shaver, P.R., & Wrightsman, L.S. (1991). Measures of Personality and Social Psychological Attitudes: Volume 1 in Measures of Social Psychological Attitude Series. California: Academic Press Inc.

Salmela-Aro, K. (1992). Struggling with self: The personal projects of students seeking psychological counselling. Scandinavian Journal Of Psychology, 33, 330-338.

Salmela-Aro, K. & Nurmi, J. (1996). Depressive symptoms and personal project appraisals: A cross-lagged longitudinal study. Personality and Individual Differences, 21, 373-381.

Salmela-Aro, K. & Nurmi, J. (1996a). Uncertainty and confidence in interpersonal projects: Consequences for social relationships and well-being. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 13, 109-122.

Segall, M.H., Dasen, P.R., Berry, J.W., & Poortinga, Y.H. (1990). Human behavior in global perspective: An introduction to cross-cultural psychology. New York: Pergamon Press.

Seldon, K., Gee, T., & Little, B.R. (2001). The consistency of multidimensional project spaces in personal projects data. Poster presentation at the annual Canadian Psychological Association Conference, Quebec City, Canada.

Seligman, M. E. P. (1991). Learned optimism. New York, NY: Random House.

Silverstein, M., Chen, X., & Heller, K. (1996). Too much of a good thing? Intergenerational social support and the psychological well-being of older parents. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58, 970 - 982.

Smith, P.B., & Bond, M.H. (1999). Social psychology: Across cultures. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Smith, C.A., & Ellsworth, P.C. (1985). Patterns of cognitive appraisal in emotion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 813-838.

Stevens, J. (1996). Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences (3rd Ed.). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Suh, E., Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Triandis, H.C. (1998). The shifting basis of life satisfaction judgments across cultures: Emotions versus norms. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74, 482-493.

Terkel, R. (1997). Personal projects and well-being: an exploration with Israeli students. Unpublished bachelor's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Triandis, H. C., & Lambert, W. W. (1980). Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Perspectives: Volume 1. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Van Hiel, A., Kossowska, M., & Mervielde, I. (2000). The relationship between Openness to Experience and political ideology. Personality and Individual Differences, 28, 741-751.

Wilmot, K. (1993). Personal projects, well-being and the social ecology of early adolescence. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Wilson, D. A. (1990). Personal project dimensions and perceived life satisfaction: A quantitative synthesis. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Xiao, B.L. (1985). A comparison of personal projects between Chinese undergraduates and Canadian undergraduates. Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.

Yamamoto, T., Sarvada, H., Minami, H., Ishii, S. & Inoui, W. (1992). Transition from the university to the workplace. Environment and Behaviour, 24, 189-205.

Yetim, U. (1993). Life satisfaction: A study based on the organization of personal projects. Social Indicators Research, 29, 277-289.

Appendix A--Breakdown of Major Discipline by Country

Canada

Arts and Social Sciences

Art History	1
Biology	4
Child Studies	7
Cognitive Science	1
English	4
French	1
History	2
Interdisciplinary Studies	1
Linguistics	2
Psychology	23
Sociology	4

Public Affairs and Management

Business	1
Commerce	8
Criminology	15
Economics	3
Journalism	1
Law	7
Mass Communication	1
Social Work	5

Engineering 5

Undeclared 6

Other

Industrial Design	1
Computer Science	1
Science	1
Incomplete	1

TOTAL **106**

Personal Projects Analysis

Finland

<i>Telecommunications/Informatics</i>	15
<i>Electrical</i>	6
<i>Engineering</i>	6
<i>Other</i>	
Adult Education	1
Occupational Psychology	1
Production Economy	1
<i>Incomplete</i>	31
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>61</u>

France

<i>Math</i>	30
<i>Arts and Social Sciences</i>	
Psychology	9
Biology	2
Advanced Reading & Writing	8
<i>Public Affairs and Management</i>	
Accounting & Management	11
Legal Studies	9
<i>Engineering</i>	8
<i>Other</i>	
Veterinarian	3
Physical Education	4
<i>Incomplete</i>	2
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>86</u>

Appendix B--Project Categorization Format

Project Categorization Format

1. ACADEMIC

This category includes school-related projects (e.g., assignments, essays, exams, readings).

2. HEALTH/BODY

This category includes activities relating to appearance, health, fitness (e.g., lose weight, stop smoking, workout, sleep, play a sport with a fitness goal clearly stated and not for recreational reasons).

3. INTERPERSONAL

This category includes projects dealing with others on a personal level. The subcategories are:

3.1 Family (projects involving a parent, spouse, grandparents, etc., as a focus either individually or in a group, e.g., taking my mom to do her grocery shopping, projects involving family plans, e.g., have children, get married).

3.2 Interpersonal intimate (projects involving intimate others such as spouse, boyfriend, girlfriend, or close friends, e.g., getting over Mary).

3.3 Interpersonal secondary (assume interpersonal projects are secondary unless family members or intimate friends are specified; projects dealing with acquaintances such as classmates, teachers, co-workers, e.g., getting along better with my boss; entertaining acquaintances).

3.4 Community/supportive projects (projects involving activities related to groups of people other than family or friends, e.g., coaching soccer, volunteer work, scouts/girl guides).

3.5 Interpersonal meta-projects (e.g., getting my social life together).

4. INTRAPERSONAL/VALUE CONCERNS

This category includes projects dealing with outlook and attitudes relating to the self. The subcategories are:

4.1 Spiritual or philosophical projects (relating to the clarification or expression of religious beliefs, philosophical questioning).

4.2 Self-improvement projects (psychological as opposed to physical changes).

4.3 Intrapersonal meta-projects (e.g., maintain some sense of order in my life, increase the scope of my knowledge, ideas and expressions).

4.4 Coping/adjustment projects (e.g., adjust to my new living situation).

4.5 Leisure withdrawal projects (e.g., watch less t.v., go out less, shop less).

4.6 Transition projects.

5. LEISURE

This category includes recreational activities that are done alone or with others. The subcategories are:

5.1 Entertainment (e.g., television, movies, museum, theatre, concerts).

5.2 Parties/dances.

5.3 Hobbies (e.g., often creative or building projects).

5.4 Consumerism (e.g., pleasure shopping).

5.5 Drinking/drug use (e.g., getting high).

5.6 Pleasure reading/writing.

5.7 Vacation projects (e.g., planning, packing or organizing vacation).

5.8 Sports (played for recreational purposes and not specifically identified for health or fitness).

5.9 Enjoying one's pet (e.g., play with my cat/dog).

6. ADMINISTRATIVE/MAINTENANCE

This category includes projects relating to organization and administration. The subcategories include:

6.1 Activities related to, a) finding a place to live, selling or subletting a place to live; b) obtaining employment (e.g., registering at the employment centre, filling out job applications).

6.2 Household/general maintenance projects (e.g., repairs, house-cleaning, shopping for necessities such as groceries).

6.3 Car maintenance (e.g., taking the car in for lube and oil-change).

6.4 Paying bills, arranging finances, loans.

6.5 Activities related to getting registered for a course or program (e.g., registering for school, arranging a car pool, obtaining course schedules).

6.6 Tasks involving pets (e.g., taking my dog to the vet for distemper shots, not having fun with Spot–Leisure)

6.7 Administrative/maintenance meta-projects (e.g., managing properties, designing home).

7. OTHER

This category includes projects that cannot be classified because of inadequate information. Before using this category an attempt should be made to gain more information in order to correctly classify the project. The project statement on the original elicitation list and the dimension rating scores for that project may be helpful sources. For example, if a project is listed only as 'Mary', reference to the original elicitation list may show that the project was phrased as 'Breaking up with Mary', in which case the project would be correctly classified as INTERPERSONAL intimate. With a project listed as 'Christmas shopping', an ambiguity for classification might arise between LEISURE pleasure shopping and ADMINISTRATIVE/MAINTENANCE. However, if the score on the 'Enjoyment' dimension was high, the project may be classified as LEISURE; conversely, if that score was low, the project may be classified as ADMINISTRATIVE/MAINTENANCE.

8. OCCUPATIONAL

This category includes job-related courses (e.g., learn to type, learn French), or tasks on the job (e.g., finish report)

Appendix C--Intercorrelations Between 17 Project Dimensions--Canada, Finland and France

Canadian Intercorrelations Among the 17 Project Dimensions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Project Dimensions																
1 Importance																
2 Difficulty	.21															
3 Visibility	.36	.23														
4 Control	.21	-.34	.21													
5 Initiation	.23			.35												
6 Stress	.30	.61	.24	-.20												
7 Outcome	.45		.38	.47	.28											
8 Self-Identity	.48		.29	.44	.27		.48									
9 Progress	.35		.32	.20	.40		.41	.40								
10 Support	.21		.29				.19	.26								
11 Financial Constraint		.21				.21										
12 Community								.33	.24	.27						
13 Community Benefit								.22	.22	.25		.61				
14 Angry		.36		-.28		.38	-.27				.19		.20			
15 Anxious	.29	.49	.30			.62				.23				.50		
16 Proud	.31		.24	.25			.33	.49	.20			.32	.22			
17 Joyful	.29			.27			.28	.53				.34	.27			.77

Note: Only significant correlations are included. Bolded values represent $p < .001$, non-bolded values represent $p < .01$.

Finnish Intercorrelations Among the 17 Project Dimensions

Project Dimensions	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1 Importance																
2 Difficulty																
3 Visibility																
4 Control		-.37														
5 Initiation				.32												
6 Stress	.34	.42	.33													
7 Outcome		-.30		.48	.28											
8 Self-Identity	.33				.33		.48									
9 Progress				.39			.51	.35								
10 Support			.48	.49			.29		.45							
11 Financial Constraint		.45	.26	-.31						.40						
12 Community			.31							.46						
13 Community Benefit			.30													
14 Angry					-.26	.33							.34			
15 Anxious						.55								.51		
16 Proud				.29		.33				.30		.43		.26	.31	
17 Joyful				.44			.33			.37		.47				.73

Note: Only significant correlations are included. Bolded values represent $p < .001$, non-bolded values represent $p < .01$.

French Intercorrelations Among the 17 Project Dimensions

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Project Dimensions																
1 Importance																
2 Difficulty	.22															
3 Visibility																
4 Control		-.24	.44													
5 Initiation				.23												
6 Stress		.24														
7 Outcome			.28	.39												
8 Self-Identity	.37		.24		.35		.23									
9 Progress		-.39					.21									
10 Support			.45				.34									
11 Financial Constraint																
12 Community			.27			.22		.24	.28	.29						
13 Community Benefit			.23			.31			.30		.24	.44				
14 Angry					-.23		-.27	-.22								
15 Anxious						.41						.22		.25		
16 Proud			.23				.25									
17 Joyful	.23		.27													.50

Note: Only significant correlations are included. Bolded values represent $p < .001$, non-bolded values represent $p < .01$.

Appendix D--Principle Components Analysis--Canada, Finland, France

Principle Components Analysis---Canada

<u>Dimensions</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>	<u>Factor 4</u>	<u>Factor 5</u>
Importance		.364	.360	.487	
Difficulty	.758				
Visibility				.618	
Control	-.322	.300	.661		
Initiation			.777		
Stress	.819				
Outcome		.347	.533	.487	
Self-Identity		.597	.431		
Progress			.503	.485	
Support				.624	
Financial Constraint	.394			-.510	
Community					.808
Community Benefit					.860
Angry	.724				
Anxious	.800				
Proud		.865			
Joyful		.891			

Note: All values > .300 have been included in the table, values > .500 (bolded) were considered for inclusion in the factor.

Principle Components Analysis---Finland

<u>Dimensions</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>	<u>Factor 4</u>	<u>Factor 5</u>
Importance					.746
Difficulty	-.421		.651		
Visibility		.345	.625		
Control	.638	.439			
Initiation	.308				.542
Stress			.475	.642	
Outcome	.749				
Self-Identity	.584				.496
Progress	.783				
Support	.581	.460	.397		
Financial Constraint			.745		
Community		.683			
Community Benefit			.339		-.625
Angry				.822	-.300
Anxious				.830	
Proud		.822		.334	
Joyful		.859			

Note: All values > .300 have been included in the table, values > .500 (bolded) were considered for inclusion in the factor.

Principle Components Analysis---France

<u>Dimensions</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>	<u>Factor 4</u>	<u>Factor 5</u>	<u>Factor 6</u>
Importance				.798		-.309
Difficulty		.687		.386		
Visibility	.757					
Control	.764					
Initiation	.497	-.355		.352		
Stress		.622	.331			
Outcome	.500				.415	
Self-Identity				.727		.303
Progress			.740			-.405
Support	.608					
Financial Constraint						.833
Community			.683			
Community Benefit			.759			
Angry		.614		-.340		
Anxious		.670				
Proud					.846	
Joyful					.740	

Note: All values > .300 have been included in the table, values > .500 (bolded) were considered for inclusion in the factor.

Appendix E---Correlational Support for Theoretical Factor Structures**Correlational Support for the Theoretical Factor Structures**

<u>New Factor</u>	<u>Correlations Between Countries by Factor</u>		
	<u>France/Finland</u>	<u>France/Canada</u>	<u>Canada/Finland</u>
Factor 1--Efficacy	.621** (1/1)	.514* (1/3)	.700** (3/1)
Factor 2--Negative Affect	.778** (2/4)	.845** (2/1)	.722** (1/4)
Factor 3--Positive Affect	.609** (5/2)	.820** (5/2)	.598* (2/2)
Factor 4--Community	ns	.699** (3/5)	ns
Factor 5--Agency	.732** (4/5)	ns	ns

Note: ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$. The original factors supporting this factor structure were different for each of the countries. The supporting factor numbers are in brackets beside the correlations.

Appendix F--Random Sample of Personal Projects by Category

Random Sample of Personal Projects by Category

Academic Projects	Health Projects
<u>Canadian</u>	<u>Canadian</u>
Start studying for exams	Start working out
Finish university with honours	Eat Healthier
<u>Finnish</u>	<u>Finnish</u>
Read study books	Maintain a healthier lifestyle
Develop my study skills	Lose 5 kilos.
<u>French</u>	<u>French</u>
To succeed in my studies	Live a more healthy lifestyle
Complete my university courses	Lose 3 kg

Interpersonal Projects		Leisure Projects	
<u>Canadian</u>		<u>Canadian</u>	
Visit with my grandmother		Learn more about photography	
Keep in touch with friends		Travel the world	
<u>Finnish</u>		<u>Finnish</u>	
Keep relationships with friends		Play volleyball	
Make more time for my family		Travel around world in the future	
<u>French</u>		<u>French</u>	
Have fun with friends		Travel to foreign countries	
Find a good husband		Go to the movies	
Intrapersonal Projects		Administrative Projects	
<u>Canadian</u>		<u>Canadian</u>	
Find time for spiritual life		Go grocery shopping	
Stop feeling sorry for myself		Clean room	
<u>Finnish</u>		<u>Finnish</u>	
More self-discipline		Move into my own home	
Civilize myself in all areas		Find a summer job	
<u>French</u>		<u>French</u>	
Remain humble and natural		Get a driver's license	
Being less timid		Live in an apartment	
Note: Examples of occupational projects and those projects categorized as other are not provided.			

Appendix G---Sample Packages--Canada, Finland and France

Canadian Package

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Carleton University
Social Ecology Laboratory
Psychology Department

This form is intended to ensure that you are aware of your rights concerning participation in this study and to ensure you are adequately informed to be able to decide whether you wish to participate. Please read the following carefully and sign below to indicate that you understand your rights as a voluntary participant in this research.

Title of Study: Personal Projects Analysis and Well-Being: Cross-Cultural Explorations

I understand that this study is examining the kinds of activities and concerns that people currently have in their daily lives and scenes and images of their current life that are important to them. I am willing to complete the questionnaires in the attached packages and understand it will take approximately one hour. I am aware that some of the measures in this package may ask questions of a personal and sensitive nature and that I may choose not to answer specific questions or I may withdraw at any point in the process for any reason without penalty.

I understand that my name will not be identified in any way on the questionnaire and thus my anonymity is assured. The data, once collected, will be kept strictly confidential and will not be used in any way other than for the research purposes outlined above.

I understand that if I should have any complaints or concerns about this research, I may report them to Kelly Richardson, the principal investigator (520-2600, ext. 1448), or Dr. Brian Little, the research supervisor (520-2600, ext. 1097). If I should have any ethical concerns about the research I may contact Dr. M. Senechal, Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee, (520-2600, ext. 1155).

Date: _____ 2000/01

Signature of Participant _____

Signature of Researcher _____

General Background Information

Age: _____ yrs

Gender: M F

Native Language: _____

Language Spoken in the (current) home: _____

Marital Status (circle one):

single (never married)
currently married/living with common law spouse
divorced
widow/widower

Father's profession: _____

Mother's profession: _____

Do you have children? Y N

Are you a student who is: full time part time special

What is your current year of study at university? 1 2 3 4 5
Other _____ (special/qualifying)

What is your academic major? _____

Do you work? Y N

If yes, how many hours per week? _____ hrs

Have you done any volunteer work in the past year? Y N

If yes, how many hours per week? _____ hrs

Are you currently involved in any volunteer work? Y N

If yes, how many hours per week? _____ hrs

Would you like to volunteer but are unable to do so? Y N

If yes, why are you unable to do so? _____

Personal Projects Analysis

Part 1: Project Elicitation

We are interested in studying the kinds of activities and concerns that people have at different stages of their life. We call these personal projects. All of us have a number of personal projects at any given time that we think about, plan for, carry out, and sometimes (though not always) complete. Projects may be related to any aspect of your daily life, university, work, home, leisure and community, among others. Please think of projects in this broad way.

Here are some examples of projects:

Complete my class assignment
Trying to help a friend get along better with others
Overcome my fear of meeting new people
Avoid having dinner with my family
Try to finish my favourite book
Taking a trip out of town
Take out the garbage
Finding a part-time job
Have a coffee with my grandmother
Write a best selling novel
Maintaining a healthy lifestyle
Stop worrying about stupid things
Watching movies with my best friends
Stop being stressed
Breaking up with my partner

We are also very interested in finding out how people feel about these personal projects, how enjoyable they are, and so on. To start, please take ten minutes and write down on the following page as many personal projects as you can that you are currently engaged in or considering -- remember these need not necessarily be formal projects, we would prefer you give us more of the everyday kinds of activity or concerns that characterize your life at present.

Brian Little, Ph.D., 1983

Please go ahead and write down as many personal projects as you can think of in 10 minutes:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Part 2: Project Rating

Now copy 7 of these projects on the PERSONAL PROJECTS RATING MATRIX. If you do not have 7 projects in your list, please try to come up with a few more. If your initial list contains more than 7 projects, select the 7 that you think would be of interest to explore in more detail in order to better understand your life.

Once you have written all 7 projects you may begin to rate each one from 0 - 10 on the series of dimensions listed along the top of the page. Attached to the back of this questionnaire is a list of these dimensions and a more detailed explanation of what each one means. Please detach the list for easy reference and refer to it as needed while you rate your projects on each dimension.

PERSONAL PROJECTS RATING MATRIX

List of Personal Projects	Importance	Difficulty	Visibility	Control	Initiation	Stress	Outcome	Self Identity	Progress	Support	Financial Constraint	Community	Community Benefit	Angry	Anxious/Worried	Proud	Happy Joyful	With Whom?	Where?
1																			
2																			
3																			
4																			
5																			
6																			
7																			

This questionnaire consists of nine adjectives which may describe the way you have felt during the past few weeks. Using the scale below each item, please indicate how much each adjective describes how you have felt lately. Indicate your choice by making a mark in the appropriate box.

During the past few weeks did you ever feel...

Happy

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Frustrated

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Worried or Anxious

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Joyful

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Pleased

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Angry or Hostile

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Unhappy

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Depressed

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Enjoyment/Fun

Not at all ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Extremely Much ☐ ☐

Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or behaved. Please indicate how often you have felt this way **during the past week** by rating each item on the following scale:

0 = rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)

1 = some or little of the time (1 - 2 days)

2 = occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3 - 4 days)

3 = most or all of the time (5 - 7 days)

During the past week:

- _____ 1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me.
- _____ 2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.
- _____ 3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends.
- _____ 4. I felt that I was just as good as other people.
- _____ 5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.
- _____ 6. I felt depressed.
- _____ 7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.
- _____ 8. I felt hopeful about the future.
- _____ 9. I thought my life had been a failure.
- _____ 10. I felt fearful.
- _____ 11. My sleep was restless.
- _____ 12. I was happy.
- _____ 13. I talked less than usual.
- _____ 14. I felt lonely.
- _____ 15. People were unfriendly.
- _____ 16. I enjoyed life.
- _____ 17. I had crying spells.
- _____ 18. I felt sad.
- _____ 19. I felt that people dislike me.
- _____ 20. I could not get "going".

Personal Project System Rating Scale

Consider the different pursuits, activities, commitments and projects in which you are currently involved. We call this your “personal project system.” **On the whole**, how would you evaluate your current project system on the following dimensions? Please circle the appropriate number.

On the whole, my current activities, commitments, pursuits and projects are:

meaningful (e.g., enjoyable, valuable)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	meaningless (e.g., worthless, unenjoyable)
chaotic (e.g., out of control not enough time)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	well-organized (e.g., under control, adequate time)
supported (e.g., lots of help, and affection from others)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	totally lacking support (e.g., others don't, care at all)
very stressful (e.g., lots of hassle, and conflict)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	unstressful (e.g., no hassle)
progressing well (e.g., likely to be, very successful)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	progressing poorly (e.g., very likely , to fail)

Life Satisfaction Scale

Below is a scale that we would like you to use to tell us how satisfied you are with your life as a whole right now. If you are completely satisfied with your life as a whole as it is now, you would circle the number ten (10). If you are completely dissatisfied with your life as a whole as it is now, you would circle zero (0). If you are neither completely satisfied nor completely dissatisfied, you would use one of the numbers from 1 to 9 to indicate your current level of satisfaction. Remember, the higher the number, the more satisfied you feel with your life as it is right now.

In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your life as a whole right now? Circle the number on the scale below that comes closest to how you feel:

Completely	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Completely
Dissatisfied						Neutral						Satisfied

Detailed Explanation of Dimensions

- 1. Importance:** How important each project is to you at the present time. Use 10 if the project is very important to you and 0 if it is not at all important to you.
- 2. Difficulty:** How difficult do you find it to carry out each project. Use 10 for a project that you find very difficult to carry out and 0 for one that you do not find difficult at all.
- 3. Visibility:** How visible each project is to the relevant people who are close to you, that is how aware they are that you are engaged in this project. Use 10 for a project that is very visible to those around you and use 0 for a project which is not at all visible to those around you.
- 4. Control:** How much you feel you are in control of each project. Use 10 for a project over which you feel in complete control and 0 for a project over which you feel you have no control at all.
- 5. Initiation:** How much you feel responsible for having initiated each project. Use 10 if you feel fully responsible for having initiated a project and 0 if you have taken no part whatsoever in initiating a project.
- 6. Stress:** How stressful it is for you to carry out each project. Use 10 if a project is very stressful to carry out and 0 if a project is very relaxing to carry out.
- 7. Outcome:** What you anticipate the outcome of each project to be. Use 10 if you think that a project will be extremely successful and 0 if you think a project will turn out to be a total failure.
- 8. Self-Identity:** To what extent a project is distinctly you; your personal “trademark” as opposed to quite alien to you. Use 10 if a project is a distinctive trademark and 0 if a project is decidedly alien.

9. **Progress:** How successful you have been in a project so far. Use 10 to indicate that you have been very successful and 0 to indicate that you have had no success at all.
10. **Support:** How much support is provided by others for each project. Use 10 if a project is very much supported by others and 0 if a project is not supported at all.
11. **Financial Constraint:** To what Extent do you feel that your personal financial situation hinders or negatively affects each project. use 10 if a project is very affected and 0 if a project is not affected at all.
12. **Community:** To what extent does each project contribute towards a sense of community and harmony with other people of your environment. Use 10 to indicate a high sense of community and harmony and 0 to indicate no sense of community or harmony at all.
13. **Community Benefit:** To what extent you take part in a project primarily for the well-being of others. Use 10 to indicate mostly for the well-being of others and 0 to indicate not at all for the well-being of others.

For the dimensions 14 - 17, please rate on a scale from 0 (not at all) to 10 (very much indeed) the extent to which you feel the emotion listed while engaged in the project (or, for projects that have not yet begun, while imagining how you will/would feel during engagement in the project).

In column 18, please write down the names of the other people involved in each project with you. You may use only first names, but include the initial of the last name to differentiate people who share the same first name. If there is no one else involved in a project with you, leave the corresponding space blank.

In column 19, please indicate the setting in which you would most likely or most typically carry out each project. Some projects may not be taking place in a particular setting, in which case you would leave the corresponding space blank.

DEBRIEFING

Carleton University
Social Ecology Laboratory
Psychology Department

Title of Study: Personal Projects Analysis and Well-Being: Cross-Cultural Explorations

Background and Purpose of Study: The personal projects measure you completed will be compared with the same measure which was administered in Finland and France to explore cross-cultural differences and similarities, primarily in the context of “social capital”, that is, projects you do primarily for the well-being of others. The researcher is interested in differences across the three countries in the level and nature of so-called “social capital” projects, as well as in the effect the inclusion of one or more of such projects in a person’s project system may have on overall well-being for that individual.

Results: The results of this study will be available in Loeb A405 and B552 in August, 2001, if you are interested in the outcome. Thank you very much for your participation. Your time and effort are most appreciated.

Questions and Comments: If you find this study has raised issues of a personal nature that you might like to discuss with someone, feel free to contact Carleton University Health Services (520-6674).

If you have any questions or comments about this research, please feel free to contact Kelly Richardson, the principal investigator (520-2600, ext. 1448) or Dr. Brian Little, the research supervisor (520-2600, ext. 1097). If you have any concerns about the ethics of this study, please refer them to Dr. M. Senechal, Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee, (520-2600, ext. 1155).

Finnish Package

Hei!

Ohessa on kysymyksiä, jotka liittyvät eri elämänvaiheisiin liittyviin projekteihin ja tavoitteisiin. Pyydämme Sinua nyt täyttämään ohessa olevan lomakkeen. Lomakkeen täyttö kestää n. 30 min.

Tässä esitettyihin kysymyksiin ei ole oikeita tai vääriä vastauksia. Toivomme, että vastaisit kysymyksiin niinkuin itse asioista ajattelet. Kysymyksiin vastatessasi kirjoita vastaus siihen varattuun tilaan tai ympyröi tai pane rasti sopivaksi kokemasi vaihtoehdon kohdalle.

Älä kirjoita lomakkeeseen nimeä vaan vastaa nimettömänä.

Voit halutessasi kommentoida lomaketta viimeisen sivun takakannelle.

Suuret kiitokset yhteistyöstä!

Katariina Salmela-Aro
Psykologian tohtori, tutkija
Helsingin yliopisto
p. 191 23239

Riika Pennanen
Psykologian yo, tutkimusavustaja
Helsingin yliopisto
p. 191 23239

Taustatiedot:

Ikäsi: _____ vuotta

Sukupuolesi: 1 nainen 2 mies

Äidinkielesi: _____

Kieli, jota puhutte kotona: _____

Siviilisaaty (ympyröi):

1. naimaton (en ole koskaan ollut naimisissa)
2. avoliitossa
3. naimisissa
4. eronnut
5. leski

Isän ammatti: _____

Äidin ammatti: _____

Onko Sinulla Lapsia? Ei Kyllä, kuinka monta: _____

- Koulutus:
1. peruskoulu
 2. ammattikoulu
 3. ylioppilas
 4. opistotason tutkinto
 5. korkeakoulututkinto

Oletko tällä hetkellä opiskelija?

1. en
2. kokopäiväinen
3. osapäiväinen
4. joku muu

Jos olet nyt opiskelija, mikä on opiskelupaikkasi? _____

mikä on opintoalasi? _____

Jos olet nyt yliopisto-opiskelija, monettako vuotta opiskelet? 1 2 3 4 5, muu _____

Oletko työssä? En Kyllä, montako tuntia viikossa? _____

Ammattisi: _____

Oletko viimeisen vuoden aikana tehnyt vapaaehtoistyötä?

En Kyllä, montako tuntia viikossa? _____

Teetkö tällä hetkellä vapaaehtoistyötä? En Kyllä, _____ tuntia viikossa

Haluaisitko tehdä vapaaehtoistyötä, muttet kykene? En Kyllä, miksi et kykene? _____

Henkilökohtaiset projektit

Osa 1: Projektien tuttuaminen

Olemme kiinnostuneita tutkimaan sitä, millaisia asioita ihmisillä on menossa eri elämänvaiheissa. Kutsumme näitä henkilökohtaisiksi projekteiksi. Meillä kaikilla on eri elämänvaiheissa monia henkilökohtaisia projekteja, joita me ajattelemme, suunnittelemme, toteutamme ja joskus (ei aina) saamme valmiiksi. Ne voivat liittyä mihin tahansa elämäntilanteeseen kuten koulutukseen, työhön, vapaa-aikaan, kotiin, itseesi, yhteisöön. Ajattele projekteja tällä tavalla laajasti.

Tässä joitain esimerkkejä projekteista:

*Saada valmiiksi opiskeluun liittyvät tehtävät
 Pyrkii saamaan ystäväni tulemaan paremmin toimeen muiden kanssa
 Voittaa pelkoni tavata uusia ihmisiä
 Välttää illastaminen perheeni kanssa
 Saada mieleiseni kirja luettua loppuun
 Tehdä retki maaseudulle
 Viedä roskat
 Löytää osa-aika työ
 Käydä kahvilla isoaitini kanssa
 Kirjoittaa romaani
 Ylläpitää tervettä elämäntyyliä
 Lopettaa huolehtiminen tyhmistä asioista
 Lopettaa stressaaminen
 Lopettaa yhteiselo puolisoni kanssa
 Mennä leffaamaan hyvän ystäväni kanssa*

Me olemme myös kiinnostuneita siitä, miltä projektit tuntuvat ihmisten mielestä, kuinka nautittavia ne ovat jne. Aluksi, seuraavan 10 minuutin aikana mieti ja kirjoita seuraavalle sivulle mahdollisimman monta sellaista henkilökohtaista projektiasi, joiden parissa tällä hetkellä työskentelet tai joita mietit. Niiden ei tarvitse olla muodollisia projekteja. Toivoisimme, että tuottaisit sellaisia projekteja, jotka kuvaavat sinun elämäsi tällä hetkellä.

Brian Little, Ph.D., 1983

Kirjoita seuraaville riveille niin monta henkilökohtaista projektiasi, kun Sinulle tulee mieleen seuraavien 10 minuutin aikana:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

Osa 2: Projektien arviointi

Kopioi nyt 7 tuottamistasi henkilökohtaisista projekteista HENKILÖKOHTAISTEN PROJEKTIENTIMATRIISIIN sivulle 6.

Jos et tuottanut 7 projektia, mieti jos voisit tuottaa niitä vielä lisää.

Jos tuotit yli 7 projektia, valitse ne 7, joita kannattaisa pohtia vähän tarkemmin, jotta voisi ymmärtää sinun elämäsi.

Kun olet kirjoittanut 7 projektiasi, voit aloittaa arvioimalla jokaisen vuorotellen asteikolla 0 - 10 arviointimatriisin dimensioiden suhteen. Arviointidimensiot on kuvattu tarkemmin alla. **Voit irroittaa listan (sivut 4 ja 5), jotta arviointisi olisi helpompaa.**

Arviointidimensioiden selitykset:

1. Tärkeys: Kuinka tärkeä projekti on Sinulle tällä hetkellä?
10 erittäin tärkeä ja 0 ei lainkaan tärkeä
2. Vaikeus: Kuinka vaikeaa projektia on viedä eteenpäin?
10 hyvin vaikea ja 0 ei lainkaan vaikeaa
3. Näkyvyys: Kuinka näkyvä projektisi on Sinulle oleellisille ihmisille eli kuinka tietoisia he ovat siitä, että Sinulla on tämä projekti?
10 erittäin näkyvä ja 0 ei lainkaan näkyvä
4. Kontrolli: Kuinka paljon voit itse kontrolloida projektiasi?
10 voit täydellisesti kontrolloida ja 0 et voi lainkaan vaikuttaa
5. Aloitteellisuus: Kuinka paljon olet vastuussa projektin aloittamisesta?
10 olet täysin vastuussa ja 0 et ole lainkaan ottanut osaa projektin aloittamiseen
6. Stressaavuus: Kuinka stressaavaa on projektin toteuttaminen?
10 hyvin stressaavaa ja 0 ei lainkaan stressaavaa
7. Tulos: Minkä arvioit olevan projektin tulos?
10 projekti tulee olemaan erittäin onnistunut ja) tulee olemaan täysin epäonnistunut
8. Identiteetti: Miten kuvaava/ täysin vieras projekti on Sinulle?
10 erittäin selvästi minua kuvaava ja 0 selvästi vieras minulle

9. Edistyminen: Kuinka menestyksekkäs olet tähän mennessä ollut projektisi suhteen?
10 hyvin menestyksellinen ja 0 ei lainkaan edistystä
10. Tuki: Kuinka paljon tukea saat muilta projektiisi?
10 erittäin paljon tukea ja 0 ei lainkaan tukea
11. Taloudelliset esteet: Miten paljon taloudellinen tilanteeseesi estää tai vaikuttaa negatiivisesti projektiisi?
10 hyvin paljon ja 0 ei lainkaan
12. Yhteisyys: Miten paljon projektisi johtaa yhteisyyteen ja harmoniaan muiden ihmisten kanssa?
10 projekti tuottaa erittäin paljon harmoniaa ja 0 ei tuota lainkaan harmoniaa
13. Yhteisön hyöty: Miten paljon otat osaa projektiin muiden hyvinvoinnin takia?
10 lähinnä muiden hyvinvoinnin takia ja 0 ei lainkaan muiden hyvinvoinnin takia

Dimensiot 14 - 17 arvioi miten paljon kyseinen projekti tuottaa tätä tunnetta 0 (ei lainkaan) - 10 (hyvin paljon) tai jos projekti ei ole vielä alkanut, miten paljon se tuottaisi tätä tunnetta.

Kohta 18, kirjoita niiden ihmisten nimet, jotka ovat mukana kanssasi tässä projektissa. Kirjoita vain etunimet. Jos kukaan muu ei ota osaa projektiin jätä kohta tyhjäksi.

Kohta, 19, kirjoita mikä on tyypillisin paikka missä toteutat tätä projektiasi. Jotkut projektit eivät liity mihinkään erityiseen paikkaan. Jätä silloin kohta tyhjäksi.

ARVIOINTIMATRIISI

Projektiesi lista	1. Tärkeys	2. Vaikeus	3. Näkyvyys	4. Kontrolli	5. Aloitteellisuus	6. Stressaavuus	7. Tulos	8. Identiteetti	9. Edistyminen	10. Tuki	11. Taloudelliset esteet	12. Yhteisyys	13. Yhteisön hyöty	14. Viha	15. Ahdistus	16. Viipeys	17. Ilo	18. Kenen kanssa?	19. Missä?
1																			
2																			
3																			
4																			
5																			
6																			
7																			

Tällä sivulla on yhdeksän adjektiivia, jotka voivat kuvata sitä, miltä Sinusta on tuntunut viime viikkojen aikana. Arvioi jokainen tunne sen mukaan, miten paljon se on kuvannut viime aikaista tunnetilaasi. Ympyröi sopiva numero.

Viime viikkojen aikana, oletko tuntenut itsesi lainkaan...

Onnelliseksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Turhautuneeksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Ahdistuneeksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Riemukkaaksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Tyytyväiseksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Vihaiseksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Surulliseksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Masentuneeksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Iloiseksi

en lainkaan 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5 ☐ 6 ☐ hyvin paljon 7 ☐

Alla on lista erilaisia tapoja, joilla tavoin olet ehkä käyttäytynyt. Arvioi, kuinka usein olet käyttäytynyt tai tuntenut tällä tavoin viimeisen viikon aikana:

0 = tuskin koskaan (alle päivää),

1 = harvoin (1 - 2 päivää),

2 = joskus (3 - 4 päivää),

3 = lähes aina (5 - 7 päivää)

Viime viikkona:

- _____ 1. Minua harmittivat asiat, jotka eivät yleensä harmita minua.
- _____ 2. Minulla ei ollut ruokahalua.
- _____ 3. En päässyt masennuksesta, vaikka muut yrittivät auttaa.
- _____ 4. Tunsin olevani yhtä hyvä kuin muutkin.
- _____ 5. Minun oli vaikea keskittyä.
- _____ 6. Tunsin itseni masentuneeksi.
- _____ 7. Kaikki mitä yritin vaati suurta ponnistusta.
- _____ 8. Tunsin toiveikkuutta tulevaisuutta kohtaan.
- _____ 9. Tuntui, että elämäni oli epäonnistunut.
- _____ 10. Tunsin itseni pelokkaaksi.
- _____ 11. Uneni oli levotonta.
- _____ 12. Olin iloinen.
- _____ 13. Puhuin tavallista vähemmän.
- _____ 14. Tunsin itseni yksinäiseksi.
- _____ 15. Ihmiset olivat epäystävällisiä.
- _____ 16. Nautin elämästä.
- _____ 17. Minulla oli itkukohtauksia.
- _____ 18. Tunsin itseni surulliseksi.
- _____ 19. Tunsin etteivät ihmiset pitäneet minusta.
- _____ 20. En saanut itseäni ”käyntiin”.

Henkilökohtaisten projektien systeemin arviointi lomake

Mieti niitä kaikkia asioita, sitoutumia ja projekteja, joita Sinulla on tällä hetkellä elämässäsi. Kutsumme tätä kokonaisuutta ”Henkilökohtaisten projektien systeemiksi” Kokonaisuutena, miten voisit arvioida henkilökohtaisten projektiesi systeemiä seuraavien asteikkojen suhteen. Ympyröi sopiva numero.

Kokonaisuutena minuun nykyiset projektini, aktiviteettini ja sitoutumiseni ovat:

merkityksellisiä (esim. nautittavia, arvokkaita)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	merkityksettömiä (esim. arvottomia, ei-nautittavia)
kaoottisia (esim. ei kontrolloitavia, ei tarpeeksi aikaa)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	organisoiuneita (esim. kontrolloitavissa, tarpeeksi aikaa)
tuettuja (esim. paljon apua ja tukea muilta)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	tuki puuttuu täysin (esim. muuteivat eivät lainkaan välitä)
hyvin stressaavia (esim. paljon konflikteja, ja hässäkkää)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	ei lainkaan stressaavia (esim. ei hässäkkää)
edistyvät hyvin (esim. tulevat onnistumaan hyvin)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	edistyvät huonosti (tulevat epäonnistumaan)

Elämäntyytyväisyys

Alla on skaala, jonka avulla haluaisimme, että kerrot meille kuinka tyytyväinen olet elämääsi kokonaisuutena juuri nyt. Jos olet tällä hetkellä täysin tyytyväinen elämääsi kokonaisuutena ympyröi numero 10. Jos taas olet täysin tyytymätön elämääsi kokonaisuutena ympyröi numero 0. Jos et ole toisaalta täysin tyytyväinen tai täysin tyytymätön käytä jotain numeroa 1 - 9 kuvataksesi tämän hetken tyytyväisyyden tasoa. Muista, mitä suurempi numero, sitä tyytyväisempi olet elämääsi.

Yleisesti, kuinka tyytyväinen tai tyytymätön olet elämääsi kokonaisuutena tällä hetkellä? Ympyröi se numero, joka parhaiten vastaa sitä miltä sinusta nyt tuntuu:

Täysin	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Täysin
tyytymätön						neutraali						tyytyväinen

French Package

FORMULAIRE DE CONSENTEMENT INFORME

Ce formulaire a pour but de s'assurer que vous avez pris connaissance de vos droits, concernant votre participation à cette étude, et de vérifier que vous êtes correctement informé, afin que vous puissiez décider librement de participer ou non à cette enquête. Nous vous prions de lire soigneusement ce qui suit, et de signer au bas de la page, pour indiquer que vous connaissez vos droits, en tant que participant volontaire à cette recherche.

Titre de l'Etude: Analyse des Projets Personnels d'Activité: Explorations inter-culturelles.

J'ai bien noté que cette étude examine les différents types d'activité et les préoccupations que les gens ont, dans leur vie de tous les jours, ainsi que les moments et épisodes de leur vie courante que sont importants pour eux. J'ai pris la décision de remplir le questionnaire qui suit, et comprend que cela me prendra environ 1 à 2 heures. Je sais que certains des sujets étudiés peuvent conduire à des questionnements d'ordre personnel ou mettant en jeu ma sensibilité, et que je peux choisir de ne pas répondre à certaines questions, ou que je peux décider de stopper ma participation à quelque moment que ce soit.

J'ai bien noté que mon nom ne pourra être identifié en aucun point du questionnaire, et qu'ainsi l'anonymat est totalement garanti. Une fois collectées, les données seront traitées de façon complètement confidentielle, et ne pourront être utilisées à d'autres fins que pour cette étude.

Je sais que, si j'avais la moindre préoccupation ou le moindre problème à exprimer, je pourrais en référer à Monsieur Gosling, responsable de cette recherche sur Paris X-Nanterre. (Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale des Conduites et des Cognitions; tel : 01 40 97 78 11)

Date:

Signature du participant:

Signature du chercheur:

Fiche d'information d'état civil

Age: _____

Sexe: M F

Langue natale: _____

Langue couramment parlée à la maison: _____

Statut marital (entourer):

célibataire (jamais marié)
marié/vivant en concubinage
divorcé
veuf/veuve

Profession du père: _____

Profession de la mère: _____

Avez-vous des enfants? O N

Etes-vous étudiant: à temps complet à temps partiel cas particulier

Quelle est votre année d'étude dans l'enseignement supérieur? 1 2 3 4 5
Autre _____ (spécialisation...)

Quel est votre matière principale? _____

Avez-vous un travail salarié? O N

Si oui, combien d'heures par semaine? _____

Avez-vous participé à un quelconque travail bénévole, l'an passé? O N

Si oui, combien d'heures par semaine? _____

Est-ce que vous faites habituellement un travail bénévole (W. associatif, social)? O N

Si oui, combien d'heures par semaine? _____

Si vous ne pouvez le faire pour cause d'impossibilité matérielle, aimeriez-vous le faire?

O N

Si oui, pourquoi ne le pouvez-vous pas? _____

Analyse des Projets Personnels d'Activité

1 ère partie: Mise à jour des Projets

Dans cette étude, nous nous intéressons aux différentes activités et préoccupations que les gens peuvent avoir, à différents moments de leur vie. C'est ce que nous appelons leurs "Projets Personnels d'Activité". Chacun de nous a, à un moment donné, un certain nombre de Projets Personnels, auxquels il pense, pour lequel il fait des plans, qu'il met à exécution, et parfois même (mais pas toujours), qu'il mène à leur terme.

Ces projets peuvent avoir trait à l'un quelconque des aspects de notre vie quotidienne - scolarité, travail, foyer, loisirs ou vie sociale, entre autres. Réfléchissez à ce que sont vos projets personnels d'Activité, en prenant ce terme dans son sens le plus large.

Voici quelques exemples de projets personnels d'Activité:

Venir à bout de mon cursus scolaire
Essayer d'aider un ami à avoir de meilleures relations avec les autres
Surmonter ma peur de faire de nouvelles connaissances
Éviter les dîners en famille
Développer un hobby (sport, instrument de musique)
Surmonter ma peur de prendre la parole en public
Jouer dans une troupe de théâtre amateur
Lire toute l'oeuvre de mon auteur préféré
Aller faire une excursion à la campagne
Prendre en charge les ordures (tri, sortie au jour dit, ...)
Trouver un petit job à temps partiel
Allez prendre une tasse de café avec ma grand-mère
Écrire une nouvelle susceptible de faire un gros succès d'édition
Faire tout le nécessaire pour mener une vie saine
Cesser de me faire du souci pour des choses idiotes
Aller au cinéma avec mes meilleurs amis
Cesser d'être stressé
Rompre avec ma petite amie

Nous souhaitons aussi découvrir comment les gens ressentent ces différents projets personnels, quel plaisir ils en tirent, etc...

Pour commencer, prenez dix minutes et écrivez sur la page suivante tous les projets personnels auxquels vous pensez et dans lesquels vous êtes engagé, ou qui sont importants pour vous. N'oubliez pas qu'il n'est pas nécessaire d'écrire des projets formels: nous préférierions que vous nous indiquiez ces activités ou préoccupations quotidiennes qui font de votre vie ce qu'elle est aujourd'hui.

Brian Little, Ph.D., 1983

Écrivez tous les projets personnels d'activité auxquels vous pouvez penser en 10 minutes:

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no text or other markings on the paper.

2nde partie: Evaluation des Projets Personnels d'Activité

Recopier maintenant 7 de ces projets sur chacune des lignes de la *matrice d'évaluation des projets personnels d'activité*.

Si vous en avez cité moins de 7, reprenez un temps de réflexion pour parvenir à ce nombre de projets.

Si votre liste initiale en contenait plus de 7, choisissez les 7 qui vous paraissent avoir le plus d'intérêt comme outil d'exploration pour mieux comprendre votre vie.

Une fois que vous avez inscrit chacun de ces 7 projets, vous pouvez commencer à évaluer chacun d'eux **en le notant de 0 à 10**, sur chacune des dimensions figurant dans les colonnes de la matrice.

***Nota:** A la suite de la page de la matrice, figure la liste de ces dimensions, avec l'explication détaillée de ce que chacune représente: détachez les 2 pages, et gardez-les à côté de la matrice tandis que vous remplirez les colonnes.*

Matrice d'évaluation des projets personnels d'Activité

Liste des projets personnels d'activité	Importance	Difficulté	Visibilité	Maîtrise	Initiateur	Stress	Résultat	Identité personnelle	Progression	Soutien	Composante financière	Harmonie	Bénéfice pour la société	En colère, fâché	Soucieux	Fier	Heureux, joyeux	Avec qui?	Comment?
1																			
2																			
3																			
4																			
5																			
6																			
7																			

Cette page est constituée de neuf adjectifs qui pourraient décrire l'état d'esprit dans lequel vous avez vécu les dernières semaines.

En utilisant la gradation sous chaque adjectif, indiquez comment vous vous sentiez par rapport à ce sentiment: couchez la case qui représente le mieux votre vécu.

Durant ces dernières semaines, est-ce que vous vous sentiez...

Heureux

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Frustré

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Soucieux

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Joyeux

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Satisfait

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Fâché ou agressif

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Malheureux

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Déprimé

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Dans le plaisir et l'amusement

Pas du tout ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Énormément ☐

Figure ci-dessous une liste de situations que vous avez pu ressentir ou de comportements que vous avez pu avoir récemment.

Indiquez à quelle fréquence vous les avez vécus, la semaine précédente, en évaluant chacun suivant l'échelle ci-dessous:

0 = jamais ou très rarement (moins d'1 journée)

1 = peu fréquemment (1 ou 2 jours)

2 = de temps en temps, ou avec une fréquence très modérée (3 ou 4 jours)

3 = la plupart du temps ou toujours

La semaine dernière:

- _____ 1. J'ai été ennuyé par des choses qui, d'habitude, ne m'ennuient pas.
- _____ 2. Je n'avais pas envie de manger, je n'avais pas d'appétit.
- _____ 3. Je sentais que je ne pourrais pas faire passer mon cafard, même avec l'aide de ma famille.
- _____ 4. Je ressentais que je valais bien autant que les autres.
- _____ 5. J'avais du mal à rester concentré sur ce que je faisais.
- _____ 6. Je me sentais déprimée.
- _____ 7. Je sentais que tout ce que je faisais me coûtait un effort.
- _____ 8. J'étais plein d'espoir pour l'avenir.
- _____ 9. Je pensais que ma vie était un échec.
- _____ 10. J'avais peur.
- _____ 11. Mon sommeil était agité.
- _____ 12. J'étais heureux.
- _____ 13. Je parlais moins que d'habitude.
- _____ 14. Je me sentais seul.
- _____ 15. Les gens étaient hostiles.
- _____ 16. J'aimais la vie.
- _____ 17. J'avais des accès de larmes.
- _____ 18. Je me sentais triste.
- _____ 19. J'avais l'impression que les gens ne m'aimaient pas.
- _____ 20. Je ne pouvais pas me mettre en train.

Échelle d'évaluation pour l'étude des Projets Personnels d'Activité

Étudier les différents objectifs, activités, engagement et projets dans lesquels vous vous impliquez. Nous les appellerons vos Projets Personnels d'Activité.
En considérant leur ensemble, comment évalueriez-vous votre système habituel de prise en compte des projets: entourez le chiffre correspondant au mieux.

Dans leur ensemble, mes activités, engagements, projets sont:

plein de sens	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	dénué de sens
(ils ont de la valeur, j'y prends plaisir)												(ils ne valent rien, je n'y prends aucun plaisir)

Chaotique	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	bien organisé
(incontrôlable, pas assez de temps)												(sous contrôle, temps appropriée)

Très encouragé	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	mangue total d'encouragement
(bcp d'aide et d'affection des autres)												(les autres ne s'y intéressent absolument pas)

Très stressant	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	sans aucun stress
(bcp de disputes, de conflit)												(aucune tension)

progressant bien	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	progressant peu
(promis au succès)												(échec attendu)

Échelle de satisfaction quant à sa vie

Ci-dessous figure une échelle que nous aimerions que vous utilisiez pour dire à quel point vous êtes satisfait de votre vie, vue dans son ensemble, au jour d'aujourd'hui.

Si vous êtes complètement satisfait de votre vie, dans son ensemble, entourez le chiffre 10.

Si vous en êtes complètement mécontent, entourez le chiffre 0.

Si vous n'êtes ni complètement satisfait, ni complètement mécontent, entourez un des chiffres de 1 à 9, pour indiquer votre degré de satisfaction.

N'oubliez pas que, plus le chiffre est élevé, plus vous êtes satisfait de votre vie telle qu'elle est aujourd'hui.

En général, à quel degré êtes-vous satisfait ou mécontent de votre vie dans son ensemble, telle qu'elle est aujourd'hui? Entourez le chiffre qui est le plus proche de ce que vous ressentez:

Complète	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Satisfaction
insatisfaction						neutre						complète

Explication détaillée des Dimensions

Notez sur une échelle de 0 à 10, le sens de chaque valeur extrême étant précisé ci dessous.

1. Importance	A quel point chaque projet est important pour vous, dans votre vie d'aujourd'hui. Mettez 10 si le projet est très important, et 0 s'il ne l'est pas du tout.
2. Difficulté	Combien il est difficile pour vous de parvenir à faire avancer ce projet. Utilisez 10 pour un projet que vous trouvez vraiment très difficile à porter, et 0 pour un projet que vous ne trouvez pas difficile du tout.
3. Visibilité	A quel point chacun de vos projets est « visible » pour les personnes qui vous sont proches, c'est-à-dire à quel point vos proches sont au courant de votre engagement dans chacun de ce projets.
4. Maîtrise	Dans quelle mesure vous sentez que vous gardez le contrôle sur chacun de ces projets. Utilisez 10 pour un projet que vous sentez avoir complètement en mains, et 0 pour un projet qui vous échappe totalement.
5. Initiateur	A quel point vous assumez la paternité de ce projet. Utilisez 10 si vous vous sentez pleinement responsable de cette initiative, et 0 si vous n'y avez pris aucune part.
6. Stress	A quel point chacun des projets est source de stress pour vous. Utilisez 10 si le projet est très stressant, 0 s'il ne l'est pas du tout.
7. Résultat	Le résultat que vous prévoyez que chaque projet aura. Utilisez 10 si vous pensez que le projet réussira, et 0 si vous pensez qu'il court à l'échec.
8. Identité perso.	A quel point vous pensez qu'un projet vous est propre, qu'il caractérise ce que vous êtes, comme une marque de fabrique. Utilisez 10 si le projet est typiquement vous, et 0 s'il vous est vraiment totalement étranger.
9. Progression	A quel point votre projet progresse jusqu'à ce jour. Utilisez 10 pour indiquer que le projet a été couronné de succès et 0 pour indiquer que le projet n'a pas encore démarré.

10. Soutien	Le niveau d'aide, d'encouragement que les autres peuvent vous apporter pour chacun des projets. Utilisez 10 si le projet soulève un fort quota d'encouragement, et 0 s'il n'est absolument pas soutenu par les autres.
11. Composante	Dans quelle mesure vous sentez que votre situation financière financière entrave ou nuit à chacun de vos projets. Utilisez 10 si un projet est très affecté et 0 s'il ne l'est pas du tout.
12. Harmonie	Dans quelle mesure chaque projet contribue au développement des bonnes relations sociales et à l'harmonie entre les personnes de votre entourage. Utilisez 10 s'il contribue fortement à l'harmonie du groupe, 0 s'il n'y contribue pas du tout.
13. Bénéfice	Dans quelle mesure ce projet contribue en priorité au bien-être des pour la société autres. Utilisez 10 pour indiquer que ce projet est essentiellement centré sur la recherche d'harmonie et 0 pour indiquer qu'il ne tient aucun compte du bien-être des autres.

Pour les dimensions de 14 à 17, évaluez sur une échelle de 0 (pas du tout) à 10 (énormément) l'intensité de l'émotion que vous ressentez (ou, si le projet n'a pas encore commencé, ce que vous imaginez que vous sentirez, pendant les phases de déroulement du projet), ceci pour chacune des émotions listées dans les colonnes.

**Dans la colonne 18, notez les noms des autres personnes engagées avec vous dans chacun des projets. Ne marquez que le prénom, en ajoutant l'initiale du nom de famille, si plusieurs personnes portent le même prénom.
S'il n'y a personne d'autre engagé avec vous, laissez cet espace blanc.**

**Dans la colonne 19, indiquez la cadre dans lequel il est le plus probable que vous puissiez mener à terme chaque projet.
Certains projets peuvent ne pas exiger de circonstances particulières: laissez alors cette case blanche.**