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.

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

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

42

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

**The Nature of the Self and Well-Being:
A Relational Analysis Using Personal Projects**

Deborah S. James, M.A.

May, 2000

**Thesis submitted to the Department of Psychology in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctorate of Philosophy**

© Deborah S. James, 2000

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.

0-612-52324-1

Canada

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

"The Nature of the Self and Well-Being:
A Relational Analysis Using Personal Projects"

submitted by

Deborah J. James

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Chair
External Examiner
Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
May, 2000

Abstract

Historically, the concept of the autonomous self has been the focus of Western philosophy and, as one of our most cherished values, the notion of the independent self has structured our vision of the world in our everyday lives (Kitzinger, 1992). In line with this, the majority of personality theorists have delineated the end goal of development as the establishment of an independent and autonomous self. However, there has been increasing criticism of this model (e.g., Gilligan, 1982) in that a fundamental aspect of the self, namely the relational self, has been ignored. Recently researchers have explored the existence of different self-construals (e.g., Stern, 1990), as well as the antecedents and consequences associated with such self-construals (e.g., gender (Lyons, 1983) and culture (Markus & Kitayama, 1991)). This research examined the relations between the self, the relational characteristics of people's personal projects, and well-being. Study One was designed to identify relational items for the Personal Projects Analysis (PPA) which measures the social meaning, personal meaning and stress of people's life pursuits. In this study, 25 women and 25 men completed a q-sort that revealed two underlying constructs, namely, relational and independent. In Study Two, 72 women and 57 men completed measures of the self (i.e., independence, interdependence, interpersonal orientation, gender), a version of the PPA (Little, 1983) that included the new relational items, and their well-being (e.g., depression, life satisfaction). Analyses revealed that a) the relational content of participants' projects and their personal project scores mediated the relation between interdependence scores and well-being, and b) participants' personal project social meaning and stress scores mediated the relation between the relational content of their projects and their well-being. The implications of these results for gender differences in the self, the Western ideal of the autonomous self, the measurement of the relational self, and Personal Projects Analysis are discussed.

Acknowledgements

Many people have taken this long journey with me to achieve my goal of earning a Ph.D. It has consisted of many twists and turns, and at times it appeared that it would a goal that would not be achieved. Somehow, however, the end has finally come and the journey is complete.

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Connie Kristiansen, who has experienced the many ups and downs on this journey with me. She has come through at the crucial times when this research process seemed bleak and unforgiving and shown me the way to move onto completion. I take away many lessons from my experiences with her and they will stand me in good stead for my future.

To many good friends (especially Elaine and Anita) and family members (especially Audrey and Gerry) who had to endure many gripe sessions as this research was completed. Their support was unfailing and even if I didn't think I would get done, they did. To them, my heartfelt thanks.

Lastly, but first in my heart and life, my husband Malcolm. He was there for every step of this journey and gave me the many pushes when I needed it, but sympathetic hugs too. He has sacrificed much for me to complete my Ph.D. and hopefully his rewards will now begin. Also, to my daughter Shelby, who at eight, really doesn't understand what I have accomplished, but has been asked many times in her short life to let Mommy get her work done and to put playing on hold.

In closing, this research is dedicated to the memories of my mother and father, Shirley and Leonard James. My father did not see the beginning or the end of my higher education, but I carried him in my heart from start to finish. My mother did not live to see the end of this research, but I think she did believe I would finally accomplish my goal.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.....	1
THEORETICAL OVERVIEW	
The Self.....	2
Theoretical and Empirical Evidence on Gender and the Self.....	4
Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives on Culture and the Self.....	15
Self-Construals and Well-Being.....	23
Personal Project Analysis and Well-Being.....	30
Personal Projects Analysis.....	30
PPA and well-being.....	34
A Relational Analysis of Personal Projects Analysis.....	37
PPA and gender.....	39
Summary.....	43
STUDY ONE: IDENTIFYING RELATIONAL CONSTRUCTS	
Method.....	45
Participants.....	46
Procedure.....	49
Measures of self-construals.....	49
Q-sorting task.....	50
Results.....	52
Preliminary Analyses.....	52
Main Analyses.....	52
Descriptive statistics.....	52
Q-sort analysis.....	53
Group membership, gender and criterion scores.....	63
Alternative explanations.....	65
Discussion.....	69

STUDY TWO: THE SELF, PERSONAL PROJECTS AND WELL-BEING	
Method	72
Participants	72
Procedure	75
Questionnaire package	76
Results	79
Preliminary Analyses	79
Scale homogeneity	79
Descriptive statistics and interrelations among self-construal measures	79
Descriptive analyses and interrelations among personal project dimensions	81
Descriptive statistics and interrelations among measures of well-being	99
Intercorrelations among the predictor variables	103
Main Analyses	103
Correlations between predictor and criterion variables	106
Measures of the self as moderators of the personal project-well-being relation	106
Proportion of relational projects and personal project factor scores as mediators of the self-construal-well-being relation	108
Alternative explanations	127
Discussion	133
Gender Differences	133
Impact of Western Ideals	135
Self-Construals, Daily Activities and Well-Being	137
Conceptualization of the Relational and Independent Personalities	139
Issues Regarding Personal Project Analyses	142
Summary	144

References.....	145
Appendix A. Questionnaires-Study 1.....	157
Appendix B. Questionnaires-Study 2.....	173
Appendix C. Categories of Personal Projects.....	200

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1	Characteristics of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals.....	18
2	Five Factor Model of Standard PPA Dimensions.....	32
3	Three Factor Model of Standard PPA Dimensions.....	33
4	Demographic Characteristics of the Sample.....	47
5	Results of the Factor Analysis of Participants' Q-Sorts Using a Forced Three Factor Solution.....	55
6	Average Ranking of Q-Sort Item Scores for the Three Groups of People.....	57
7	Results of the Relational Group by Gender MANOVA on Self- Construal Scores.....	64
8	Results of the Independent Group by Gender MANOVA on Self- Construal Scores.....	66
9	Correlations between Participants' Demographic Characteristics, Gender, Self-Construal Scores, and Q-Sort Rankings.....	67
10	New Personal Project Dimensions.....	71
11	Demographic Characteristics of the Sample.....	73
12	Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for the Measures of Self-Construal.....	80
13	Results of the MANOVA Examining the Effects of Gender on Self-Construals.....	82
14	Content of Participants' Projects.....	83
15	Who Participants Did Their Projects With.....	85
16	For Whom Projects Were Done.....	86
17	Where Projects Were Done.....	88
18	Contents of Participants' Relational and Nonrelational Projects.....	89
19	Internal Consistency Across Projects and Descriptive Statistics for the Measures of the Personal Project Dimensions.....	92

Table	Description	Page
20	Results of the Factor Analysis of the Standard and Relational Personal Project Dimensions.....	96
21	Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for Personal Project Factor Scores.....	97
22	Intercorrelations Among the PPA Factors.....	98
23	Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for the Measures of Well-Being.....	100
24	Intercorrelations Among the Measures of Well-Being.....	101
25	Intercorrelations Among Domains of Life Satisfaction Scores.....	102
26	Intercorrelations Among Measures of the Self and Personal Project Factor Scores.....	104
27	Results of Regression of the Proportion of Relational Projects onto Personal Project Factor Scores.....	105
28	Correlations Between Predictor Variables and Composite Well-Being.....	107
29	Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Participants' Gender and Proportion of Relational Project Scores.....	109
30	Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Participants' Independence Scores and Proportion of Relational Project Scores.....	110
31	Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Participants' Interdependence Scores and Proportion of Relational Project Scores.....	111
32	Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Participants' Interpersonal Orientation Scores and Proportion of Relational Project Scores.....	112
33	Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Gender and Personal Project Factor Scores.....	113

Table	Description	Page
34	Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Participants' Independence and Personal Project Factor Scores.....	114
35	Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Participants' Interdependence and Personal Project Factor Scores.....	115
36	Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Participants' Interpersonal Orientation and Personal Project Factor Scores.....	116
37	Results of the Regression of Composite Well-Being onto Personal Project Factor Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects and Gender.....	118
38	Results of the Regression of Composite Well-Being onto Personal Project Factor Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects and Independence Scores.....	120
39	Results of the Regression of Composite Well-Being on to Personal Project Factor Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects and Interdependence Scores.....	123
40	Results of the Regression of Composite Well-Being onto Personal Project Factor Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects and Interpersonal Orientation.....	125
41	Correlations Between Social Desirability and Demographic Variables and Measures of the Self, Personal Project Factor and Well-Being Scores.....	128
42	Correlations of Demographic Characteristics with Self-construal, Proportion of Relational Projects, Personal Project and Well- Being Scores.....	130

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Description	Page
1	Scree Plot of Eigenvalues for the Unforced Principal Components Analysis of Q-Sort Items.....	54
2	Scree Plot of Eigenvalues for the Unforced Principal Components Analysis of the Standard and Relational Personal Project Dimensions.....	95
3	Schematic Model of the Relations Between Gender, Proportion of Relational Project Scores, Personal Project Factor Scores and Well-Being.....	119
4	Schematic Model of the Relations Between Independent Self Scores, Proportion of Relational Project Scores, Personal Project Factor Scores and Well-Being.....	121
5	Schematic Model of the Relations Between Interdependent Self Scores, Proportion of Relational Project Scores, Personal Project Factor Scores and Well-Being.....	124
6	Schematic Model of the Relations Between Interpersonal Orientation Scores, Proportion of Relational Project Scores, Personal Project Factor Scores and Well-Being.....	126

The Nature of the Self and Well-Being: A Relational Analysis Using Personal Projects

Historically, the concept of the autonomous self has been the focus of Western philosophy (e.g., classic liberalism; Tong, 1989) and, as one of our most cherished values, the notion of the independent self has structured our vision of the world in our everyday lives (Kitzinger, 1992). Embedded within this social context (Sampson, 1993), North American psychologists have also had an individualistic approach to the self. This “rugged individualism” is perhaps most evident within the domain of personality theory, where the majority of personality theorists have delineated the end goal of development as the establishment of an independent, self-sufficient and autonomous self. During the past twenty years, however, there has been increasing criticism of this model of development (e.g., Cross & Madson, 1997; Deaux, 1992; Gilligan, 1977, 1982; Miller, 1976/1986, 1984/1991). These criticisms have centred on the fact that existing theories of personality have not considered a fundamental aspect of the self, namely the relational self. In response to this neglect, several theories have emerged that stress the relational aspects of development that affect people's self-construals (e.g., Jordan, 1985/1991; Josselson, 1992; Miller, 1976/1986, 1984/1991).

In line with the above theorizing, researchers have begun to examine the existence of different self-construals in people's self-descriptions (e.g., Stern, 1990), the various antecedents associated with different selves, such as gender (e.g., Lyons, 1983), power (e.g., Fiske, 1993), and culture (e.g., Markus & Kitayama, 1991), and the consequences of different self-construals on diverse phenomena, including emotions, motivation and cognition (Markus & Kitayama, 1991, 1994), moral reasoning (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Lyons, 1983), stereotyping (Fiske, 1993), self-esteem (Josephs, Markus, & Tafarodi, 1992), social behaviour (Cross & Madson, 1997) and well-being (e.g., Helgeson, 1994). Continuing this tradition, this research examines the relations between people's self-construals and their well-being using their everyday projects.

The Self

Sampson (1988) stated that the essence of American individualism involves the notion of a “self-contained” individual who has “firmly drawn self-other boundaries and an emphasis on personal control” (Sampson, 1988, p.16). In their historical review of the self, Guisinger and Blatt (1994) documented that, relative to the concept of relatedness which has been in existence for most of history, the concept of the individual is unique to a short period of modern history. Despite its novelty, a review of the major frameworks of personality ranging from psychoanalysis to cognitive science led Sampson (1993) to conclude that the focus of psychology has been almost exclusively limited to the autonomous, self-sufficient individual. Erikson's (1963) theoretical articulation of the stages of development has been described as one theory that exemplifies the problems inherent in such theories (e.g., Jordan, 1985/1991; Surrey, 1984/1991).

In his psychosocial theory, Erikson claimed that people go through eight developmental stages across the lifespan, with a “psychosocial crisis” motivating the transition from one stage to the next. The issue of autonomy arises in many of these stages, including the second stage in which, children aged one to three are said to strive for independence and control over their actions. It also appears in the third stage where, from age three to six, the ability to set and pursue goals becomes the primary developmental task. Similarly, between the ages 12 to 20, in stage five, the task is to form a unique identity and find a place in society. Indeed, it is not until Erikson's sixth stage (ages 20 to 23) that relationships become an important component of personality development. As one moves through Erikson's stages, then, it is clear that the end goal is to become a fully individuated, autonomous individual who is distinct from others.

Because of its emphasis on uniqueness and autonomy and its neglect of the role of relationships until early adulthood, Erikson's model of development is regarded as deficient in explaining the course of development for people who may have a relational self. For example, according to Miller (1984/1991), stage two, the stage of autonomy, is experienced differently by girls than boys. Unlike boys, who are encouraged to develop a sense of separateness and agency, girls' sense of selves involve being in complex

relationships with those in authority (e.g., mother, father or caregiver). Similarly, while boys learn to celebrate being autonomous and taking the initiative during adolescence, girls learn that exercising power is disapproved of, whereas attending to others' needs, wants and desires are deemed appropriate. The pressure to behave in a socially prescribed manner is often intensified at this stage.

In her extensive interviews with twenty adult women, Hancock (1991) found that the last time these women felt free and unencumbered by cultural demands was at about the age of nine. As adolescence approached, they were expected to conform to stereotypical ideals and to downplay their sense of independence and assertiveness. It became more important to attend to the needs of others. It was not until well into their forties and fifties, when they were interviewed, that these women realized that they had given up a part of themselves in order to comply with cultural norms for their gender. Brown and Gilligan (1992) discovered similar responses in their interviews with almost 100 girls between the ages of seven and eighteen over a period of five years. At the ages of eight and nine these girls were willing to speak their minds and have open conflicts with their friends. As they moved into adolescence they began to mold themselves into what they thought others expected of them. As a result, they were less likely to voice their own opinions or be openly critical of others in order to maintain their relationships with others. It would appear that adolescence is a time that young girls are expected to give priority to relationships rather than to themselves, and this appears to continue throughout adulthood.

Although Erikson has been criticized for his apparent neglect of relatedness, Guisinger and Blatt (1994) argued that, both individualism and relatedness “exist independently until late adolescence and then integrate into what Erikson called an identity” (Guisinger and Blatt, 1994, p.16). Such integration, they claimed, was important to ensure a fully developed personality capable of handling the diverse tasks that lay ahead as one grew older. Despite the argument that relatedness may exist in early childhood, it was not seen as an important task by Erikson. Moreover, while it is theoretically conceivable that both the independent and relational selves may co-exist, it

is also possible that one aspect may predominate or precede the other, or that the relative balance of the independent versus relational aspects of the self may vary across the lifespan. As discussed in the next section, several theories of personality recognize the importance of relatedness and its relation to independence, including those concerned with gender and cultural differences in the self.

Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives on Gender and the Self

Many theories draw attention to the role of gender in the formation of personality. In one of the earliest systematic formulations concerning gender and the self, Bakan (1966) coined the terms “agency” and “communion” to describe what he regarded as the two basic components of personality.

Agency for the existence of an organism as an individual, and communion for the participation of the individual in some larger organism of which the individual is a part. Agency manifests itself in self-protection, self-assertion, and self-expansion; communion manifests itself in the sense of being at one with other organism. Agency manifests itself in the formation of separation; communion in the lack of separation. Agency manifest itself in isolation, alienation, and aloneness; communion in contact, openness, and union. Agency manifests itself in the urge to master; communion in non-contractual cooperation. Agency manifests itself in the repression of thought feeling, and impulse; communion in the lack and removal of repression (Bakan, 1966, p.15).

Bakan noted that personality theorists’ prevailing and dominant emphasis on agency had outgrown its usefulness and that there was a need to recognize the contribution of communion to personality. Moreover, he argued that cultural influences, which differ for women and men, result in women having more communal tendencies and men having more agentic orientations. Consistent with this, a number of studies have documented that women are more likely to possess traits such as being sympathetic and caring for others, while men are more likely to have characteristics such as self-reliance and assertiveness (Hyde, 1996).

Since Bakan (1966), a number of other theorists have examined gender differences in personality and their basis. Miller (1976/1986) and others such as Lykes (1985), Schwalbe (1991) and Sampson (1993), suggest that gender differences in personality stem from a chronic power differential that allows men to dominate over women, which in turn results in men and women experiencing very different lives. Because the dominant group determines developmental norms, the subordinate group develops qualities that are deemed desirable by the dominant group, such as submissiveness and lack of initiative. Further, because they have to protect themselves from the dominant group, the subordinate group often knows more about the dominant group than vice versa, and often more than they know about themselves. Subordinates may also start to believe some of the untruths about themselves put forth by the dominant group (e.g., women are weaker than men are). In line with this account, Miller (1976/1986) argued that because women in our society occupy a position subordinate to men, women's sense of their identity and how they should behave is defined by the male determined beliefs of our culture. Because these beliefs include the notions that women should provide empathy and support to men, women tend to take responsibility for relationships (Miller, 1986). Men, on the other hand, are encouraged to be self-sufficient and self-reliant and, as a result, develop independent personalities.

A number of studies provide empirical evidence for this intergroup account of personality. Fiske (1993) presented compelling empirical evidence that those who are in the subordinate position attend more closely to the expectations of those belonging to the dominant group. Fiske (1993) outlined a series of studies carried out by her and her colleagues that have illustrated three points about those who are in a less powerful position. First, people pay more attention to those who control and pass judgement on their behaviour outcomes. Second, powerless people draw inferences from the information they gather about others. Lastly, and as a result, powerless people increase the variability of their impressions and are less likely to rely only on stereotypes as explanations for someone else's behaviour. Depret and Fiske (1993, cited in Fiske, 1993) in their study on power, found that undergraduates paid more attention to others who

were in the position to judge their performance on a task. When these superiors were from outside of the psychology department and their power was increased, the participants paid even more attention. In particular, the participants paid more attention to information that was not consistent with the stereotype of the other person. As the stakes increased in the study, the more the participants paid attention and the more careful they were in carrying out their tasks. Goodwin and Fiske (1993, cited in Fiske, 1993) found that when university undergraduates were given the chance to evaluate high school students' job applications, they spent less time on each individual application when their percentage of power in the decision increased.

Moskowitz, Suh and Desaulniers (1994) provided further evidence of the importance of power differentials between members of dominant and subordinate groups, namely bosses and employees. Moskowitz et al., approached the issue of possible gender differences in agency and communion by examining men and women's behaviour in the workforce. Agency involves striving for mastery, power and the pursuit of individuation, and like the notion of independence it is supposed to be more common in men's behaviour than in women's. Communion involves striving for intimacy and union with others, being agreeable, and is expected to be more common in women's behaviour than in men's. Based on this premise, Moskowitz et. al., expected to find that women used more communal approaches to their work with others and men used more agentic approaches. In addition, however, they also predicted that whether or not the person was a superior or subordinate would affect their dealing with others. The results supported their hypotheses. Although women reported more communal behaviour and men reported more agentic behaviour, their position in the company had an impact on their behaviour. Being a supervisor was associated with more agentic behaviours, such as self-assertion and people reported more submissiveness toward their bosses than co-workers regardless of gender. This study again illustrates the importance of the social structure and how power differentials may bring out different behaviours regardless of gender.

Chodorow (1978) provides yet another theoretical account of gender differences in the self. Adopting a feminist object relations perspective in the psychoanalytic tradition,

Chodorow (1978) pointed to the effects of women's role as mothers on the development of personality. Because women do virtually all of the mothering in our society, girls and boys have different relational experiences during infancy. Because girls are the same sex as their mothers and their mothers provide a model for feminine behaviour, girls do not have to differentiate themselves from their mother in order to develop a sense of self. Boys, however, need to break away from their mothers to successfully develop their masculine identity. As a solution to this one-sided and off-balanced development Chodorow suggests that men should become more proactive in raising their children. According to Chodorow (1978), then, gender differences in infancy results in an emphasis on the communal or relational self of women and the agent or independent self of men.

Stiver (1983/1991) explored the concept of dependency and the tendency to see it as both a negative and feminine characteristic. The term dependency is at odds with the developmental aim of independence and as a result to see a person as dependent is to see them as deficient and childlike (Green, 1990). Stiver (1983/1991) stated that when men behave in a self-sufficient way they are regarded as independent, but when women act this way, they are seen as compensating for their more basic dependency. Women develop in the context of relationships and therefore can experience independence as lonely and isolating (Stiver, 1983/1991). Stiver defined dependency in a very different way, suggesting it be regarded as no more than a state whereby one counts on someone else for their expertise or experience when one is lacking in that specific area. Dependence, therefore, can be viewed as enhancing and empowering the self and part of normal growth. In this respect, being relational is healthy rather than pathological. As Bowlby (1969, cited in Stern, 1990), put it:

Paradoxically, the truly self-reliant person when viewed in this light proves to be by no means as independent as cultural stereotypes suppose.

An essential ingredient is a capacity to rely trustingly on others when occasion demands and to know on whom it is appropriate to rely. (p. 84)

While there is no empirical evidence for Chodorow's (1978) psychoanalytic speculations regarding the origin of the gendered self, there is a good deal of evidence for the role of socialization experiences more generally. In a review of this research, Cross and Madson (1997) documented a number of ways that socialization could affect the self. For example, parents may treat their daughters and sons differently (Fivush, 1992, as cited in Cross & Madson, 1997) and as a result they grow up with different expectations as to how they should think about themselves and act accordingly to those beliefs. Research has shown that girls are taught to be more in tune with theirs and others emotions than boys are. Also, parents have been shown to label and express more emotions with their daughters than with their sons (Kuebli & Fivush, cited in Cross & Madson, 1997). The authors further argue that this sensitivity to emotions plays a pivotal role in the development of a relational self-construal for girls and how girls and women continue to develop their skills on an emotional basis in order to maintain close relationships. Cross and Madson (1997) also reviewed the literature discussing the expression of emotion. This research suggested that parents respond more positively to girls expressing sadness rather than anger, but for boys there was no positive response to their sadness. Girls were also encouraged not to openly express their anger in a close relationship, but rather to work toward re-establishing the relationships, but boys were not encouraged as often to do so. These types of experiences for girls would encourage them to develop empathic relationships with others and not express their anger at others, as this would be seen as damaging to a relationship. Lastly, their review of aggression revealed that for girls, direct aggression is not encouraged as it is for boys, particularly physical aggression. Boldizar, Perry, and Perry's (1989, cited in Cross & Madson, 1997) research on boy's and girl's aggression, showed that girls were more concerned about the welfare of the target of the aggression, whereas the boys were more concerned with controlling the target of the aggression. It would appear that for girls and women, the use of direct aggression is contrary to their relational self-construal and is at odds with their position of being mainly concerned with others. As a result of this socialization, girls and

boys learn that there are particular ways in which it is acceptable for them to act and as a consequence this shapes their sense of self.

There are many social expectations for women and men to fulfill in their lives (e.g., occupations) and these expectations that could affect people's self-construals. However, Martin and Ruble (1997) pointed out that the evidence for effect of socialization on the self is far from consistent. They describe Lytton and Romney's (1991, cited in Martin & Ruble, 1997) meta analysis of hundreds of studies that did not support the conclusion that parents treat girls and boys differently. This research suggested that this differential treatment only takes place in the encouragement of gender-related toys. Also, the authors described research (Huston, 1983) that concluded that the type of parent may have more of an influence rather the differential treatment of girls and boys. For instance, parents who were warm and moderately controlling had children who tended to be more communal and showed more feminine behaviours. Parents who were more demanding and controlling had children who demonstrated more masculine and agentic behaviours. However, Martin and Ruble (1997) pointed out the weaknesses in the evidence that they presented and acknowledged that more research may be needed in this area for clarification. However, it does not mean that socialization does not have an impact on women and men developing different self-construals, with women being more relational and men being more independent.

Building on the idea of socialization, Eagly (1983) developed her social role theory of personality development. Like Miller, (1986) and others (i.e, Lykes, 1985; Sampson, 1993; and Schwalbe, 1991), Eagly's (1983) social role theory draws attention to the effects of one's relative social position on personality. The traits that people were expected to have were inferred from their social role more than their gender, but because the division of labour is stratified by gender, we assume and expect people to have personalities consistent with their gendered roles. Eagly and Steffen (1984) presented two reasons for women and men having different social roles. First, women are more likely than men to hold lower positions in the hierarchies of status and authority. Second, women are more likely than men to be homemakers and therefore less likely to be in the

paid workforce. These different social roles may lead to women forming a more communal social role and a commitment to maintaining harmony and positive feelings among members of their group, whereas, men would develop a more independent social role that does not emphasis relationships and harmony. Eagly and Steffen (1984) demonstrated in their research that when participants were given a brief description about a male or female who was either employed, a homemaker or had no designated occupation, and asked to indicate how agentic or communal that person was, they reverted to gendered stereotypes in their assignment. Those who were described as homemakers were rated by the participants as high in communion and low in agency (stereotypically female) and those who were described as being employed were rated by the participants as low in communion and high in agency (stereotypically male). The authors concluded that the role of homemaker was the most salient feature of the description, not whether or not the person described was male or female. This is an example whereby the social role was influenced by its place in the hierarchy of power and status. The role of homemaker was more important than the gender of the person performing the task, and the role of homemaker was considered lower in status than that of a person who is employed. Eagly presented her social role theory as an explanation for the differences in women and men's social behaviour and her research provided support for the importance of social roles and their effect on gender roles.

In their paper on self-concepts, Markus and Oyserman (1988), reiterated many of the points outlined above and concluded that there is a fundamental difference in the way women and men perceive themselves and the world around them. And in a subsequent paper, Markus and Cross (1990) reviewed a large body of literature to explore the many ways that a sense of self "can be considered an interpersonal creation" (p. 577). Despite the focus on the individual in psychology, they discovered a long history of interest in the role of others in the development of the self-concept, a history going back to James in 1890 and continuing to the present. Markus and Wurf (1987), for example, described the self-concept as a system of self-schemas or generalizations about the self derived from past social experiences, experiences that, by definition, include others. Likewise,

Baldwin (1992) wrote that "the role of internalized relationships in defining and maintaining the sense of self has been generally under emphasized" (p. 461).

Regardless of whether one regards gender differences in the self as being due to intergroup power differentials, gender differences in infants' experiences with their primary caregivers, gender differences in socialization or gender differences in schematic information processing, there is good reason to believe that such differences exist. In this regard, Gilligan (1982) was among the early researchers to observe and comment on the distinction between women's relational self and men's autonomous self.

In her research on moral reasoning, Gilligan (1982) found that women responded to moral dilemmas in a relational way in terms of "seeing the world that coheres through human connection rather than through systems of rules" (p. 29). Gilligan (1982) discussed three studies that exemplified the differences between women and men. In one study, 25 college students who had taken a course on moral and political choice were interviewed shortly after they took the course and again five years later. During the first interview she discovered that women based their responses to the Heinz dilemma (whether or not Heinz should steal the drug to save his dying wife), in terms of their sense of responsibility to others. Whereas, men's responses concerned weighing individual's rights against one another. When these college students were interviewed five years later, they were asked to describe who they were and what they were like. The women answered in terms of the relationships that were important in their lives, while the men described themselves using adjectives of separation (e.g., intelligent, logical) and in terms of their achievements since college. When men did mention other people it was simply as a qualification of who they were.

In another study, Gilligan found that the issues of morality for 24 women contemplating an abortion, were explicitly tied to issues of relationships and their conflicting responsibilities to the various people involved. Gilligan (1982) also reported on the results of a study that involved 144 women and men aged six to sixty. Even as early as the age of eleven, these girls and boys approached the Heinz dilemma from different perspectives: While girls emphasized the network of relationships and

responsibilities to others, boys used logical deduction to resolve competing claims and rights. As a result of these findings, Gilligan (1982) claimed that women were more likely to base their moral judgments on an "ethic of care" that involved considering others needs in their own terms, being responsible to others, and considering the personal and social context of the dilemma. Men, on the other hand, were more likely to resolve moral dilemmas based on an "ethic of justice" that involved abstract, decontextualized values and individual rights. This research provided an alternative to Kohlberg's androcentric theory of moral development, which was based on his longitudinal study of 84 males (Kohlberg, 1958, cited in Gilligan, 1982) and which often made women appear deficient in their moral reasoning because, unlike men, they often failed to go beyond the third of Kohlberg's six stages of moral development. Note that Gilligan did not regard women's or men's moral reasoning as superior to the other, but simply as differences resulting from gender differences in socialization.

Lyons (1983) conducted the first rigorous empirical test of the relation between the relational versus independent nature of the self and care versus justice oriented moral reasoning. In this study 14 men and 16 women whose ages ranged from eight to over 60, Lyons asked about moral dilemmas that they themselves had experienced and how they viewed and resolved these dilemmas. Lyons' results revealed that most women described themselves in relational terms (10 of 16) and used an ethic of care (12 of 16) to solve their moral dilemmas. Most men described themselves in terms descriptive of separation (11 of 14) and used an ethic of justice (11 of 14) to resolve their dilemmas. Further, and as Lyons predicted, those who defined themselves in relational terms more frequently used an ethic of care to resolve their personal moral dilemmas, whereas those who defined themselves in separate terms more frequently used an ethic of justice. In view of these findings, Lyons concluded that women have a more relational sense of self and men have a more independent sense of self. Although gender may predispose a person toward a certain sense of self and/or a particular moral orientation, these reactions are by no means absolute.

While the above research documented the relation between self-construals and moral reasoning, Lykes (1985) explored the relations between the self, social responsibility, and experiences of collective activities in her study with 54 white women and 30 white men. Lykes' analyses revealed that women who integrated the images in the Rorschach test also perceived social dimensions in the Thematic Apperception Test, expressed a more collective ideology and described the resolution to moral dilemmas with themes of social responsibility. However, men's responses to the various measures were not consistently correlated. For men, there was either no connection between their measure of ideology and their perceptual test or that relationship was negative (as between the ideology and social responsibility measures). Follow-up interviews (only with the women) showed that the women who took part in collective activities described themselves in terms of their relatedness to others. The author noted that it was women who were from lower status occupations were the most likely to see the importance of the connection between relationships with others and working toward a common goal for the betterment of everyone. This research demonstrated that women's relational sense of self affected their behaviour beyond their close relationships into the arena of collective activities.

As a result of the theory and research of Bakan (1966), Miller (1976), Chodorow (1978) and Gilligan (1982), there has been growing criticism of personality theories that regard the goal of development as becoming an independent, fully individuated. The major concern of this criticism is that the relational development of people's sense of self has been ignored, devalued and even deemed pathological by traditional developmental theorists. As Gilligan (1977) put it "there seems to be a line of development missing from current depictions of adult development, a failure to describe the progression of relationships toward a maturity of interdependence...the reality of continuing connection is lost or relegated to the background" (p. 155).

Using an approach similar to Lyons (1983), Stern (1990) interviewed 23 young girls, who were between the ages of 11 and 16, over a three year period. When these girls were asked to describe themselves to themselves, their most common response involved their relational style and relational skills (e.g., caring for others, being a good listener) rather

than their personal qualities or achievements. Further, although these girls were concerned with becoming more independent and more their own person, their descriptions of independence departed from the conventional definition of independence as being autonomous. Instead, while these girls regarded independence as a way to recognize how they were different from others, they also believed that this recognition would help enhance their relationships with others. As Stern (1990, p. 85) put it, the girls felt independence gave them "an enhanced capacity to look outside themselves and attend to others."

Cross and Madson (1997) conducted an extensive review of the literature regarding gender and self-construals and the impact of these self-construals on cognition, motivation, emotion and social behaviour. In terms of cognition, and as illustrated above (e.g., Stern, 1990), women have been found to describe themselves in primarily relational terms. Cate and Sugawara (1986, cited in Cross & Madson, 1997), for example, found that women were more likely to give positive evaluations to personality dimensions such as likability and sociability, which are characteristic of a relational self-construal. Men, however were more likely to give positive evaluations to personality dimensions such as power and self-sufficiency, which are more characteristics of an independent self-construal.

In the area of motivation, Cross and Madson (1997) reviewed the research that examined people's self-related motivations for enhancing their well-being. It was shown that for women, feeling good about themselves would come from developing and maintaining close ties with others, whereas for men, feeling good about themselves would come from being independent and self-reliant. Also, strategies for self-enhancement appear to be different for women and men. For example, Heatherington, Daubman, Bates, Brown and Preston (1993, cited in Cross & Madson, 1997) reported that female college students were more modest than male college students in a setting where they revealed their grade point averages. For women, being modest was a way of not hurting other people's feelings, something men were not concerned with.

In the area of being sensitive to and displaying emotions, Cross and Madson's review illustrated that women were more sensitive to others' emotions and more likely to outwardly display their emotions through facial expressions. Relative to men, women also share their emotions with more people (Rime, Mesquita, Phillipot, & Boca, 1992, cited in Cross and Madson, 1997), unless this emotion involves anger, which might threaten a relationship. In regard to social behaviour, Cross and Madson (1997) noted that, in order to maintain their autonomy, men were less likely than women to disclose emotional information within a relationship (Dindia & Allen, 1992, cited in Cross & Madson, 1997). Based on their review of such research, Madson and Cross (1997) concluded that women were more likely than men to display characteristics that were more relational and that these characteristics might account for gender differences in a number of domains, including cognition, emotion and social behaviour.

In sum, there have been various explanations for gender differences in self-construals. These explanations have included an imbalance in power between women and men (Miller, 1976/1986; Sampson, 1993), women being the predominant caregivers (Chodorow, 1978), socialization (Cross & Madson, 1997), and social role theory (Eagly, 1983). Each of these theoretical perspectives explains why women and men could develop different self-construals, with women having more relational self-construals and men having more independent self-construals. Evidence was presented that gender differences in self-construals can impact on a number of areas. These areas included moral reasoning (Gilligan, 1982; Lyons, 1983), self-descriptions (Stern, 1990), cognition, motivation and social behaviour (Cross & Madson, 1997). While gender differences in self-construals may account for the differences in the areas outlined above, there is another potential explanation, namely culture. The next section will discuss the potential influences of culture on self-construals.

Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives on Culture and the Self

Although individualism is central to the concept of the self in the Western world, this is not true in all countries. Guisinger and Blatt (1994) argued that many cultures do not depict the individual as separate from her or his relationships. The emphasis on

individualism leads to a distorted view of development and the misunderstanding and disregarding of the beliefs of non-western cultures. Indeed, an increasing voluminous literature indicates that the concept of individualism is at odds with many cultural expectations. As Markus and Kitayama (1994a) put it “the cultural ideals and moral imperatives of a given cultural group are given life by a diverse set of customs, norms, scripts, practices, and institutions that carry out the transformation of the collective reality into the largely personal or psychological reality” (p. 571). Each culture defines what a person is to be (Markus and Kitayama, 1994b). When one behaves according to cultural mores, one experiences good feelings and vice versa.

Fiske, Kitayama, Markus and Nesbitt (1998) further discussed the importance of cultural influences and that social psychology has often ignored these influences and centred on the individual as a single analytical unit. Processes that were once thought as basic to every human are now seen as varying across cultures. Cultural expectations and interactions within that culture shape all these processes, including cognition, emotions and motivation.

Markus, Mullally and Kitayama (1998) discussed the importance of recognizing cultural influences on self-construals. As they put it “sociocultural understandings and practices will influence the form and function of the psychological processes that comprise the self—what people notice and think about, what they feel moved to do, what they feel, and how they organize, understand and give meaning to their experiences” (p. 27). They further suggested that everyone’s sense of self is a culture-specific one that develops as one adapts to their environment and all experiences are at both the individual and cultural levels. Due to these shared experiences people from the same culture will be more alike in their responses to others in comparison to those from different cultures. Markus et al. (1997) suggested that a person’s sense of self is constructed through constant interaction with cultural practices and therefore the content and structure of the self may vary according to the cultural context in which it develops.

In their extensive review of the literature, Markus and Kitayama (1991) documented evidence for two distinct cultural views on the nature of the self, namely the differences

interdependent (relational) and independent (individual) self-construals. According to Markus and Kitayama (1991) these self-construals are the "overarching schemata of the individual's self-system. These construals recruit and organize the more specific self-regulatory schemata" (p. 230). As shown in Table 1, Markus and Kitayama outlined the in the definition, structure, important features, tasks, role of others, and basis of self-esteem between an independent and interdependent self-construal.

The interdependent self-construal involves having flexible and fluid boundaries, whereas an independent self-construal has boundaries that are fixed and stable. Fiske et al. (1998) added that an interdependent self-construal is committed to being bound to others rather than unattached. Important features of an interdependent self are the emphasis on external and public roles, which revolve around relationships, unlike an independent self, which revolves around the importance of private thoughts and concerns. Markus and Kitayama (1991) describe the tasks for an individual with an interdependent self-construal as fitting in with others and carrying out appropriate actions in social settings. For people with independent self-construals, their tasks involved being unique, expressing their own opinions and concentrating on their own attributes. The role of others has different implications for the two self-construals. For one with a independent self-construal, others are important for self-evaluation and social comparisons. Relationships are often seen as competing with individual needs and goals and group pressures are seen to interfere with these goals (Markus et al., 1997). For the interdependent self-construal, people define themselves in relation to others and using specific contexts to define themselves. Also, the interdependent person also evaluates their life in terms of how much of a contribution they have made to the collective needs of those around them (Markus et al., (1997). Lastly, the basis of self-esteem for those with interdependent self-construals rests on their ability to conform, and maintain harmony with others and respond to the goals of the group. For those with an independent self-construal, self-esteem is based on their ability to express their own uniqueness and to validate their own attributes (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Table 1

Characteristics of Independent and Interdependent Self-Construals

Feature compared	Independent self	Interdependent self
Structure	Bounded, unitary, stable	Flexible, variable
Important features	Internal, private (abilities, thoughts, feelings)	External, public (statuses, roles, relationships)
Tasks	Be unique, express oneself Realize internal attributes	Belong, fit-in, occupy one's proper place Engage in appropriate actions
Definition	Separate from social context Promote own goals Be direct, "say what's on your mind"	Connected with social context Promote others' goals Be indirect: "read other's mind"
Role of others	Self-evaluation: others important for social comparison, reflected appraisal	Self-definition: relationships with others, specific contexts define the self
Basis of self-esteem	Ability to express self, validate internal attributes	Ability to adjust, restrain oneself, maintain harmony within social context

Note. Adapted from Markus and Kitayama (1991, p.230).

Interdependent selves are evident in such cultures, as the Chinese, Japanese and Hindus, whereby core conceptions of the self are reflected in the person's most significant relationships. It is, for example, the Japanese cultural norm to subordinate individual needs to the needs of the family and society. To have one's sense of belonging to family, or in a larger context to community, jeopardized, is significant (Bradshaw, 1990). According to Markus and Kitayama, this interdependence does not imply that people do not have a sense of themselves. Indeed, it requires self-control and agency to continually monitor ongoing situations and adapt accordingly. The independent self-construal, in contrast, is concerned with attending to the self, asserting oneself and being autonomous, along the lines of Western ideals. Our North American culture, for example, takes the position that the less one relies on others, either friends or family, the healthier one is.

Several researchers have explored whether the type of self-construal one had would be reflected in their self-descriptions. Cross, Kanagawa, Markus and Kitayama (1995, cited in Markus et al., 1997) studied the differences in Japanese and American students' responses to the Twenty Statements Test, which requires participants to finish twenty statements that start with "I am" across four different social contexts (alone, with a friend, in a classroom and in a professor's office). Across all four situations the Japanese students were more likely to describe themselves in terms of preferences and in terms of everyday activities. The American students were more likely to use psychological attributes in their characterizations of themselves. The authors concluded that the Japanese students offered descriptions of themselves that would not invite comparisons with others and therefore are nonthreatening in a relational way. Further, Cross et al. found that the Japanese students used the context of the situation in order to give an appropriate response in their self-descriptions, whereas the American students did not change their self-descriptions across the different contexts. The authors concluded that the Japanese students were paying attention to the situation in order to comply with that particular social context and gave responses that could fulfill their relational need to fit in

and not appear different. These results supported Markus and Kitayama's (1991) delineation of two self-construals and how the expression for each self-construal is different.

Rhee, Uleman, Lee and Roman (1995) observed cross-cultural differences in self-construals. Their sample of university students from Seoul, Korea and New York City also completed the Twenty Statements Test. The authors predicted that the students from New York would use descriptions that were more autonomous and abstract and the Korean students would use descriptions that were more social and specific. Their results partially supported their predictions. In line with their predictions, American students used more pure traits and emotional states that fit the abstract and autonomous categories, while Korean students used more specific attributes and global descriptions. Contrary to their predictions, the American students used more social identity and physical attribute terms in their self-descriptions. Rhee et al., (1995) suggested that the American students might have used more social terms because of the diversity of the sample of American participants: 53% were Asian Americans, African Americans and Latinos. The authors pointed out that when these groups were together their social identity may have been more salient due to the differences among them, and this is what prompted intergroup comparisons. Despite this unexpected outcome in Rhee et al.'s (1995) study, it is partial support for the influence of culture on self-construals and how people with different self-construals describe themselves.

Singelis (1994) in his development of his Self-Construal Scale examined whether or not there would be cultural differences on the two components of his scale, namely the independent and interdependent components. Singelis conducted two studies with students at a Hawaiian university (364 and 165 students, respectively). His research revealed that the two components of self-construal were distinct and representative of their underlying concepts. Asian American students reported higher levels of agreement with the items forming the interdependent self-construal subscale than Caucasian Americans. Caucasian American students had higher scores on the independent self-construal subscale than Asian American students. Singelis (1994) concluded that the two

groups of students endorsed items on his scale that were descriptive of their self-construals, namely independent and interdependent. The above three studies provided support for the existence of Markus and Kitayama's (1991) culturally based self-construals and how people describe themselves differently based on these self-construals. Those with relational self-construals (e.g., Japanese, Koreans) described themselves in more context specific terms, whereas those with independent self-construals (e.g., Americans) described themselves in more autonomous and unique terms.

In their extensive review of the literature, Markus and Kitayama (1991) examined the impact of self-construals in three areas, namely cognition, emotion and motivation. In the area of cognition, Markus and Kitayama concluded that Western people with independent self-construals had more distinct self-knowledge, whereas Eastern students with relational self-construals had more knowledge about others (Kitayama, Markus, Tummala, Kurokawa, & Kato, 1990, cited in Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Shweder and Bourne (1984, cited in Markus & Kitayama, 1991), for example, explored potential differences in people's knowledge of others by asking Americans and Indians to describe people who were close to them. The results revealed that, despite differences in education, social class or literacy abilities, the Indian participants tended to describe others in situation specific and relational terms, American participants, on the other hand, described others in terms of behaviours that were specific to the person. Shweder and Bourne found that 46% of the Americans' descriptions were context-free compared to only 20% of the Indians' descriptions. Given these findings, Shweder and Bourne (1984) concluded that the context and relational aspects of another person were more important for the Indian than the American respondents.

In terms of emotions, one study revealed that American relative to Japanese participants reported experiencing their emotions longer and more intensely (Matsumoto, Kudoh, Shcherer & Wallbott, 1988, cited in Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Americans also reported that they had more bodily symptoms (e.g., lump in the throat) than the Japanese. Lastly, when asked how they would cope with these emotions, more Japanese than American students said they would do nothing. This may indicate that people with

interdependent self-construals are more aware of the emotions others experience, rather than concentrating on their own emotions. Further, people with interdependent self-construals have been found to be very adept picking up the emotions that are other- rather than self-focused and people with independent self-construals may be noted to focus more on their own emotions (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Lastly, Markus and Kitayama's review indicated different selves might have different motives. Markus and Kitayama (1992, cited in Markus & Kitayama, 1991) conducted a study where both Japanese and American students were given questionnaires containing "false uniqueness" statements. The students were asked questions such as how many other students on campus would be smarter than they were. American students indicated that only 30% of other students would be smarter, while Japanese students indicated that at least 50% would be smarter or have more of other traits and abilities. In this instance, the desire for uniqueness could have led the American students to see themselves as different or better than others, while the Japanese students did not have this desire.

Fiske et al., (1998) in their review of the literature on culture and self-construals, examined the effects of culture on moral judgements. Iwas (1990, cited in Fiske et al., 1998) compared the responses of Japanese and Americans to the Heinz dilemma. Iwas found that for the Japanese participants, the dilemma was viewed in terms of human relationships, which reflected a relational approach to the dilemma. American participants viewed the dilemma in terms of a conflict between two rights, the right to property and the right to life. This would be more reflective of an independent approach to the dilemma. This research provides support for the impact of different self-construals on moral reasoning.

In sum, the notion that individualism is a universal one has been disregarded as the influence of culture has been taken into the research equation. Markus and Kitayama (1991) have delineated two different types of self-construals, namely independent and interdependent. The independent self-construal is more indicative of a Western ideal of the self and the interdependent self-construal is more indicative of a collective ideal (e.g., Japanese, Chinese and Hindu cultures). Cross et al., (1995, cited in Markus et al., 1997),

Rhee et al., (1995) and Singelis (1994) through their research provided evidence for the existence of the two distinct self-construals. Markus and Kitayama (1991) provided evidence for the effects of culturally influenced self-construals on emotion, cognition and motivation. Fiske et al., (1998) examined the influence of these self-construals on moral reasoning. The next step in this process is to examine the evidence that would provide a link between self-construals and well-being.

Self-Construals and Well-Being

Several studies have examined the relation between self-construals and well-being, as well as the impact of gender and culture on this relation. As will be discussed below, women's relational self-construal contributes to their self-esteem, just as men's, independent self-construal contributes to their self-esteem.

Josephs, Markus and Tafarodi (1992) hypothesized that for men feeling good about oneself would derive from being independent, and separate and better than others, whereas for women, feeling good should arise from being sensitive to and connected with others. All three of their studies compared women and men who had low or high self-esteem and their results supported their hypotheses.

In the first correlational study of 43 male and 47 female college students, the authors predicted that men with high self-esteem were more likely to perceive themselves as having unique attributes than men with low self-esteem or women with either low or high self-esteem. Students were asked to think of their best overall skill and a skill that they thought they were good at in each of four domains, namely social, athletic, academic and creative. Students then rated the importance of each of those skills to their view of themselves and the percentage of other students who were also very good at the same skill. As predicted, men who had high self-esteem gave lower percentages of other students who would be as good as themselves at the same skill and their percentages were significantly lower than those of men with low self-esteem and women with either high or low self-esteem. The authors interpreted these findings to indicate that men with high self-esteem were concerned with maintaining a view of themselves as distinct and unique from others.

In their second correlational study, the authors predicted that women with high self-esteem would remember words that were encoded with respect to others more than women with low self-esteem or men with low or high self-esteem. Thirty men and 35 women were given 48 target words orally and asked to embed the words in one of four sentences where: 1) the participant had to be in the sentence with the target word; 2) the group they felt they affiliated with the most had to interact with the target word; 3) their best friend had to interact with the word; and 4) Ronald Reagan had to interact with the word. After a filler task, participants completed a recall task for the target words. The results revealed that, for all of the participants, the target words used in the self-referent sentence were recalled the most and the target words used in the Ronald Reagan sentences were recalled the least. Further, high self-esteem women and men recalled significantly more self-referent target words than the low self-esteem women and men. Also, women with high self-esteem recalled more target words from the best friend and their own group condition than women with low self-esteem and men with high or low self-esteem. And finally, as expected, women with high self-esteem were better at remembering words that had been used in sentences that were more relational in nature.

Joseph et al., (1992) conducted one more study in order to examine the relation between women's and men's sense of self and self-esteem. In this study, 93 students received false feedback regarding their performance on a bogus standardized test called the "polysomical" interpretation (PI) test. Students were told the test measured two factors, a person's ability for independent thinking and how motivated they were to distinguish themselves from others (an A score) and the person's capability to be an interdependent thinker and how attuned and responsive they were to the needs of others (a B score). The students were randomly given one of four scores, a high or low PLA score and a high or low PIB score. After students received their feedback, they were asked to estimate how well they would do if they were given a second chance at the same test. Women with high self-esteem who were given a low PIB score predicted they would obtain a higher score than those women with low self-esteem and men with low or high self-esteem. Men with high self-esteem who were given a low PLA score predicted they

would score higher than men with low self-esteem and women with low or high self-esteem. On the basis of this pattern of self-enhancing biases, the authors concluded that the women were concerned with maintaining connection and good relations with others, whereas the men were concerned with individuation and maintaining distinctiveness and uniqueness from others.

Block and Robins (1993) conducted a longitudinal study examining the personality factors associated with the self-esteem of girls and boys from early adolescence to young adulthood. Forty-four males and 47 females were tested three times, when they were 14, 18, and finally at 23. Block and Robins had the participants perform two q-sort procedures on a set of personality characteristics, once representing how they actually felt about themselves and a second representing how they ideally would like to be. The discrepancy between the two q-sorts represented a self-esteem score. At each testing session, four psychologists described each of the participants by doing a q-sort of personality characteristics using the California Adult Q-set (Block, 1961, as cited in Block & Robins, 1993).

Analyses of these data revealed that, at fourteen, girls who were protective, humorous, sympathetic and generous (according to the psychologists) had high self-esteem, while girls who were critical, hostile, anxious and generally negative tended to have low self-esteem. Among boys, those who were anxious, fantasized and daydreamed had low self-esteem and those who were calm, relaxed, not socially anxious and satisfied had high self-esteem. Although the exact personality characteristics that correlated with self-esteem were not given for the age of eighteen, the authors stated that characteristics were very similar to those at age 23. At 23, higher self-esteem scores were associated with interpersonal connectedness and the ability to relate to others for the young women. For young men, self-esteem was related to being unemotional, uninvolved and being distant from others. Central to males' positive self-identification was the ability to control social anxiety to enable them to function effectively. In general terms, over the period of time, the males' self-esteem increased and the females' decreased. The change in self-esteem over time for girls was related to interpersonal characteristics that reflected

warmth and a communal orientation, while for boys, the change predominantly involved characteristics that focused on the self.

Aube, Norcliffe, Craig, and Koestner (1995) examined the ability of the Masculinity Model to predict adjustment-related outcomes when gender role characteristics are taken into consideration. The Masculinity Model assumes that the attitudes, characteristics and behaviours traditionally associated with a male gender role contribute positively to well-being. As the authors stated, however, the model does not take into account gender characteristics that are central to interpersonal functioning. In other words, the model is missing a relational component. Aube et al., conducted a study with 81 couples, female roommates, male roommates, and 28 romantic couples who were either married or living together for more than three months. The participants' feminine and masculine traits were measured with the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1984). Participants also completed a questionnaire assessing their beliefs in sex-role behaviours. Well-being was assessed by measuring life satisfaction, positive and negative affective states, the quality of their relationship with their roommate (dyadic adjustment) and the quality of their social interactions with each other.

The results from a regression analyses revealed that, for both women and men, higher scores on masculine traits were associated with higher levels of life satisfaction, more positive affect and better dyadic adjustment. For men, but not for women, high feminine trait scores were related to better dyadic adjustment. For both men and women, feminine traits were positively related to the experience of pleasant interpersonal emotions. For women and men, higher scores on masculine behaviours were related to higher levels of negative affect and for women it also led to lower levels of sharing with their partners. However, for women it was a higher level of feminine behaviours, not traits, which were related to more satisfying dyadic interactions. Given these findings, the authors concluded that people who are expressive and interpersonally orientated have interactions that involved more sharing and contributed positively to the relationship than those who were not expressive. The authors have illustrated that the important role of

feminine traits and behaviours, which are indicative of a relational self, have rarely been considered in terms of their impact on well-being.

In sum, then, the findings of Josephs et al., (1992) illustrated that uniqueness is more important to men than women and that women are better able than men to recall words encoded with respect to others. In addition, that for women with high self-esteem self-enhancement came through wanting to increase their connectedness with others, whereas for men it was in maintaining their individuality. Block and Robins' (1993) findings also suggested that by young adulthood, different characteristics predicted self-esteem. Men's self-esteem is tied to their autonomy, whereas women's self-esteem is related to their connectedness with others. Aube et al., (1995) demonstrated that relational characteristics such as being emotionally expressive and interpersonally oriented contributed positively to relationships. These findings, then, suggest that gender differences in self-construals could contribute differently to their sense of well-being.

Just as gender and the self affect well-being, so too do culture and the self affect well-being. Kitayama, Markus, Matsumoto and Norasakkunkit (1997) explored the process of self-enhancement and self-criticism with students in the United States and Japan, and with an additional group of Japanese students who were temporarily studying in the United States. Students were asked to generate situations that would either increase or decrease their self-esteem. Their results revealed that for the Japanese in Japan, more failure rather than success situations were regarded as relevant to their self-esteem. The American students chose more success situations as relevant and indicated that their self-esteem would rise more in these success situations than it would decrease in failure situations. For the Japanese students in America, their self-esteem would decrease more in failure situations than it would rise in success situations. These results were the strongest in those situations that were indigenous to that particular culture. The need for self-enhancement for American students fits within the idealization of the individual, in that for one to be unique they would be more successful and therefore be different from others. For Japanese students, the attention paid to failure would be more indicative of a relational self-construal as this self-criticism was the strongest in situations that were

indigenous to their own culture (e.g., involving others). As Markus et al., (1997) put it, this self-criticism is important for pointing out one's shortcomings in order to improve one's behaviour to meet the expectations of the relationship in question.

Kwan, Bond and Singelis (1997) examined the importance of relationship harmony and self-esteem in predicting life satisfaction. In their study, harmony was considered to be the balance that exists within a relationship, a concept that would be of particular importance for those with an interdependent self-construal. Their results revealed that relationship harmony was relatively more important than self-esteem in predicting the life satisfaction for students in Hong Kong, while self-esteem was more important in predicting the life satisfaction of students in the United States. The researchers also measured the participants' self-construals and found that the effect of an independent self-construal on life satisfaction was mediated by self-esteem and that the effect of an interdependent self-construal on life satisfaction was mediated by relationship harmony. Although, there were no cultural differences in this finding, the students in Hong Kong had significantly higher interdependence scores and American students had significantly higher independence scores. This study illustrated the connection between an independent self-construal and self-esteem and the connection between an interdependent self-construal and relationship harmony in prediction of life satisfaction, however, the cultural basis for these connections was not established.

In a study conducted with participants from 41 countries, Suh, Diener, Oishi and Triandis (1998) examined the relationship between the individualistic versus collective nature of each country, participants' emotions and life satisfaction. Their results revealed that emotions play a stronger role in the judgement of well-being in those countries that were more individualistic than collective. Students in a second study were also asked to answer the questions from the perspective of a culturally ideal person. This study revealed the same results: The life satisfaction of students from individualistic countries was based predominantly on emotions. However, students from collectivist countries paid equal attention to their own feelings and the ratings given to their culturally ideal person.

Lastly, Oishi, Diener, Lucas and Suh (1999) explored the question of how life satisfaction could vary across cultures depending upon salient cultural values. They anticipated that needs such as self-respect and freedom would be more important in individualistic countries. Their study included 56,446 respondents from 39 countries. Their results revealed that in wealthier countries, home life satisfaction was central to participants' overall life satisfaction, while in poorer countries, it was financial satisfaction was most important to life satisfaction. A second study conducted with students examined the same questions, but with the inclusion of an individualistic versus collective rating given to each country. The results showed that for individualistic countries, the association between satisfaction with freedom and life satisfaction was higher than in collectivist countries and this association was the strongest in wealthier nations. They concluded that "the degree to which satisfaction with esteem needs predicts global life satisfaction varies across cultures, depending on salient cultural values" (Oishi et al., 1999, p.989).

In sum, research on culture, self-construals and well-being has provided some support for the notion that different self-construals are shaped by cultural forces and that this in turn impacts on well-being. Kitayama et al., (1997) presented evidence that different culturally based self-construals impacted self-esteem. Kwan et al., (1997) demonstrated the connection between interdependent self-construals and relationship harmony and independent self-construals and self-esteem in predicting life satisfaction. Suh et al., (1998) revealed that for individuals from individualistic countries, it was their emotions that were most strongly linked to well-being, whereas those from collectivist countries paid equal attention to their own emotions and cultural norms. Lastly Oishi et al., (1999) demonstrated the importance of cultural values in predicting life satisfaction. What is missing from research, thus, far, however, is an examination of the effect of self-construals on the choice of everyday activities and how these activities, in turn, impact well-being.

Personal Projects Analysis and Well-Being

Personal Projects Analysis. Several methods have been developed to assess the relations between people's behaviour and their sense of well-being. These methods include Little's (1983) Personal Projects Analysis (PPA), Cantor and Kihlstrom's (1987) and Zirkel and Cantor's (1990) life tasks, Emmons' (1986; 1989) personal strivings, Karoly's (1991) Goal Systems Questionnaire, and Brunstein's (1993) Personal Goals. Each of these methods uses a slightly different approach to examine the characteristics of people's daily activities and goals that affect their well-being.

Each of these methods, however, has a different focus or structure than Little's (1983) PPA. Cantor and Kihlstrom (1987), for example, changed a portion of Little's PPA to examine people's activities at a time of life transition. In the Goal Systems Questionnaire Karoly (1991) converted Little's PPA, into a more traditional questionnaire format. Emmon's (1986; 1989) personal strivings approach is also very similar to PPA in that it assesses people's motivation for engaging in various activities. Brunstein's (1993) Personal Goals method is also like Little's PPA but has as its focus long-term goals rather than everyday activities. Given this, Little's PPA is clearly a viable method to assess the nature of people's everyday activities.

Little (1983) defined a personal project as a "set of interrelated acts extending over time" (p. 276). Asking people about the nature of the projects in which they are presently engaged provides a picture of what their daily lives entail. This method also ensures that the projects are personally relevant and meaningful (Little, 1993). As Little (1989, p. 16) wrote, the "substance and style of these endeavours, and how they are individually constructed and collectively managed, will reflect each person's specialized orientations and competencies." Little (1999) stated that "projects have inner representation as aspirations and goals, but they also have an external manifestation as observable acts" (p. 506). People's personal projects are constrained and aided by the opportunities within their surrounding environment. People also differ in respect to their choices (or non-choices) in personal projects, such as how large or small their projects are, the length of time required for any given project, and the number of ongoing projects.

Three factors guided the development of the methodology underlying PPA. First, it is based on the Kellian notion that we can best get to know what people's lives entail by asking them (Little, 1983). Second, it was designed to provide a systematic approach in order to allow for the comparison of project systems across individuals. Lastly, the modular approach of PPA was designed to allow the researcher to explore the uniqueness of any particular group.

In PPA, participants are asked to list as many activities or concerns that they foresee being involved in over the next few weeks (See Appendix B for the exact wording of the elicitation process). From this initial listing, ten projects listed on the Personal Projects Matrix (shown in Appendix B) are selected for further study and rated on various dimensions. Seventeen dimensions, developed on the basis of theoretical relevance and practicality, appear to capture the important components of personal projects. As presented in Table 2, these dimensions include enjoyment, value congruency, self-identity, stress, challenge, visibility, other's view, progress, outcome, initiation, and control among others. These dimensions are rated for their relevance to each individual projects on an eleven point scale. There are also two other dimensions, with whom and where the project will be carried out, that requires open-ended answers. Three or five factors appear to underlie the 17 standard PPA dimensions (Little, 1988). Little (1988) reported on an exploratory factor analysis that resulted in five factors, namely meaning, structure, community, efficacy and stress (see Table 2). However, earlier research revealed a three factor model, the factors being social meaning, personal meaning and stress (see Table 3). When these two factor models were subjected to a LISREL confirmatory factor analysis, both models were robust and fit the data. In the interest of parsimony, Little (1988) recommended using the three factor model.

When using PPA the researcher can analyze the data at either an ipsative or a normative level (Little, 1983). At an ipsative level, the researcher gains insight into what is going on within an individual's project system. For example, one could look at the impact of various projects on each other as well as the correlations between types of projects and various measures of personality and well-being. On a normative level,

Table 2

Five Factor Model of Standard PPA Dimensions

Factor	Standard PPA Dimensions
Meaning	Enjoyment, Value congruency, Self-identity, Absorption, Importance
Stress	Stress, Challenge, Difficulty
Community	Visibility, Others' view
Efficacy	Progress, Outcome
Structure	Initiation, Control, Time adequacy, Positive impact, Negative impact

Note. Adapted from Little (1988).

Table 3

Three Factor Model of Standard PPA Dimensions

Factor	Standard PPA Dimensions
Social Meaning	Project visibility, Others' view, Progress, Enjoyment, Time adequacy
Personal Meaning	Control, Initiation, Self-identity, Value congruency, Outcome, Positive impact, Importance, Absorption
Stress	Difficulty, Stress, Challenge

Note. Adapted from Little (1988).

groups of people with similar backgrounds can be brought together to identify what projects are more likely to be related to higher levels of well-being or what personality variables might be related to different types of projects for that particular group. The majority of work to date has been at the normative level, but some studies have been carried out at the ipsative level (e.g., Cameron, 1984). The ability to add dimensions and the choices in analyses shows that PPA "is not a fixed methodology and designed to be a flexible vehicle for appraising diverse aspects of human conduct" (Little, 1987, p. 233). One of the most common uses of PPA has been to identify the dimensions that predict the well-being of a variety of participants in many different situations. To date, research participants have included pregnant women (McKeen, 1984), Bangladesh university undergraduates (Chatterjee, 1981), elementary school students (Wilmot, 1993), student mothers (Burgess, 1982), Canadian undergraduates (e.g., Blake, 1994; Carver, 1988; Horley, 1984; McGregor, 1994; Oke, 1985), nurses (Barnes, 1986) and general community members (Mickelson, 1984; Palys, 1979; Palys & Little, 1983).

PPA and well-being. Researchers have used PPA to explore the project systems of different groups of people in varying situations and the characteristics of people's projects that are related to various indices of their emotional and physical well-being. Little (1999) stated "the central notion underlying current PAC perspectives on well-being is that human happiness and quality of life are intimately related to the content and appraisal of one's ongoing pursuits" (p. 514). In one of the earliest studies, Palys and Little (1983) examined the relationship between university students' personal projects systems and their life satisfaction. Based on their responses to one global question assessing life satisfaction, students who reported lower life satisfaction had more responsibility in initiating their projects and retained a large share of responsibility throughout the project. They also had projects they enjoyed less, found more difficult, had fewer projects that involved others and had less time than they would like on their projects. Participants with lower life satisfaction scores were also involved in more responsibility or nurturing projects, as indicated by the classification of their projects.

Students with higher life satisfaction scores, by comparison, tended to share project initiation and execution.

In 1984 Bowie-Reed also examined the relation between people's personal projects and their life satisfaction. Bowie-Reed divided her sample of university students into those who were high and low in their interest in relating to and being concerned with others. She found that students who were more socially orientated were more satisfied with life when their projects had more social and personal meaning. Those who were less socially orientated, on the other hand, were more satisfied with life when their projects were rated less depressing, stressful, and more hassle-free.

Subsequent studies by Little (1983, 1987, 1988, 1989) further explored these relations. Little (1987) found that, in a community sample, those projects that were higher in stress and difficulty and lower in time adequacy were associated with more depressive and anxious symptoms. Project stress was also a major predictor of university students' well-being. Little (1988) subsequently stated that project outcome, stress, difficulty, control and progress were the major correlates of life satisfaction. Little (1989) also concluded that the single best predictor of life satisfaction and depressive affect is anticipated project outcome, that is, the extent to which people believe that they are going to complete their projects successfully.

In a meta-analysis of 27 studies predominantly with university students, Wilson (1990) found that life satisfaction was associated with project systems that were low on stress and difficulty, under control, progressing well and expected to be successful. Together these dimensions accounted for as much as nineteen percent of the variance in life satisfaction.

When examining different types of projects, Little (1993) found that intrapersonal projects, (e.g., changing something about themselves), relative to interpersonal projects, were described as more onerous and demanding. Intrapersonal projects were also related to negative affect, were related to feelings of lack of control, less self-identity, more stress and difficulty and less chance of successfully completing the project, particularly if the individual was engaged in many intrapersonal projects.

Other researchers have also examined PPA's relation to well-being. Omodei and Wearing (1990), for example, used a slightly different approach to examine the connection between personal projects and subjective well-being. Instead of having participants rate their projects on the 17 standard PPA dimensions, they rated their projects directly onto various indices of well-being, including positive and negative affect, life satisfaction, achievement of needs and level of involvement. Need satisfaction and level of involvement accounted for a significant proportion of the variance in positive, but not negative, affect. They concluded that having projects that fulfilled certain needs and were involving promoted positive affect. When then they explored why people persist with their negative projects, participants' comments indicated that these projects were necessary in order to fulfill other needs, such as repairing an unsatisfactory relationship. Omodei and Wearing's study illustrates how a slightly different methodological use of PPA still documented the link between the nature of people's projects and their subjective well-being.

Ruehlman and Wolchik (1988) conducted a study using PPA, but only asked for four projects rather than the standard ten. They measured subjective well-being with the Mental Health Inventory (Veit & Ware, 1983), which measures both negative and positive affect. After factoring the project dimensions, they found that the three project factor scores accounted for 25% of positive affect and 23% of negative affect. Higher scores on project mastery (including progress, absorption, positive outcome) and project involvement (self-identification and self-initiation) were associated with greater subjective well-being, while higher scores on project strain (difficulty, stress, challenge and negative impact), were associated with lower ratings of subjective well-being.

As the above research illustrates, a PPA approach has captured significant relationships between project dimensions and subjective well-being. Indeed, this prior research has also shown that PPA has been able to explain a substantial amount of the variance in both psychological distress and life satisfaction even after personality factors such as Neuroticism, Extraversion and Openness (Costa & McCrae, 1985) have been considered. Little (1988), for example, reported that 21% of the variance in well-being

was explained by project dimensions after 28% of the variance had been explained by personality factors (see also Pychyl, 1995).

A Relational Analysis of Personal Projects Analysis

In 1991, Markus and Cross suggested that Little's (1983) personal projects approach has the potential to meaningfully consider the role of others, and ongoing interactions with others, in the workings of a person's self-system. While PPA may be a viable method with which to examine how individuals' personal projects involve efforts to maintain relationships or negotiate a sense of themselves across divergent relationships, its construction was guided by mainstream theoretical perspectives of personality development, therefore its applicability to relational concerns merits further discussion.¹

Several aspects of Markus and Kitayama's (1991) characterization of independent and interdependent selves, for example, suggest that Little's (1983) PPA may be biased. Possibly only those with an independent self-construal could work toward their goals or change them at will, which would negate the reality that not all people are in a position to do so or the possibility that not all people approach their lives in this manner.

Consistent with the centrality of personal feelings, abilities, and values to the independent self, the focus of PPA research has been on the individual, their own feelings and their own abilities. In terms of the tasks that independent and relational people pursue, there is a lack of addressing the concerns of a relational person in PPA. PPA as it is administered currently asks a person to reflect on their individuality. This is congruent with the first task of being unique. Markus and Kitayama (1991) described the independent self as comprising "a unique configuration of internal attributes (e.g., traits, motives and values)" (p. 24). The standard PPA dimension of "value congruency" reflects this focus on measuring how projects reflect the individual's value system, not how a project would reflect a concern for others' values. The next task of promoting one's own

¹ While this paper concentrates on the potential limitations of Little's (1983) PPA, these criticisms could also be directed at the other methodologies discussed earlier (e.g., Cantor & Kihlstrom, 1987; Emmons, 1986). All of these approaches have come about within a goal directed framework and could therefore be criticized for their inattention to the relational aspects of development.

goals fits the framework within which PPA was developed. As discussed earlier, PPA was designed to examine everyday activities through projects assuming that the reason for carrying out these projects is to achieve personal goals, opposed to helping others to achieve their goals.

For the relational self, the role of others is important in terms of defining who they are and maintaining relationships is central to their identity. However, for independent selves, others are used for reflective purposes. As Markus and Kitayama (1991) put it, "Others, or the social situation in general, are important, but primarily as standards of reflected appraisal, or as sources than can verify and affirm the inner core of the self" (p. 226). The standard PPA dimensions of visibility to others and others' view of importance are likely to serve this function, rather than assessing a person's concern for how others feel.

Lastly, PPA assumes that independent selves strive to carry out their tasks in order to increase their self-esteem. If the standard dimensions are more reflective of an individualistic than a relational self-construal, PPA may be unable to account for the well-being of people with relational selves simply because it does not assess the aspects of their projects that contribute to their well-being. Therefore, adding explicit relational components to PPA might enhance its ability to predict the well-being of people with either sense of self.

Consistent with the foregoing discussion, McGregor (1994) added dimensions to the PPA in an attempt to more adequately represent different self-identities and thereby enhance the prediction of well-being. From his review of the literature, McGregor identified four self-identities that were examined in past research (e.g., McAdams, 1993, as cited in McGregor, 1994), namely the agentic, communal, achievement, and hedonistic identities. For the purpose of using PPA, the standard dimensions of importance, value congruency, absorption, self-worth and commitment were used to represent an agentic identity. Of relevance to people with a communion identity, McGregor added five new dimensions (communion, other's benefit, affiliation, trust, support from others) and one standard dimension was used (other's view of importance).

For the achievement identity, the standard dimensions of stress, structure and efficacy were used. Lastly, for the hedonistic identity, the standard dimensions of enjoyment, stress, other's view, and time pressure were used and three new dimensions of fun, creativity and health were added. People's scores on these PPA dimensions were used to classify individuals into one of the four identities discussed above. Specifically, individuals were ranked according to their scores and based on their ranking for each identity type, they were classified into the identity on which they ranked highest on.

McGregor's analyses revealed that the majority of the community-orientated people were women who had children, while the majority of agentically-orientated people were men (there were no gender differences in the other identity categories). McGregor (1994) predicted that participants would report higher levels of meaning and happiness when their projects resonated with their self-identities, but this was not the case. One possible explanation for this is that a person's identity type was determined on the basis of their highest rank. With this categorization then, these identities were treated as if they were mutually exclusive even though a person could have a high ranking on more than one identity.

The above discussion has illustrated that Little's PPA may not fully encompass a relational approach and thereby detract from the possibility of assessing the relation between the PPA dimension scores and well-being of people with relational selves.

PPA and gender. Although participants' sex has always been identified within data sets, most PPA analyses have not considered the possible differential results according to sex. In this regard, Eagly (1990) stated that there are advantages to exploring sex differences that outweigh the advantages of not exploring them. For one, it is a variable that is easily and reliably measured and therefore there are typically no obstacles to gathering this data. Second, examining and reporting sex differences can be useful, if only to illustrate that they are becoming smaller over time. Third, if differences do appear between the sexes, they could provide insight into men's dominance of women and how this dominance is maintained.

The limited analyses of sex differences in PPA was to some extent rectified by Wilson's (1990) meta-analysis of 27 studies conducted predominantly with first year undergraduate students. Contrary to expectations, this meta-analysis failed to observe any gender differences in the dimensions that predicted well-being. As stated earlier, it is conceivable that the restricted individualistic nature of the PPA dimensions and instructions limited the likelihood of observing gender differences. Similarly, given that university students comprised the majority of research participants, women and men's projects likely involved similar university related projects. However, some PPA studies have uncovered gender differences.

Helmer (1979) examined gender differences in the content and structure of PPA with 101 female and 51 male university students. Her results revealed that, compared with men's projects, women's projects were more interpersonal in nature. Women also tended to involve fewer people in their nurturing projects than men did. For men, the harmony among their projects was more likely to be upset when they had a greater the number of responsibility projects (e.g., nurturing activities). This was not the case for women. Lastly, men's sense of control over their projects increased as the number of nurturing activities they were engaged in decreased. The finding that for women, nurturing projects were greater in number and had a less negative impact on the rest of their projects is consistent with women having a more relational sense of self. Also, in this study how visible projects were to others was associated with women's well-being, but not men's. This is consistent with Markus and Kitayama's (1991) description of how the relational self is more affected by the opinions of others.

Others have come to similar conclusions. MacDiarmid (1988) found that women reported higher life satisfaction scores if their projects were more under their control, less important, less stressful and more visible to others. For men, projects that were less difficult and for which they had more time were associated with greater life satisfaction scores. Lower depression scores were associated with projects more under control for women and with less stressful projects for men. MacDiarmid (1988) also observed gender differences when project dimensions were subjected to a discriminant function

analysis. This analysis of her data yielded one discriminant function that included the dimensions of importance, self-identity and initiation. Women rated their projects higher on each of these dimensions than men. This study documented differential predictors of well-being for women and men.

Based on the work of Gilligan (1982), Young (1989) explicitly explored the concept of a "different voice." Overall, Young reported no gender differences in the scores on the two dimensions that were worded to reflect the ethic of care and the ethic of justice. The ethic of care dimension asked "to what extent is each project carried out for the enjoyment, maintenance or advancement of the physical and/or emotional well-being/development of another person(s)" (p. 38). The ethic of justice (individualism) dimension was worded "to what extent is each project characterized as being individualistic, i.e., in pursuit of your own interests, goals and concerns" (p. 38). When Young examined two different types of projects, specifically academic versus home projects, differences did emerge in the relation between the two new dimensions (care and individualism) and the project factor scores, namely, meaning, structure, community, stress and efficacy. For women higher scores on the caring dimension were associated with home projects that had more meaning, had more structure, were more efficiently carried out and were more important in terms of the community factor. Women's higher scores on the justice dimension, by comparison, were associated with home projects that were less meaningful. Women's higher scores on the caring dimension were associated with academic projects that had less stress and were more important in terms of the community factor, whereas higher scores on the justice dimension were associated with academic projects that were more meaningful. For the men in the study, none of these correlations were significant. However, the differential correlations between the scores on the ethic of care and the ethic of individualism dimensions with the project factors for women may be indicative of women's social role. Women appeared to be more concerned with caring for others in the home, but not within the academic setting where the goal is individual academic success.

NOTE TO USERS

Page(s) not included in the original manuscript are unavailable from the author or university. The manuscript was microfilmed as received.

42

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

dimension ratings, how important peers saw their activities was significantly correlated to girls' but not boys' life satisfaction scores. However, the ratings given for how important parents saw their activities was associated with life satisfaction for both girls and boys. Wilmut's results appear to be supportive of the relational model of development that depicts girls, rather than boys, as more sensitive to others.

Despite Wilson's (1990) conclusion that there are no gender differences in PPA, the research discussed above indicates that PPA is sensitive enough to differentiate between the everyday activities and their importance for women and men. MacDiarmid (1988) observed that different dimensions accounted for women's and men's well-being and that these dimensions clustered differently. Phillips et al. (1993) found that relative to men, women's work culture was more important for work satisfaction. Wilmut (1993) examined life satisfaction for adolescents and found that for girls, but not for boys', others' view of their projects was important. Taken together, these studies have supplied empirical evidence that even within the existing PPA framework, women appear to have a more relational approach to their projects while men have a more independent perspective.

Summary

As outlined above, Western psychology has developed around the central theme of the individuated, autonomous self. Consistent with this, developmental theories dictate that the goal of development is to be an independent person (e.g., Erikson, 1963). Because of the limited focus on the individual, others (e.g., Miller, 1984/1991) have argued that these theories neglect the relational component of development, a component central to women and members of subordinate groups and non-Western cultures,. In view of this, this research was designed to examine the relation of different self-construals with the choices of everyday activities, as measured using PPA. Although Little's (1983) PPA has proven to be a reliable predictor of subjective well-being and may be used to uncover gender differences in the prediction of well-being, it was developed within an individualistic framework and therefore, may also be criticized for not including a relational component. Yet the past success of PPA suggests that it would

seem worthwhile to enhance PPA to see if there is also a differential impact of self-construals on a person's sense of well-being. New PPA dimensions will be added to existing dimensions to explicitly tap a relational component of the self. It is predicted that these new dimensions will better predict well-being for those who have a relational self-construal while the existing dimensions will better predict well-being of people with an independent self-construal. It was also expected that the nature of the self might affect the proportion of participants' projects that are relational in nature and that the proportion of relational projects, in turn, would affect well-being via their impact on participants' Personal Project scores.

STUDY ONE: IDENTIFYING RELATIONAL CONSTRUCTS

Method

A q-sort procedure was used to identify relational components of identity that could be translated into new PPA dimensions. In contrast to other methods, such as fixed response questionnaires, Q methodology has the advantage of uncovering participants' own point of view rather than those of the researchers (Kitzinger, 1999). Consistent with this, it is a method endorsed by a number of feminist researchers (e.g., Kitzinger, 1986; Snelling, 1999). In a q-sort participants are asked to rank a set of statements according to their perceived relevance to the question at hand (e.g., personality traits, political opinions). As Brown (1980) stated, "the sorting is interactive, dynamic and operant and the factors that emerge are 'operational definitions' of the attitudes or value preferences which produce them" (p. 55). Therefore, as a participant sorts through the statements and puts them into the various piles it is their own preferences that drive the distribution. There is no definition of any particular model before the q-sort takes place. Rather, the participants create the model as they place the items along the q-sort continuum.

The list of q-sort statements is usually derived theoretically. They can also be based on interviews, standard q-sort decks, standard questionnaires and from texts (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The aim in generating the statements to be sorted is that they are theoretically representative of the phenomena under study (Brown, 1980). For the present study, the q-sort statements were derived from existing questionnaires that assess relational and independent self-construals (e.g., "I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with that group") and the literature regarding the relational theory of development (e.g., "Being emotionally connected to others is very important to me"). There has been some research with PPA using a q-deck of statements, the Q-deck Questionnaire (Little, 1981), representing the standard seventeen dimensions, (Barnes, 1986; Blevis, 1987; Little, 1983; Thom, 1986). Because this questionnaire was developed to reflect the existing PPA dimensions, the statements are applicable to this research

project in that the items reflect an independent approach to personal projects (e.g., “I usually feel in charge of the things I do”).

Once the data have been collected, participants' q-sort responses are factor analyzed. The key aspect that differentiates a q-sort factor analysis from a regular factor analysis is that in q-sorting it is the people that are factored rather than the items (Brown, 1980). The resulting factors are therefore made up of people with common viewpoints on a subject. In the present research, then, one would anticipate at least two factors: one representing people who have an independent self-construal and another composed of people with a relational self-construal. However, it would not be surprising if these two factors have subcomponents that surface through the q-sorting procedure. It was also anticipated that the factor(s) representing an independent self-construal would mirror some of the standard PPA dimensions.

Participants

In the past much of the research using PPA has been done with university students rather than the general population (Wilson, 1990). Given that the purpose of this research was to identify individual differences in self-construals and project choices, a community sample was deemed more desirable than a relatively homogeneous sample of Introductory Psychology students. The initial participants in this study were recruited through the researcher's friendship networks and additional participants were recruited using snowball sampling (Palys, 1992). The participants were 25 women and 25 men from the general community, ranging from 27 to 51 years of age ($M = 38.6$, $SD = 6.6$ years). As shown in Table 4, which presents information about the characteristics of these participants, twenty-seven (54%) of the participants were recruited directly by the researcher, sixteen (32%) were recruited by friends, and the remaining seven (14%) were recruited by the participants' spouses. Thirty-two percent of participants had at least a high school diploma, 36% had a trades certificate or community college diploma, 24% had completed a B.A. and 8% had gone beyond a B.A. Eighty-four percent ($n = 42$) of

Table 4

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

	Total sample	Women	Men
Age	<i>M</i> = 38.6	<i>M</i> = 38.6	<i>M</i> = 38.6
Education			
High school	16 (32%)	8 (32%)	8 (32%)
Trades / community college	18 (36%)	9 (36%)	9 (36%)
B.A./ B.A. honours	12 (24%)	5 (24%)	6 (24%)
Graduate studies	4 (8%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)
Marital status			
Common-in-law/married	45 (90%)	23 (92%)	22 (88%)
Divorced	2 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Single	3 (6%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)
Children			
No	15 (30%)	9 (36%)	6 (24%)
Yes	35 (70%)	16 (64%)	19 (76%)
Work outside the home			
No	3 (6%)	3 (12%)	0 (0%)
Yes	47 (94%)	22 (88%)	25 (100%)
Full-time	39 (83%)	18 (81%)	21 (84%)
Part-time	8 (17%)	4 (19%)	4 (16%)
Personal income			
< \$15,000	8 (16%)	7 (28%)	1 (4%)
15,000 - 24,999	4 (8%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)
25,000 - 34,999	11 (22%)	10 (40%)	1 (4%)
35,000 - 44,999	10 (20%)	2 (8%)	8 (32%)
45,000 - 54,999	7 (14%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)
55,000 - 64,999	5 (10%)	1 (4%)	4 (16%)
65,000 - 74,999	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
> 75,000	3 (6%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)

Table 4 cont.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

	Total sample	Women	Men
Family income			
\$15,000 - 24,999	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)
25,000 - 34,999	2 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
35,000 - 44,999	5 (10%)	1 (4%)	4 (16%)
45,000 - 54,999	5 (10%)	3 (12%)	2 (8%)
55,000 - 64,999	9 (18%)	6 (24%)	3 (12%)
65,000 - 74,999	7 (14%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)
> 75,000	21 (42%)	11 (44%)	10 (40%)
Ethnic background			
African/Canadian	2 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
Canadian	17 (34%)	13 (52%)	4 (16%)
First Nations	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	2 (8%)
French Canadian	4 (8%)	1 (4%)	3 (12%)
British	26 (52%)	10 (40%)	16 (64%)

the sample was married and the majority had children (70%). For those who had children, twenty-four (48%) had no more than two children ($M = 2.3$, $SD = 0.8$ children). Most of the participants worked outside the home (94%) and of those, eight (17%) worked part-time. The average personal income for participants was in the \$25,000 to 44,999 range ($mdn = \$35,000$ to 44,999), and their average family income was in the \$55,000 to 74,999 range ($mdn = \$55,000$ to 64,999). For ethnic background, this group indicated they were mainly of British heritage ($n = 26$) or Canadian ($n = 17$). However, 4% of the participants indicated First Nations, which is consistent with the demography of Canada (Waldrum, Herring & Young, 1995). In sum, the 50 participants were largely educated, from a middle socioeconomic background, and mainly homogeneous in terms of their largely Anglosaxon ethnic background.

Procedure

After providing informed consent, participants completed measures designed to assess their interdependent and independent self-construals (the order of these two scales was alternated) and performed a q-sorting task. Note that, to minimize carry-over effects, half of the participants completed the questionnaires first and then performed the q-sorting task and the other half of the participants did the q-sort first and then completed the questionnaires.

Measures of self-construals. Participants completed two measures of their self-construals, one of which was Singelis' (1994) Self-Construal scale (see Appendix A). The Self-Construal scale is designed to assess independent and interdependent self-construals based on Markus and Kitayama's (1991) research. This scale consists of 24 items, 12 of which assess the interdependent construct (e.g., "It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group") and 12 that measure the independent construct (e.g., "Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me"). For each item, participants' indicated their agreement using 7-point scales labeled 'strongly disagree' and 'strongly agree' at the poles. Singelis (1994) tested the Self-Construal scale with two ethnically diverse groups of undergraduate students ($N = 364$ and 165). Singelis' factor analysis

revealed two factors, one representing each type of self-construal. For the independent self-construal subscale, the Cronbach alpha reliability was .69 in the first study and .70 in the second. For the interdependent subscale, the Cronbach alphas were .73 and .74, respectively. In both studies, the two subscales were virtually independent. Construct validity was provided by the finding that, in both studies, Asian Americans had higher interdependent scores and Caucasian Americans had higher independent scores. The Self-Construal scale therefore appeared to be reliable and valid.

Participants also completed Swap and Rubin's (1983) Interpersonal Orientation Scale (see Appendix A). A person who is high in interpersonal orientation is "first and foremost, responsive to the interpersonal aspects of his [or her] relationship with the other. He [or she] is both interested in, and reactive to, variations in the other's behavior" (Rubin & Brown, 1975, p.158, cited in Swap & Rubin, 1983). An interpersonal orientation is thus analogous to a relational self-construal. Those who score low on the scale are seen as "nonresponsive to interpersonal aspects of his [or her] relationship with the other" (Rubin & Brown, 1975, p. 159, cited in Swap & Rubin, 1983)). In the Interpersonal Orientation scale, participants are asked to rate their agreement with 29 items (e.g., Other people are the source of my greatest pleasure and pain) using 5-point Likert-type scales anchored by 'strongly agree' and 'strongly disagree' at the extremities. This scale was originally tested with 879 undergraduates and displayed a Cronbach alpha of .79 on a subsample of 155 students. The test-retest reliability with 173 students over a five week period was .76. This questionnaire was used in the present study to provide convergent validity for Singelis' measure of the self.

Q-sorting task. Participants were asked to sort 79 statements designed to reflect both the independent and relational self-construals. These statements, shown in Appendix A, consisted of items derived from the above two scales, Miller and her colleagues' descriptions of the relational self-concept (e.g., Jordan, 1985/1991; Miller, 1976/1986; Surrey, 1984/1991), and Little's (1981) Q-Deck Questionnaire. One relational item, for example, read: "When making a decision, I think of how it will affect others before I think of how it will affect me." A statement reflecting an independent self-construal read:

"I am not concerned with the impact of my behaviour on others." This type of q-sort deck is considered a "hybrid" q-deck in that the items are taken from a number of sources (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

Each of the 79 statements was written on a 3" X 5" index card. Participants were instructed to sort the statements into two piles, one representing "like me" and another representing "not like me." Participants were then instructed to place the four statements most like them under the value of +5 and the four statements most unlike them under the value of -5. They were then asked to sort the remaining statements along the continuum from "not at all like me" (-5) to "very much like me" (+5) while bearing in mind the frequency distribution illustrated below.

Most Unlike Me	Neutral										Most Like Me
-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5	
<hr/>											
4	5	7	8	9	14	9	8	7	5	4	
Number of items											

This distribution is designed to approximate a normal distribution for factoring purposes. Participants were then asked to sort the statements until they were satisfied with their rankings. Finally, participants completed a one page questionnaire assessing demographic information (see Appendix A), were debriefed and then thanked for their participation.²

² It was planned to audiotape participants while they were completing their q-sorts. Even with prompting, however, participants had a difficult time articulating why they were making their choices. The few comments that were made were in reference to a feeling the participants had rather than any reason for their choices. The audiotaping was therefore discontinued after several participants.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

The initial analyses examined the internal consistency of the scales. Item analyses of the interdependent and independent subscales of Singelis' (1994) Self-Construal Scale yielded alphas of .66 and .60, respectively. Swap and Rubin's (1983) Interpersonal Orientation Scale yielded an alpha of .69. Given the homogeneity of the items, scale scores were derived by calculating the mean and, as a result, higher scores reflected more of the attribute in question.

Main Analyses

Descriptive statistics. These first analyses examined the scales' descriptive statistics and whether there were gender differences. These analyses suggested that these participants were both somewhat independent ($M = 57.5$, $SD = 8.7$, possible range = 1 to 84) and somewhat interdependent ($M = 51.7$, $SD = 8.7$, possible range = 1 to 84). A paired t-test, however, revealed that these participants' viewed themselves as more independent than interdependent, $t(49) = 3.44$, $p < .001$. Swap and Rubin's scale also revealed that they were somewhat interpersonally orientated ($M = 96.9$, $SD = 9.9$, potential range = 1 to 145). There were gender differences in Interpersonal Orientation scores, where women ($M = 100.4$, $SD = 8.6$) were more concerned for others than men ($M = 93.5$, $SD = 10.2$), $t(48) = 2.57$, $p < .05$. Surprisingly, there were no gender differences in participants' independent (women: $M = 58.2$, $SD = 9.3$; men: $M = 56.8$, $SD = 8.3$), $t(48) = .53$, ns, or interdependent scores (women: $M = 52.68$, $SD = 9.2$; men: $M = 50.76$, $SD = 8.3$), $t(48) = 0.78$, ns.

The next analysis examined the intercorrelations among the three self-construal scales. As Singelis (1994) reported, independent self-construal scores were independent of both interdependent self-construal scores, $r(50) = .07$, ns, and Interpersonal Orientation scores, $r(50) = -.17$, ns. Also, and as anticipated, participants' interdependent self-construal scores were positively related to their Interpersonal Orientation scores, $r(50) = .39$, $p < .01$.

Q-sort analysis. To uncover the factors that represent the varying aspects of participants' self-construals, their q-sorts were analyzed using a principal components factor analysis with a varimax rotation. The first factor analysis revealed twelve factors with eigenvalues of greater than one. Because Kaiser's criterion is known to extract too many factors (Barrett & Kline, 1982; Cattell, 1978), Cattell's (1966, 1978) scree test was used to determine the number of factors. As shown in Figure 1, the scree test suggested that at most three factors underlay the q-sort. Therefore, a second factor analysis was done using a forced three factor model.

As shown in Table 5, which presents participants' loadings on each factor using a criterion loading of .40, most participants loaded on only one factor (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). Ten (20%) people, however, were "complex" in that they were representative of two factors and two people failed to represent any factor. To obtain representatives of each factor, mean q-sort item scores were calculated for the five people that loaded the highest on each of the three factors (Brown, 1980). The average rankings for each q-sort item across the five people most representative of each of the three factors is presented in Table 6. The representatives of the first group factor gave their highest "like me" scores to items such as, "It is important for me to maintain a good relationship with everybody" and "How other people feel is important to me," suggesting that they shared a relational orientation to others. This first factor accounted for 30.9% of the variance in participants' q-sort self-construals. The representatives of the second factor gave their "most like me" ratings to items such as "My personal identity independent of others is very important to me" and "I consider myself independent and do not like to lean on others for support," and their "least like me" items included "I automatically tune myself into other people's expectations of me" and "It is better to follow tradition than to try something my way." This group of people, then, appeared representative of an individualistic self-concept and this factor accounted for 9.8% of the variance in participants' q-sort self-construals. The items of the third group reflected a mixture of both relational and independent aspects of the self, albeit with an

Figure 1

Scree Plot of Eigenvalues for the Unforced Principal Components Analysis of Q-sort Items

Table 5

Results of the Factor Analysis of Participants' Q-Sorts using a Forced Three Factor Solution

Person	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
1	.29	.59	.09
2	.54	-.01	.07
3	.70	.39	-.13
4	.24	.62	.23
5	.27	.29	.57
6	.67	.42	.12
7	.31	.30	.11
8	.75	.08	-.19
9	.83	-.12	.18
10	.62	.38	.02
11	.21	-.09	.67
12	.56	.21	.22
13	.35	.12	.34
14	-.28	-.19	.47
15	-.34	.63	-.16
16	.19	.53	-.01
17	-.06	.49	.46
18	.22	.45	.41
19	.04	.28	-.29
20	.19	.60	.14
21	-.12	.46	.19
22	.05	.51	.41
23	.22	.74	.19
24	.57	.24	.14
25	.27	.50	-.08
26	-.40	.46	.08
27	.77	-.13	.12
28	.06	.54	.23
29	.82	.18	.11
30	.50	.29	.04
31	.74	.08	.17
32	.50	.20	.21

Table 5 cont'd.

Results of the Factor Analysis of Participants' Q-Sorts using a Forced Three Factor Solution

Person	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
33	.04	.08	.53
34	.40	.54	.14
35	.18	.60	.11
36	.75	.19	.09
37	.09	.65	.15
38	.69	.45	-.03
39	.25	.26	.44
40	.12	.31	.51
41	.84	.09	.01
42	.67	.09	.14
43	.55	.11	.37
44	.44	.47	-.21
45	.38	.63	-.29
46	.75	.06	.23
47	.67	.36	-.13
48	.51	.46	.03
49	.48	.50	.12
50	.44	.38	.21

Table 6

Average Ranking of Q-sort Item Scores for the Three Groups of People

Q-sort item	Group		
	1	2	3
1. When making a decision, I first consider how it will affect others before considering how it will affect me.	+2	0	+4
2. I find myself doing things I don't really believe in.	-2	-4	-5
3. I would rather think about a personal problem by myself than get advice from others.	-3	+2	+4
4. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.	+2	+1	+1
5. I don't really care about most things I do	-5	-4	-5
6. I am not concerned about the impact of my behaviour on others.	-4	-5	-4
7. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.	+3	+1	0
8. I usually enjoy the things I do.	+3	+2	+1
9. Other people are the source of my greatest pleasure and pain.	+1	+1	0
10. How I behave depends on the people around in the situation.	+2	+1	+2
11. I usually decide myself what I want to do.	-2	+2	-1
12. I find myself doing things that are really like me.	0	+2	-1
13. I consider myself to be understanding with others when they are sharing an experience with me.	+3	+2	+2
14. Other people don't think what I am doing is important.	-4	-3	0

Table 6 cont'd.

Average Ranking of Q-sort Item Scores for the Three Groups of People

Q-sort item	Group		
	1	2	3
15. Most of what I do really matters to other people.	+1	0	-2
16. I can't count on anyone else to help me get things done.	-4	-4	-4
17. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.	-1	+1	+3
18. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.	0	+4	-1
19. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.	0	-3	+2
20. I am usually successful in getting ahead with things.	+1	+4	-2
21. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with that group.	-1	-1	+1
22. I tend to avoid close interpersonal relationships.	-5	-1	0
23. What others think about my actions is of little or no consequence to me.	-3	-3	-1
24. I get a lot of support from people close to me.	+5	+1	0
25. Most of my outings are arranged to suit others.	+1	-4	-1
26. I have my own standards of behaviour.	0	+3	+3
27. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.	-3	+3	0
28. There are many of people depending on me.	0	-2	0

Table 6 cont'd.

Average Ranking of Q-sort Item Scores for the Three Groups of People

Q-sort item	Group		
	1	2	3
29. My personal identity independent of others is very important to me.	-1	+5	-2
30. I am greatly influenced by the moods of the people I am with.	+2	0	+1
31. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.	+1	-3	-3
32. I feel responsible for other people.	0	-3	+1
33. I would rather not insist on doing an activity, if it hurts another person's feelings.	0	+3	+2
34. Not many of my friends know what is important to me.	-3	-1	+5
35. I have to believe in something before I'll become involved.	0	+1	+4
36. Nothing can keep from doing something I want to do it.	-1	-2	0
37. Most people know about my plans and activities.	+2	-3	-1
38. It's important for me to work with people with whom I get along well, even if that means I get less done.	+1	-2	-2
39. It is better to follow tradition than to try to do something my way.	0	-5	0
40. If I need to talk, there is always someone around to listen.	+4	0	-4
41. I automatically tune myself into other people's expectations of me.	0	-5	-5

Table 6 cont'd.

Average Ranking of Q-sort Item Scores for the Three Groups of People

Q-sort item	Group		
	1	2	3
42. It is important for me to minimize conflict with those people I am close to.	+4	+2	+3
43. Many of my activities are carried out in an effort to please other people.	+2	-3	+4
44. I work hard at achieving the goals that I have set for myself.	-5	+5	-3
45. I usually make my own decisions by myself.	-2	+2	-2
46. I don't try to meet the expectations of others.	-2	-1	-2
47. I always know what I want.	-2	-2	-3
48. I like to help other's achieve the goals they have set for themselves.	0	0	0
49. Even though people around me may hold a different opinion, I stick to what I believe in.	-1	+5	-1
50. Many of my activities are often done for the benefit or well-being of others.	-2	-2	+1
51. I consider myself independent and do not like to lean on others for support.	-2	+5	+2
52. My activities often contribute toward a sense of togetherness and harmony with other people.	+4	+1	-1
53. It is important to me that I make a favourable impression on others.	0	-1	+3
54. Feeling close to others is very important to me.	+4	-1	-1
55. It is important to me to maintain a good relationship with everybody.	+5	-1	+2

Table 6 cont'd.

Average Ranking of Q-sort Item Scores for the Three Groups of People

Q-sort item	Group		
	1	2	3
56. Many of my activities are often done for my own benefit or well-being.	-3	+3	-2
57. My activities often make me feel powerful or competent.	-2	0	-4
58. I can be strongly affected by someone smiling or frowning at me.	+2	-1	0
59. I care about what other people think of me.	+4	0	+3
60. My friends and family see the things I do as being important.	+1	0	0
61. I usually feel in charge of the things I do.	-1	+3	-3
62. I don't feel in control of what I do.	-3	-5	-2
63. I always seem to be doing things for other people.	-1	-1	+4
64. I prefer not to be emotionally involved with other people.	-5	-2	-1
65. People close to me often don't know about the things I am doing.	-3	-2	+3
66. I usually do things with my family.	+5	+2	+5
67. I belong to a crowd of people who are always doing things together.	+2	-4	-3
68. A move from here would separate me from many of the people I am close to.	+1	+4	+1
69. Being emotionally connected to others is very important to me.	+1	0	-5

Table 6 cont'd.

Average Ranking of Q-sort Item Scores for the Three Groups of People

Q-sort item	Group		
	1	2	3
70. I like to keep things I am doing to myself.	-4	0	+2
71. Doing things for others gives me a sense of satisfaction.	+3	+4	+3
72. I would rather do things for myself than for others.	-5	-2	-3
73. I am very attentive to the needs of others.	+2	0	-3
74. I tend to focus on my own need and wants rather than those of others.	-4	+2	-4
75. I get great pleasure out of sharing experiences with others.	+3	+4	0
76. I prefer the solitude of my own company.	-2	+1	+5
77. By helping others, I feel good about who I am.	+3	+3	+5
78. How others feel is important to me.	+5	0	+2
79. How others behave is important to me.	-1	0	+3

emphasis on different items. As a result this group's rankings were less interpretable than those of the first two groups were.

In sum, the first group of people chose descriptors that reflected a relational personality, whereas the second group described themselves in more independent terms. However, consistent with McKeown and Thomas' (1988) observation that "factors may be produced that are statistically significant but substantively without meaning" (p. 51), the third group comprised an uninterpretable mixture of the two. Because the focus of this research was to examine the neglected relational component of personality in addition to the traditionally examined independent component, only the first two factors were retained for subsequent analyses.

Group membership, gender and criterion scores. The next analyses examined the relations between participants' relational or independent group membership and their gender. When group membership was determined by a median split of participants' loadings on the relational factor, significantly more women (64%) than men (32%) were classified as relational, $\chi^2(1, N = 50) = 5.84, p < .01$. Specifically, 17 women and only 8 men were classified as highly relational and only 8 women and 17 men were classified as relatively low in their relational orientation. For the independent group, approximately equal numbers of men and women loaded above and below the median split, $\chi^2(1, N = 50) = .08, ns$; 11 (44%) women and 14 (56%) men scored above the median and 14 (56%) women and 11 (44%) men fell below the median.

The next set of analyses examined the relations between participants' group membership, their gender and their self-construal scale scores. As shown in Table 7, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) revealed only one significant effect, namely a main effect of relational group membership, *Pillai's Trace* $V = .166, F(3,44) = 2.91, p < .05$. Although the size of this effect, .17, is rather small, given the small sample size it is not unexpected (Howell, 1982). Examining the univariate statistics, shown in Table 7, revealed that this multivariate effect stemmed solely from differences in

Table 7

Results of the Relational Group by Gender MANOVA on Self-Construal Scores

Effect	<i>Pillai's Trace V</i>	<i>eta</i> ²	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Relational group	.166		3,44	2.91*
Interdependent self-construal		.15	1,46	8.06**
Independent self-construal		.01	1,46	0.24
Interpersonal orientation		.02	1,46	0.91
Gender	.128		3,44	2.16
Interdependent self-construal		.00	1,46	0.05
Independent self-construal		.01	1,46	0.44
Interpersonal orientation		.08	1,46	4.16*
Relational group X gender	.015		3,44	0.23
Interdependent self-construal		.00	1,46	0.13
Independent self-construal		.00	1,46	0.14
Interpersonal orientation		.01	1,46	0.41

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

participants' interdependent self-construal scores: those in the relational group had higher interdependent self-construal scores ($M = 55.1$, $SD = 8.0$) than those who were relatively nonrelational ($M = 48.3$, $SD = 8.2$).

A second MANOVA was conducted considering participants' independent group membership. Again, as shown in Table 8, only the main effect of group membership was significant, *Pillai's Trace* $V = .435$, $F(3,44) = 11.28$, $p < .001$. In this case, the effect size of .43 suggested a moderately strong relationship between participants' independent group status and their criterion scores. Consistent with this, the univariate statistics, shown in Table 8, revealed significant effects on all three criterion measures. As expected, members of the independent group scored higher on the independent self-construal scale ($M = 61.4$, $SD = 9.6$) and lower on the interdependent self-construal scale ($M = 48.0$, $SD = 8.2$) and the Interpersonal Orientation scale ($M = 93.4$, $SD = 9.6$) relative to those who were classified as relatively nonindependent ($M_s = 53.6, 55.4, 100.5$, respectively, and $SD_s = 8.1, 7.7, 9.1$, respectively). The main effect of gender was marginally significant, *Pillai's Trace* $V = .141$, $F(3,44) = 2.42$, $p < .10$, and, consistent with this, gender had a small univariate effect on participants' Interpersonal Orientation scale scores (women, $M = 100.4$, $SD = 8.6$ and men, $M = 93.5$, $SD = 10.2$).

Alternative explanations. The last analyses examined the correlations between participants' demographic characteristics and their scores on the conceptual measures. As presented in Table 9, only three of these correlations were significant. Specifically, men relative to women and participants with higher independent self-construal scores had higher personal incomes. Also participants with higher loadings on the relational q-sort factor were more likely to have children. Finally, participants' marital status was unrelated to their independent self-construal scores, $F(3,46) = 2.64$, ns., interdependent self-construal scores, $F(3,46) = 1.12$, ns., interpersonal orientation scores, $F(3,46) = 0.85$, ns., interdependent q-sort factor scores, $F(3,46) = 2.17$, ns., independent q-sort factor scores, $F(3,46) = 1.98$, ns., and gender, $\chi^2(3, N = 48) = 1.0$, ns. Therefore participants'

Table 8

Results of the Independent Group by Gender MANOVA on Self-Construal Scores

Effect	<i>Pillai's Trace V</i>	<i>eta2</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Independent group	.434		3,44	11.28 ^{***}
Interdependent self-construal		.15	1,46	8.02 [*]
Independent self-construal		.22	1,46	12.74 ^{**}
Interpersonal orientation		.14	1,46	7.30 [*]
Gender	.141		3,44	2.42 ⁺
Interdependent self-construal		.01	1,46	0.56
Independent self-construal		.01	1,46	0.54
Interpersonal orientation		.13	1,46	6.78 [*]
Independent group X gender	.030		3,44	0.45
Interdependent self-construal		.01	1,46	0.65
Independent self-construal		.02	1,46	1.09
Interpersonal orientation		.00	1,46	0.09

⁺ $p < .10$. ^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$.

Table 9

Correlations between Participants' Demographic Characteristics, Gender, Self-Construct Scores, and Q-Sort Rankings

Demographics	Gender	Independence	Interdependence	Interpersonal orientation	Relational ranking	Independent ranking
Age	.01	.08	.05	.04	.17	.15
Children	-.13	-.26	.04	-.05	-.48***	.20
Number of children	.02	.15	-.15	-.17	.03	.21
Education	.00	-.08	.03	.14	.19	.16
Personal income	.53***	.36**	.02	-.03	-.23	.26
Family income	-.12	.12	-.08	.11	.19	.06

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Note. Gender was coded as 1 for women and 2 for men. Children was coded 1 for yes and 2 for no. Education was coded as 1 for high school, 2 for trades or community college, 3 for B.A. and 4 for graduate studies.

marital status and their other demographic characteristics did not provide an alternative explanation to the above results.

Discussion

Western psychology has developed around the central theme of the individuated, autonomous self. Developmental theories, for example, dictate that the goal of development is to be an independent person (e.g., Erikson, 1963). Others, however, (e.g., Miller, 1984/1991) have argued such theories of human development neglect the relational component of development, a component central to non-Western cultures and members of subordinate groups, including women. Consistent with this perspective, the q-sort analysis revealed two orientations, orientations that were characterized by relational and independent foci. Indeed, the finding that more of the variance in q-sorts was accounted for by the relational factor than the independent factor suggests that the relational component of personality may be more central to a person's self-construal. This would be consistent with the claims of the theorists at the Stone Centre (Jordan, 1985/1991; Miller, 1984/1991) who assert that all development is relational.

The q-sort data also provided some support for the notion that women are generally more relational than men (e.g., Miller, 1984/1991; Cross & Madson, 1997; Lyons, 1983) in that women were more likely than men to be classified as relational. In line with this, women scored higher than men did on Swap and Rubin's (1983) Interpersonal Orientation Scale. There were, however, no gender differences on Singelis' (1994) interdependent scale, suggesting that the Interpersonal Orientation scale may be more congruent with the conceptualization of the relational personality. Although inconsistent with evidence that men are more likely to describe themselves as separate from others (Cross, 1990, cited in Cross & Madson, 1997; Lyons, 1983), the finding that women and men had equivalent independent self-construal scores is perhaps not surprising given our culture's encouragement of individualism in general.

The analyses that examined the effects of participants' group membership, derived from their loadings on the two q-sort factors, and gender on their self-construal scores revealed no effects due to gender, presumably because these analyses considered the

unique effects of gender (i.e., independent of group membership). Group membership, however, was significantly related to participants' self-construal scores. As expected, participants classified as more relational had higher interdependent self-construal scores, while participants who were more independent had lower interdependent self-construal scores, lower interpersonal orientation scores and higher independent self-construal scores. These findings, then, provided convergent validity for the factors that emerged from the q-sort analysis. Given these results, the next step was to formulate the new dimensions for the Personal Project Matrix.

In order to formulate new relational dimensions for the PPA, the items that received the highest and lowest average rankings by the relational group were examined. It was observed that these items did indeed reflect the different facets of the relational self as articulated in the literature. As presented in Table 10, these items were then reworded in ways consistent with the wording of the items in the existing Personal Project matrix. Having done this, the next step in this research was to use these new dimensions to examine the relation between different self-construals and the aspects of everyday activities that contribute to well-being.

Table 10

New Personal Project Dimensions

Dimension	Explanation
Emotional connection	To what extent does this project allow you to be emotionally connected to others.
Relationships	How much does this project allow you to maintain good relationships with others.
Togetherness	How does this project enhance your sense of togetherness with other people.
Conflict	To what extent does this project minimize conflict with others.
With others	To what extent can you share this project with others.
Help others	To what extent does this project enable you to help others.

STUDY 2: THE SELF, PERSONAL PROJECTS AND WELL-BEING

The purpose of the second study was to examine the relation between the nature of the self, an enhanced version of PPA that included the new relational dimensions identified in Study One, and well-being. Using the new dimensions uncovered through the q-sort procedure, it was anticipated that the well-being of those who have a relational self-construal would be better predicted by the new relational dimensions, whereas the well-being of people who construe themselves in independent terms will be better predicted by the standard PPA dimensions. It was also expected that the nature of the self would affect the proportion of participants' projects that are relational in nature and that the proportion of relational projects, in turn, would affect well-being via their impact on participants' Personal Project factor scores.

Method

Participants

The participants in this study were 72 women and 57 men from the general community who were recruited through the researcher's friendship and family networks and additional participants who were recruited using snowball sampling (Palys, 1992). Some of the participants ($n = 31$) from the first study also participated in this study. A community based sample was chosen for several reasons. In the past much of the research using PPA has been done with first year university students rather than the general population (Wilson, 1990). Given that the purpose of this research was to examine individual differences in self-construals and project choices, a community sample was deemed more desirable than a more homogeneous sample of Introductory Psychology students.

As shown in Table 11, which presents information about the characteristics of these participants, 31% of the participants were recruited directly by the researcher, 18% were recruited by the researcher's spouse, 10% by the researcher's family, 14% by participants' co-workers, 18% by participants' friends and the remaining 9% were

Table 11

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

	Total sample		Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
<hr/>						
Recruited by						
Co-worker	18	(14%)	11	(15%)	7	(12%)
Friend	23	(18%)	15	(21%)	8	(14%)
Researcher	40	(31%)	24	(33%)	16	(28%)
Researcher's network	48	(37%)	22	(31%)	26	(46%)
Age	$M = 38.6$ $SD = 7.8$		$M = 38.7$ $SD = 7.7$		$M = 38.4$ $SD = 7.8$	
Education						
High school diploma	12	(9%)	8	(11%)	4	(7%)
Trades/ community college	47	(37%)	28	(39%)	19	(34%)
B.A./ B.A. honours	51	(40%)	22	(31%)	29	(50%)
Graduate studies	19	(14%)	14	(19%)	5	(9%)
Marital status						
Common-in-law	13	(10%)	7	(10%)	6	(11%)
Divorced/separated	9	(8%)	6	(9%)	3	(6%)
Married	84	(65%)	48	(67%)	36	(63%)
Single	22	(17%)	11	(15%)	11	(19%)
Widowed	1	(1%)	0	(0%)	1	(2%)
Children						
Yes	80	(62%)	45	(63%)	35	(61%)
No	49	(38%)	27	(37%)	22	(39%)
Work outside the home						
Yes	117	(91%)	61	(85%)	56	(98%)
Full-time	103	(88%)	50	(69%)	53	(95%)
Part-time	14	(12%)	11	(15%)	3	(5%)
No	12	(9%)	11	(12%)	1	(2%)

Table 11 cont.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

	Total sample		Women		Men	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Personal income						
< \$15,000	17	(13%)	14	(20%)	3	(5%)
15,000 - 24,999	12	(9%)	11	(15%)	1	(2%)
25,000 - 34,999	17	(13%)	13	(18%)	4	(7%)
35,000 - 44,999	26	(20%)	11	(15%)	15	(26%)
45,000 - 54,999	29	(23%)	17	(24%)	12	(21%)
55,000 - 64,999	14	(11%)	5	(7%)	9	(16%)
65,000 - 74,999	5	(4%)	1	(1%)	4	(7%)
> 75,000	9	(7%)	0	(0%)	9	(16%)
Family income						
< \$15,000	3	(2%)	3	(4%)	0	(0%)
15,000 - 24,999	6	(5%)	4	(5%)	2	(3%)
25,000 - 34,999	6	(5%)	5	(7%)	1	(2%)
35,000 - 44,999	8	(6%)	4	(6%)	4	(7%)
45,000 - 54,999	11	(9%)	5	(7%)	6	(11%)
55,000 - 64,999	16	(12%)	10	(14%)	6	(11%)
65,000 - 74,999	22	(17%)	11	(15%)	11	(19%)
> 75,000	57	(44%)	30	(42%)	27	(47%)
Ethnic background						
African American	2	(1%)	2	(3%)	0	(0%)
Asian	5	(4%)	1	(1%)	4	(8%)
British	12	(9%)	6	(8%)	6	(11%)
Canadian	79	(61%)	50	(71%)	28	(49%)
European	5	(5%)	3	(3%)	2	(4%)
First Nations	2	(1%)	0	(0%)	2	(4%)
French Canadian	14	(11%)	5	(7%)	9	(16%)
Jewish	1	(1%)	1	(1%)	0	(0%)
Missing	9	(7%)	4	(6%)	5	(9%)

recruited by participants' spouses and family.

The participants' ages ranged from 25 to 55 years of age ($M = 38.6$, $SD = 7.8$ years). Nine percent of participants had at least a high school diploma, 37% had a trades certificate or community college diploma, 40% had completed a B.A. and 14% had gone beyond a B.A. Sixty-five percent of the sample were married and the majority had children (62%). Most of the participants worked outside the home (91%) and of those, most (88%) worked full-time. Participants' average personal and family incomes were in the \$35,000 to 54,999 and \$55,000 to 74,999 range, respectively. For ethnic background, most of this group indicated they were Canadian (61%) and of French Canadian heritage (11%) or British heritage (9%). In sum, the 129 participants were well educated, from a middle socioeconomic background, and rather homogeneous in terms of their largely Anglo Saxon ethnic background.

Procedure

Participants were contacted and invited to participate in a study of "Well-being and everyday activities." As an incentive, participants were told that they had a chance to win one of two \$50.00 gift certificates to a local restaurant. Once participants agreed to take part, a questionnaire was delivered to them by hand or mail, and more than one questionnaire was delivered to participants who said they could recruit others. The questionnaire package included a stamped envelope for return the of the package. Of the two hundred questionnaires that were distributed, 129 (65%) were returned completed, six (3%) were returned incomplete and 65 (31.5%) were not returned. Only 27 (21%) of those who sent back their questionnaires needed a reminder to complete the package. Participants were asked to complete the questionnaire over no more than three days due to the temporal nature of the questions. All of the participants complied with this request. Included in the questionnaire package was a sealed envelope containing the debriefing which participants were asked not to open until they were finished the questionnaire. A more detailed summary of the findings was sent to those participants who requested it.

Questionnaire package. The questionnaire package included measures of the self, Personal Projects and well-being (as presented in Appendix B), all of which were randomly ordered to minimize potential carry over effects. As in Study One, measures of self included Singelis' (1994) Self-Construal Scale and Swap and Rubin's (1983) Interpersonal Orientation Scale. The package also included the Personal Projects package, measures of well-being, and Crowne and Marlow's (1960) Social Desirability scale, as described below.³

Participants were asked to list as many projects as possible within fifteen minutes (see Appendix B). It was expected that the elicitation process would pull out both more formal projects as well as more casual and pleasurable pursuits (Little, 1987). From this list, and as is in past research (Little, 1983), the ten projects that the person was most likely to engage in over the next month or so were selected and each of these projects was rated on the 17 standard Personal Project dimensions and the six new relational dimensions using the Personal Projects Matrix (shown in Appendix B). Participants rated the importance of each dimension to each project using scales ranging from one to ten. Participants were also asked with whom they would be carrying out each project, where each project would be done, and for whom and why they were pursuing each project.

An abundance of research has examined both the nature of subjective well-being (SWB) and the factors that affect it. According to Diener (1994), SWB is the global experience of positive reactions to one's life, and includes all of the lower- order components such as life satisfaction and hedonic level. Life satisfaction refers to a conscious global judgment of one's life. Hedonic level or

³ The questionnaire package also contained Costa and McCrae's (1985) NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI). This scale was designed to measure different facets of personality, namely, neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness, and was included because past Personal Projects research has indicated a link between Personal Project dimensions and different facets of personality. Because the NEO-FFI was not the focus of this research, these data are not considered here.

balance refers to the pleasantness minus unpleasantness of one's emotional life. (p. 108)

After an extensive overview of research in this area, Diener (1984) concluded that subjective well-being is comprised of three components: negative affect, positive affect and satisfaction with life. For this research, all three components of SWB were assessed.

Because the Centre For Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977) and the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS; Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983) have traditionally been used to measure negative affect in PPA research (Little, 1988), these scales were included in the questionnaire package. The CES-D (Radloff, 1977) was designed to assess depressive symptomatology in nonpsychiatric populations. Participants rated 20 statements (e.g., "I felt that everything I did was an effort") on 4-point scales labelled "rarely or none of the time" and "most or all of the time" at the poles. The alpha coefficient with the general population has been documented as .85, with the test-retest reliability over four weeks at .67 (Radloff, 1977). The PSS assessed participants' experience of stress with 14 5-point items (e.g., "How often did you feel nervous and stressed") anchored by "never" to "very often." The PSS appears reliable with alpha coefficients across three studies ranging from .84 to .86 and a test-retest reliability of .55 over six weeks (Cohen et al., 1983).

Kammann and Flett's (1983) Affectometer 2 was used to measure both positive and negative affect. The original analysis with the scale showed an alpha coefficient of .95. The items in this measure are based on 10 mnemonic categories, namely confluence, optimism, self-esteem, self-efficacy, social support, social interest, freedom, energy, cheerfulness and thought clarity, with four items assessing each category. The 40 items (twenty sentences and twenty adjectives) required the participant to indicate how often over a period of several weeks they felt as described by each item. For example, one positive affect sentence read "I think clearly and creatively" and one negative sentence read "Nothing seems very much fun anymore." Similarly, one of the positive affect

adjectives was "loving" and one of the negative affect adjectives was "discontented."

Possible answers ranged from 'not at all' (0) to 'all of the time' (5).

Life satisfaction, the third component of subjective well-being, was measured in two ways. First, as in previous PPA research (Little, 1988), six questions assessed participants' satisfaction in six domains of their life, specifically life in general, emotional state, physical state, home life, work life and social life. These questions were answered using 11-point Likert-type scales labelled 'completely dissatisfied' and 'completely satisfied' at the poles. Life satisfaction was also measured using Diener, Emmons, Larsen and Griffin's (1985) Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), a scale that is "at least partially independent of affective measures" (Pavot & Diener, 1993, p. 169). In the SWLS, participants rated their agreement with five items (e.g., "The conditions of my life are excellent") using 7-point scales anchored by 'strongly disagree' and 'strongly agree' at the extremities. Research with the SWLS showed it had satisfactory reliability with a Cronbach alpha of .87 and a test-retest coefficient of .82. The SWLS scores were also independent of scores on Crowne and Marlowe's (1960) Social Desirability scale, with a correlation of only .02.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

The preliminary analyses began with the examination of the homogeneity of the various scales. The descriptive statistics and the intercorrelations among the various scales were examined next, as described below.

Scale homogeneity. As shown in Table 11, item analyses revealed acceptable levels of homogeneity for all of the self-construal measures ($\alpha = .64$ to $.71$). Scale scores were therefore formed by calculating the sum, with higher scores indicating more of each attribute in question. For each of the Personal Project dimensions, the analyses revealed acceptable internal consistency, with alpha coefficients ranging from $.66$ to $.90$. Participants' average scores for each dimension were calculated across all of their projects, resulting in higher ratings indicating that the dimension was more important to the participants' projects. Lastly, for the measures of well-being, the alpha coefficients ranged from $.86$ to $.93$. Higher scores on the positive affect scale and the satisfaction with life measures indicated more subjective well-being, while higher scores on the measures of negative affect, stress and depression reflected less subjective well-being.

Descriptive statistics and interrelations among self-construal measures. As presented in Table 12, the mean score for the interdependent component of the Singelis scale was 52.6 out of a possible 84 ($SD = 8.8$). The mean score for the independent component was 60.7 ($SD = 8.1$). A paired t-test revealed that these participants described themselves as more independent than interdependent, $t(128) = 7.81, p < .001$. Finally, the mean score for the Interpersonal Orientation scale was 94.6 out of 145 ($SD = 10.0$), indicating that these participants were moderately concerned for others.

The next analysis examined the intercorrelations among the measures of the self and gender. Consistent with Singelis (1994), and like the findings of Study One, participants' independent self scores were unrelated to their interdependent self scores,

Table 12

Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for the Measures of Self-Construal

Scale	α	Possible range	M	SD
Interdependence	.64	1 - 84	52.6	8.8
Independence	.71	1 - 84	60.7	8.1
Interpersonal orientation	.69	1 -145	94.6	10.0

$r(125) = .01$, ns. As anticipated, participants' interdependent self-construal scores were positively related to their Interpersonal Orientation scores, $r(123) = .28$, $p < .01$.

Unexpectedly, however, participants' independent self scores were also positively, albeit weakly, related to their Interpersonal Orientation scores, $r(126) = .19$, $p < .05$.

As shown in Table 13, the results from a MANOVA examining the relation between gender and self-scores were significant. Examining the univariate effects revealed that this effect was due solely to Interpersonal Orientation scores where, as in Study One, women scored ($M = 97.7$, $SD = 8.6$) moderately higher than men ($M = 90.4$, $SD = 10.1$).

Descriptive analyses and interrelations among personal project dimensions. Little (1983) proposed a categorical scheme that could be used to perform a content analysis of personal projects in order to better understand what occupied participants' time. Lecci (1988) further developed this classification (see Appendix C). For the present research this classification was performed by two people who agreed on 85% of the classifications. Disagreements were resolved by discussion.

As listed in Table 14, which displays the frequencies for each of the project categories, most projects involved the household, followed by projects that involved the family, job or career and health.

As shown in Table 15, respondents indicated over a third (38.9%) of their projects were done by themselves. Projects were also done with a spouse or partner (16.2%) and family (14.5%). Although these categories overlapped, they were kept separate because that was how the participants worded their responses. Thus, it was clear that the majority of participants' projects were carried out either by themselves or with a small circle of intimate others.

As displayed in Table 16, participants did most of their projects for themselves (39.8%), followed by their family (19.9%) and both themselves and their families (23.6%). Again, the categories were created based on the wording given by the

Table 13

Results of the MANOVA Examining the Effects of Gender on Self-Construals

Effect	<i>Pillai's Trace V</i>	<i>eta</i> ²	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>
Overall	.139		3,115	6.21 ^{**}
Univariate effects				
Independent self-construal		.01	1,115	0.06
Interdependent self-construal		.01	1,115	0.20
Interpersonal orientation		.13	1,115	15.30 ^{***}

^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$.

Table 14

Content of Participants' Projects

Project category	<i>n</i>	%
Academic	26	2.0
Job tasks/career	134	10.4
Health/body	131	10.1
Interpersonal		
Family	138	10.7
Intimate	69	5.4
Secondary	14	1.1
Community	30	2.3
Meta-interpersonal	17	1.3
Intrapersonal		
Religion/philosophy	11	0.8
Self-improvement	37	2.9
Meta-intrapersonal	10	0.8
Leisure		
Entertainment	10	0.8
Parties/dances	16	1.2
Hobbies	78	6.0

Table 14 cont.

Content of Participants' Projects

Project category	<i>n</i>	%
Shopping	21	1.6
Pleasure reading/writing	36	2.8
Vacation planning	59	4.6
Sports	26	2.0
Administrative		
Job/moving	12	0.9
Household	247	19.1
Car tasks	21	1.6
Finances	80	6.2
Tasks for pets	6	0.5
Meta projects	10	0.8
Other	6	0.5

Table 15

Who Participants Did Their Projects With

With whom	<i>n</i>	%
Self	502	38.9
Spouse/partner	209	16.2
Family	187	14.5
Family and friends	103	7.9
Friends	82	6.4
Bosses and co-workers	73	5.7
Children	52	4.0
Professionals	33	2.5
Community groups	18	1.4
Teachers and classmates	10	0.8
Girlfriend/boyfriend	9	0.7

Table 16

For Whom Projects Were Done

For whom	<i>n</i>	%
Self	514	39.8
Family	257	19.9
Self and family	305	23.6
Bosses and co-workers	29	2.2
Self, family and friends	50	4.7
Self and employers	25	1.9
Friends	20	1.6
Everyone	13	1.0
Community groups	14	1.1
Self and girlfriend	5	0.4
Self and students	3	0.2
Girlfriend/boyfriend	2	0.2
Pet	1	0.1

respondents and participants' projects encompassed a limited number of people who were close to them.

As shown in Table 17, participants carried out almost half (45.3%) of their projects at home, which is not surprising given the number of household projects. Projects were also conducted "anywhere" (16.6%) and at work (7.5%). However, when one combines the categories that involved the participant's home, family homes, family cottages or friends' homes, it was clear that few projects happened elsewhere.

The next analysis was conducted to examine whether participants' projects were relational or nonrelational in nature. Given the evidence presented earlier in this paper, one could make the argument that a person's daily activities would serve to maintain their sense of self-construal and to fulfill cultural expectations and as a result enable them to feel better about themselves. Following this logic, participants' projects were coded for their relational versus nonrelational content based on participants' answers to the questions "with whom," "for whom" and "why" they were engaged in a particular project. One relational project, for example, was "Visiting partner's family," a project that was carried out because of "strained relations in the past, hope to open lines of communication, means a lot to my partner, partner's family feels need to make amends to me because of past transgressions." In this example the focus is clearly on the participant's primary relationship with his partner, and with the extended family. An example of a nonrelational project was "Improving education" to "increase chance of getting new job, to please myself." Here the focus is very much on the individual herself rather than others. The researcher and one other person coded the projects individually and agreed on 94.5% of the classifications. Disagreements were resolved by discussion.

When the proportion of relational and nonrelational projects was examined using Little's categorization, as shown in Table 18, the relational projects were most commonly classified as interpersonal and involved primarily the family (36.7%) and intimate others

Table 17

Where Projects Were Done

Location	<i>n</i>	%
Home	584	45.3
Anywhere	214	16.6
Work	98	7.5
Exercise facility and home	81	6.3
Travel locations	43	3.3
Education facilities	40	3.1
Home and work	36	2.8
Stores	36	2.8
Family's homes	33	2.6
Entertainment places	33	2.6
Home and cottage	15	1.2
Community centres	15	1.2
Friends' homes	7	0.5
Bank	6	0.5
Church	6	0.5
Home and stores	3	0.2

Table 18

Content of Participants' Relational and Nonrelational Projects

Project category	Relational		Nonrelational	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Academic	1	0.3	20	2.2
Job tasks/career	10	3.0	129	14.1
Health/body	4	1.2	126	13.8
Interpersonal				
Family	122	36.7	14	1.5
Intimate	66	19.9	3	0.3
Secondary	12	3.6	2	0.2
Community	21	6.3	9	1.0
Meta-interpersonal	8	2.4	0	0.0
Intrapersonal				
Religion/philosophy	4	1.2	7	0.8
Self-improvement	11	3.3	26	2.8
Meta-intrapersonal	2	0.6	5	0.5
Leisure				
Entertainment	4	1.2	7	0.8

Table 18 cont.

Content of Participants' Relational and Nonrelational Projects

Project category	Relational		Nonrelational	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Parties/dances	14	4.2	2	0.2
Hobbies	9	2.7	69	7.6
Shopping	3	0.9	17	1.7
Pleasure reading/writing	7	2.1	29	3.2
Vacation planning	14	4.2	24	2.6
Sports	1	0.3	21	2.3
Administrative				
Job/moving	2	0.6	10	1.1
Household	10	3.0	282	30.9
Car tasks	1	0.3	20	2.2
Finances	4	1.2	72	7.9
Tasks for pets	0	0.0	6	0.7
Meta projects	1	0.3	9	1.0
Other	1	0.3	4	0.4

(19.9%). Nonrelational projects, on the other hand, most commonly involved household administration (30.9%), participants' jobs (14.1%), and health matters (13.8%). An analyses of these data revealed that participants listed more nonrelational (913, 75%) than relational (322, 25%) projects. Surprisingly women did not list more relational ($n = 194$) than nonrelational ($n = 505$) projects relative to men (relational, $n = 128$; nonrelational, $n = 418$), $\chi^2(1, N = 126) = 1.42$, ns.

The next analyses moved away from the content of participants' projects to their Personal Project dimension scores. As shown in Table 19, participants' average scores were six or higher out of a possible ten for seven of the 17 standard PPA dimensions. On average, the dimension given the highest rating was initiation, indicating that these participants typically began their projects as a result of their own initiative. The next three highest rated dimensions were outcome, importance and control, indicating that the participants were confident in successful project outcomes, that the projects were very important, and that the respondents felt in control of their projects. These scores may be construed as consistent with our Western value system where to initiate and control one's activities is deemed an important goal. The lowest scores given to the standard dimensions were for negative impact, stress and progress. Despite feeling in control and optimistic about the success of their projects, participants were not making much progress in actually carrying out their projects. Participants' average scores on the new six relational dimensions, shown in Table 19, were generally lower than most of their standard dimension scores. Nevertheless, participants' projects provided them with some opportunity to reduce conflict and maintain better relationships with others.

The next analyses examined the factor structure underlying the PPA dimensions. Prior research (Little, 1988) demonstrated that a reliable three factor solution underlay the standard PPA dimensions. Two separate factor analyses conducted on the data of approximately 2,000 respondents and two cluster analytic analyses led Little (1988) to conclude that "the standard dimensions of PPA can be effectively reduced to three factors: Social Meaning, Personal Meaning and Stress" (p. 23). The Social Meaning factor consisted of the dimensions of enjoyment, visibility to others, time adequacy,

Table 19

Internal Consistency Across Projects and Descriptive Statistics for the Measures of the Personal Project Dimensions

Dimension	α	M	SD
Standard			
Initiation	.85	7.7	1.8
Importance	.75	7.2	1.2
Outcome	.85	7.4	1.5
Control	.83	7.1	1.7
Value congruency	.87	6.8	1.8
Self-identification	.82	6.6	1.7
Enjoyment	.74	6.1	1.5
Challenge	.74	5.8	1.6
Other's view	.83	5.7	1.9
Absorption	.84	5.5	1.7
Visibility to others	.75	5.4	1.8
Positive impact	.88	5.3	2.4
Difficulty	.75	5.2	1.6
Time adequacy	.79	5.1	1.6
Progress	.77	4.6	1.7

Note. Dimension scores could range from 1 to 10.

Table 19 cont.

Internal Consistency Across Projects and Descriptive Statistics for the Measures of the Personal Project Dimensions

Dimension	α	M	SD
Stress	.70	4.1	1.6
Negative impact	.86	2.9	1.8
Relational			
Relating to others	.66	5.0	1.8
With others	.79	4.9	2.0
Togetherness	.64	4.8	1.7
Emotional connection	.66	4.7	1.7
Help others	.77	4.4	2.0
Conflict reduction	.90	3.7	2.4

Note. Dimension scores could range from 0 to 10.

other's view and progress. Personal Meaning was represented by the dimensions of importance, control, initiation, outcome, self-identification, value congruency and positive impact, and the Stress factor included the difficulty, stress and challenge dimensions.

A Principal Components analysis of the 17 standard and six relational Personal Project dimensions yielded six factors with eigen values greater than one. Given the possibility that Kaiser's criterion resulted in an overextraction of factors (Barrett & Kline, 1982; Cattell, 1978), a scree test was conducted to further examine the resulting factors. The scree test (Cattell, 1966, 1978), shown in Figure 2, suggested that only two factors underlay these data. As a result, another factor analysis was conducted using a forced two factor model with a Varimax rotation. Table 20 displays the dimensions loading onto each of the factors using a criterion loading of .45. The first factor included all of the relational dimensions as well as the standard dimensions of challenge, positive impact, negative impact, and stress. The second factor included the dimensions of control, enjoyment, importance, initiation, outcome, progress, self-identification, time adequacy and visibility.

Because this factor analysis resulted in two factors that were both inconsistent with past Personal Project research and theoretically uninterpretable in themselves, the decision was made to use the three factors identified in past PPA research and one additional factor representing the relational dimensions that were added for this research. The relational factor consisted of the conflict reduction, emotional connection, help others, relating to others, togetherness and with others dimensions. The reliability coefficients were calculated for each factor and, as presented in Table 21, were acceptable (α s = .67 to .85). Participants' average scores on each of the factors, also presented in Table 20, indicated that they regarded Personal Meaning as the most important aspect of their projects, while they viewed the Relational, Social Meaning and Stress aspects of their projects as moderately important.

The intercorrelations among the PPA factors are presented in Table 22. As one might expect, respondents' Social Meaning, Personal Meaning, and Relational factor scores

Figure 2

Results of the Scree Test for the Unforced Principal Component Analysis of the Standard and Relational Personal Project Dimensions

Table 20

***Results of the Principal Component Factor Analysis of the Standard and Relational
Personal Project Dimensions***

Dimension	Factor one	Factor two
Emotional connection	.75	.16
Relatedness	.68	.34
Togetherness	.68	.31
Helping others	.65	.37
Conflict reduction	.64	.17
Stress	.63	-.20
Challenge	.58	.01
With others	.56	.33
Negative impact	.53	-.19
Positive impact	.53	.35
Outcome	.02	.72
Control	.03	.71
Self-identity	.27	.63
Enjoyment	.23	.62
Progress	.35	.61
Time adequacy	-.12	.60
Initiation	.08	.56
Importance	.36	.52
Visibility	.41	.49
Absorption	.44	.46
Difficulty	.47	-.51
Other's view	.51	.54
Value congruency	.52	.59

Table 21

Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for Personal Project Factor Scores

Factor	α	Possible range	M	SD
Relational	.85	1 - 60	27.4	8.9
Social meaning	.73	1 - 50	26.9	6.2
Personal meaning	.81	1 - 70	50.0	8.6
Stress	.67	1 - 30	15.1	3.9

Table 22

Intercorrelations Among the PPA Factors

Factor	Social meaning	Personal meaning	Stress
Relational	.61 ^{***}	.55 ^{***}	.35 ^{***}
Social meaning		.69 ^{***}	-.02
Personal meaning			.12

^{***} $p < .001$ (2-tailed).

Note. *Ns* ranged 124 to 127.

were all interrelated. Interestingly, and consistent with the factor analysis (see Table 20), participants' Stress factor scores were correlated with their Relational factor scores, suggesting that stress increases as projects have more relational importance.

Descriptive statistics and interrelations among measures of well-being. The next analyses examined participants' scores on the criterion measures of well-being. As shown in Table 23, respondents' well-being scores suggested that, on average, they were not very stressed or depressed and experienced little negative affect. These participants also reported fairly high levels of positive affect and indicated they were reasonably satisfied with their lives and its different facets.

The negative portion of Kammann and Flett's (1983) Affectometer 2, Radloff's (1977) CES-Depression scale and Cohen, et al.'s (1983) Perceived Stress Scale were all measures of negative affect. As shown in Table 24, the correlations among these scales were significant, ranging from .49 to .72. Given this, Z scores were calculated for each scale and the mean Z score was calculated as an index of negative affect. Hence, higher scores on this composite scale represented higher levels of negative affect.

The correlations among the six domains of life satisfaction, shown in Table 25, were large enough to merit the calculation of total scale scores ($\alpha = .85$). Because these total scores were correlated with participants' scores on the Satisfaction With Life Scale, $r(126) = .68, p < .001$, participants' mean life satisfaction Z scores were calculated. As there is only one criterion measure for positive affect, the positive component of the Affectometer 2, participants' average scores on this measure were calculated and used as an index of positive affect. Contrary to prior research (e.g., Diener, 1984), participants' negative affect scores were significantly correlated with both their life satisfaction, $r(126) = -.71, p < .001$, and positive affect scores, $r(126) = -.75, p < .001$. Thus, although the concepts assessed by these measures may be theoretically distinct, in this study they are related. Given this, a composite well-being score was calculated by taking the mean Z scores for each of the three indices of well-being, with higher composite scores meaning higher life satisfaction. Note that negative affect scores were first multiplied by minus

Table 23

Internal Consistency and Descriptive Statistics for the Measures of Well-Being

Scale	α	Possible range	M	SD
Negative affect	.93	1 - 100	36.0	11.6
Perceived stress	.86	1 - 60	10.1	8.9
CES-Depression	.90	1 - 56	20.0	7.3
Satisfaction with life	.91	1 - 35	25.1	7.1
Satisfaction with domains of life	.86	1 - 60	42.1	9.9
Positive affect	.93	1 - 100	72.1	11.8

Table 24

Intercorrelations Among the Measures of Well-Being

Scale	Positive affect	Depression	Stress	Life satisfaction	Domains of satisfaction
Negative affect	-.71***	.85***	.68***	-.60***	-.66***
Positive affect		-.64***	-.66***	.60***	.67***
Depression			.67***	-.54***	-.63***
Stress				-.49***	-.60***
Life satisfaction					.68***

*** $p < .001$ (2-tailed).

Note. *Ns* ranged 125 to 128.

Table 25

Intercorrelations Among Domains of Life Satisfaction Scores

Domain	Physical health	Social life	Emotional state	Work life	Home life
Whole life	.55 ^{***}	.56 ^{***}	.77 ^{***}	.52 ^{***}	.74 ^{***}
Physical health		.40 ^{***}	.49 ^{***}	.34 ^{***}	.46 ^{***}
Social life			.64 ^{***}	.20 ^{***}	.55 ^{***}
Emotional state				.41 ^{***}	.72 ^{***}
Work life					.36 ^{***}

^{***} $p < .001$ (2-tailed).

Note. *Ns* ranged from 125 to 128.

one to reverse the direction of the scores ⁴

Intercorrelations among the predictor variables. There were a number of slight to moderate interrelations between the measures of the self, the content of participants' projects and their PPA factor scores, as documented in Table 26. Relative to men, women had higher Personal Meaning scores, people with more interdependent selves had more relational projects and higher Stress scores, and more interpersonally orientated respondents had higher Relational and Stress scores. Participants with more independent selves had slightly higher Relational scores and moderately higher Social Meaning and Personal Meaning scores. Lastly, participants who had a greater proportion of relational projects had moderately higher scores on the Relational factor and slightly higher scores on the remaining three Personal Project factors.

A simultaneous regression analysis was conducted to further examine the relation between the relational content of participants' projects and the Personal Project factors they deemed important to their projects. Although the overall effect was significant, as shown in Table 27, only one of the PPA factors was significant, namely the Relational factor, which in itself accounted for 33.6% of the variance. The more the relational the content of participants' projects, the more they described the relational aspect of their projects as important. This finding provides some evidence for the convergent validity of the new Relational factor.

Main Analyses

The primary intent of this research was to examine the relations between the self and the nature of people's personal projects and their subjective well-being. One hypothesis was that the new relational dimensions would be better predictors of the well-being of participants with less independent, more interdependent and more interpersonally

⁴ All of the subsequent analyses were also performed using the three individual indices of well being, namely, negative affect, positive affect and life satisfaction. These analyses yielded results identical to those that follow.

Table 26

Intercorrelations Among Measures of the Self and Personal Project Factor Scores

		Personal project factors			
	Proportion of relational projects	Relational	Social meaning	Personal meaning	Stress
Self-measures					
Gender	-.14	-.03	-.07	-.21 [*]	-.14
Interdependent	.22 [*]	.15	-.02	-.14	.19 [*]
Independent	.10	.22 [*]	.43 ^{***}	.30 ^{**}	-.06
Interpersonal orientation	.14	.18 [*]	.09	.16	.18 [*]
Proportion of relational projects		.52 ^{***}	.26 ^{**}	.21 [*]	.19 [*]

^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$ (2-tailed).

Note. *Ns* ranged from 126 to 128. Gender was coded as 1 for women and 2 for men.

Table 27

***Results of Regression of the Proportion of Relational Projects onto Personal Project
Factor Scores***

Source	R ²	β	<i>t</i> (122)	df	<i>F</i>
Project Factors	.336			4	15.41 ^{***}
Relational		.625	5.90 ^{***}		
Social meaning		-.093	-0.80		
Personal meaning		.046	0.43		
Stress		-.051	-0.62		
Residual	.664			122	

^{***}*p* < .001.

orientated self-construals. Conversely, the standard Personal Project dimensions were expected to be better predictors of the well-being of participants with more independent, less interdependent and less interpersonally orientated self-construals. It was also anticipated that both the relational versus nonrelational content of participants' projects and their Personal Project factor scores might mediate the relation between the nature of the self and well-being. That is, that respondents with less independent, more interdependent and more interpersonally orientated self-construals would engage in more self-congruent relational projects that, because they fulfill their relational needs, enhance their sense of well-being. To examine the feasibility of these hypotheses, the simple correlations between the predictor and criterion variables were examined and the moderating effects of self-construals on a) the relations between Personal Project factor scores and well-being and b) the relations between the proportion of relational projects and well-being were assessed. Finally, analyses were conducted to assess the mediated model articulated above.

Correlations between predictor and criterion variables. As presented in Table 28, there were a number of significant relations between participants' scores on the predictor variables and the composite measure of well-being. Although participants' gender, interdependence scores, interpersonal orientation scores and proportion of relational projects scores were not related to their composite well-being scores, participants who described themselves as more independent reported moderately higher levels of well-being. All of the correlations between participants' PPA factor scores and well-being were also significant. Participants who described their projects as more Relational and more Personally and Socially Meaningful reported more positive well-being, while participants who described their projects as more Stressful had lower levels of well-being.

Measures of the self as moderators of the personal project-well-being relation. The first set of moderator analyses examined whether participants' self-construals moderated the relations between the relational content of their projects and their well-being. In these four hierarchical regressions, one for each measure of self (gender, independence,

Table 28

Correlations Between Predictor Variables and Composite Well-Being

Predictor	Composite well-being
Self	
Gender	.01
Interdependence	-.02
Independence	.36 ^{***}
Interpersonal orientation	.06
Proportion of relational projects	.08
Personal project factor scores	
Relational	.19*
Social meaning	.46 ^{***}
Personal meaning	.28 ^{**}
Stress	-.32 ^{***}

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Note. N s ranged from 125 to 129. Gender was coded 1 for women and 2 for men.

interdependence and interpersonal orientation), the measure of self and the proportion of relational projects were entered on the first step and their interaction was entered on the second step. As displayed in Tables 29 to 32, these analyses yielded very consistent results, namely that the nature of the self did not moderate the impact of the proportion of relational projects on participants' well-being.

The next set of moderator analyses examined whether participants' self-construals interacted with their Personal Project factor scores to predict their well-being. These relationships were examined by conducting four hierarchical regression analyses, one for each measure of the self (gender, independence, interdependence, and interpersonal orientation scores). In each analysis, the measure of the self and the four PPA factors were entered on the first step and their interactions were entered on the second step.

Contrary to expectations, these hierarchical regression analyses, which are displayed in Tables 33 to 36, revealed that none of the measures of the self moderated the relations between participants' PPA factor scores and their well-being. However, two personal project factors, namely Social Meaning and Stress, consistently emerged as predictors of well-being and accounted for 31 to 33% of the variance. These findings are congruent with past Personal Projects research that demonstrated that these dimensions were important in predicting well-being (Little, 1988, 1999). Finally, only the participants' independent self-construal scores were related significantly to their well-being, perhaps because this mode of self is most congruent with our culture.

Proportion of relational projects and personal project factor scores as mediators of the self-construal-well-being relation. The final analyses examined whether the proportion of relational projects and Personal Project factor scores mediated the relations between the nature of the self and well-being. To this end, four sets of analyses were conducted, one for each of the four measures of the self (gender, independent, interdependent and interpersonal orientation scores). In each case a set of six simultaneous regression analyses was conducted to assess the mediated model.

Table 29

***Results of Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto
Participants' Gender and Proportion of Relational Project Scores***

Predictor	R^2 change	β	t	df	F change
Step one	.007			2	0.41
Gender		.026	0.29		
% of relational projects		.081	0.88		
Step two	.001			1	0.04
Interaction		.065	0.32		
Residual	.992			120	

Note. Gender was coded as 1 for women and 2 for men.

Table 30

***Results of Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto
Participants' Independence Scores and Proportion of Relational Project Scores***

Predictor	R^2 change	β	t	df	F change
Step one	.145			2	10.07***
Independence		.363	4.29***		
% of relational projects		.085	1.00		
Step two	.001			1	0.70
Interaction		.155	0.26		
Residual	.854			122	

*** $p < .001$.

Table 31

***Results of Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto
Participants' Interdependence and Proportion of Relational Project Scores***

Predictor	R^2 change	β	t	df	F change
Step one	.014			2	0.83
Interdependence		-.014	-0.16		
% of relational projects		.120	1.29		
Step two	.001			1	0.05
Interaction		.045	0.07		
Residual	.985			122	

Table 32

***Results of Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto
Participants' Interpersonal Orientation and Proportion of Relational Project Scores***

Predictor	R^2 change	β	t	df	F change
Step one	.008			2	0.49
Interpersonal orientation		.061	0.66		
% of relational projects		.059	0.64		
Step two	.009			1	1.10
Interaction		-.888	-1.05		
Residual	.983			121	

Table 33

***Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto
Participants' Gender and Personal Project Factor Scores***

Predictor	R^2 change	β	t	df	F change
Step one	.308			5	10.44 ^{***}
Gender		-.015	-0.19		
Personal project factors					
Relational		.047	0.43		
Personal meaning		.026	0.24		
Social meaning		.408	3.43 ^{**}		
Stress		-.336	-3.85 ^{***}		
Step two	.009			4	0.37
Gender X relational		-.163	-0.32		
Gender X personal meaning		-.392	-0.59		
Gender X social meaning		.686	1.09		
Gender X stress		.289	0.71		
Residual	.683			116	

^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$.

Table 34

***Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto
Participants' Independence and Personal Project Factor Scores***

Predictor	R^2 change	β	t	df	F change
Step one	.353			5	13.02***
Independence		.184	2.26*		
Personal project factor scores					
Relational		.059	0.56		
Personal meaning		.023	0.22		
Social meaning		.353	2.92**		
Stress		-.316	-3.17***		
Step two	.022			4	1.02
Independence X relational		.580	0.63		
Independence X personal meaning		.322	0.28		
Independence X social meaning		-.718	-0.65		
Independence X stress		-1.333	-1.90		
Residual	.625			115	

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 35

***Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto
Participants' Interdependence and Personal Project Factor Scores***

Predictor	R^2 change	β	t	df	F change
Step one	.327			5	11.56***
Interdependence		.045	0.56		
Personal project factors					
Relational		.041	0.52		
Personal meaning		.039	0.35		
Social meaning		.434	3.70***		
Stress		-.323	-3.76***		
Step two	.018			4	0.77
Interdependence X relational		.112	0.14		
Interdependence X personal meaning		-1.284	-1.39		
Interdependence X social meaning		1.362	1.24		
Interdependence X stress		-.084	-.010		
Residual	.655			115	

*** $p < .001$.

Table 36

***Results of the Hierarchical Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto
Participants' Interpersonal Orientation and Personal Project Factor Scores***

Predictor	R^2 change	β	t	df	F change
Step one	.309			5	10.84 ^{***}
Interpersonal orientation		.143	1.84		
Personal project factors					
Relational		-.017	-0.16		
Personal meaning		.079	0.74		
Social meaning		.423	3.57 ^{**}		
Stress		-.253	-2.95 ^{**}		
Step two	.029			4	1.27
Interpersonal orientation X relational		-1.08	-0.83		
Interpersonal orientation X personal meaning		-.426	-0.28		
Interpersonal orientation X social meaning		.107	0.89		
Interpersonal orientation X stress		-.624	-0.73		
Residual	.662			117	

^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$.

The first analysis, presented in Table 37, examined whether the proportion of relational projects and Personal Project factor scores mediated the relations between participants' gender and well-being. The results revealed that collectively, all of the predictors explained a significant 31% of well-being. Examining the model illustrated in Figure 3 showed that, although participants' gender did not have any direct or indirect effects on well-being, women relative to men had higher Personal Meaning scores. Participants' with proportionally more relational projects had higher Relational, Personal Meaning and Social Meaning scores. The proportion of relational projects also had an indirect positive effect on well-being through the Social Meaning factor. There was a marginally significant relation between the proportion of relational projects and participants' stress scores: Participants who engaged in more relational projects reported higher levels of stress that in turn decreased their well-being. Lastly, participants' Social Meaning and Stress scores were significant predictors of well-being. Thus, although the proportion of relational projects and Personal Project factor scores did not mediate the relationship between gender and well-being, Social Meaning factor scores and to some extent Stress factor scores did mediate the relation between the proportion of participants' projects that were relational in content and their well-being.

The next analysis examined whether the nature of participants' personal project scores mediated the relation between their independent self-construal scores and well-being. As shown in Table 38 and Figure 4, all of the predictors together explained 36% of the variance in well-being scores. Unlike the results above, participants' independent self-construal scores had both direct and indirect effects on well-being. As participants' independence scores increased, so did their well-being. In addition, respondents with higher independent self-construal scores had higher Social Meaning scores, which, in turn, had positive effects on well-being. Respondents' independent self scores were positively related to their Personal Meaning scores and, contrary to expectations, their Relational scores. The former relation, however, was stronger than the latter. Social

Table 37

Results of the Regression of Composite Well-Being onto Personal Project Factor Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects and Gender

	Coefficient		Equation	
	β	t	R^2	F
Well-being from:				
Gender	-.005	-0.61		
% of relational projects	.019	0.21		
Relational	.037	0.29		
Personal meaning	-.007	-0.06		
Social meaning	.435	3.60***		
Stress	-.330	-3.71**	.307	8.63***
Relational from:				
Gender	.037	0.28		
% of relational projects	.521	6.72***	.268	22.65***
Personal meaning from:				
Gender	-.202	-2.33*		
% of relational projects	.183	2.11*	.085	5.74**
Social meaning from:				
Gender	-.050	-0.57		
% of relational projects	.248	2.83**	0.67	4.49*
Stress from:				
Gender	-.108	-1.22		
% of relational projects	.170	1.92 ⁺	.046	2.98
% of relational projects from:				
Gender	-.140	-1.58	.019	2.48

⁺ $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Note. Gender was coded as 1 for women and 2 for men. $N = 123$.

Figure 3

Schematic Model of the Relations Between Gender, Proportion of Relational Projects Scores, Personal Project Factor Scores and Well-Being

⁺ $p < .10$. ^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Note. Gender was coded as 1 for women and 2 for men. $N = 123$.

Table 38

***Results of the Regression of Composite Well-Being Scores onto Personal Project
Factor Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects and Independence Scores***

	Coefficient		Equation	
	β	t	R^2	F
Well-being from:				
Independent self	.193	2.63 [*]		
% of relational projects	.057	0.66		
Relational	.028	0.24		
Personal meaning	-.014	-0.13		
Social meaning	.383	3.14 ^{**}		
Stress	-.309	-3.65 ^{***}	.359	10.81 ^{***}
Relational from:				
% of relational projects	.493	6.44 ^{***}		
Independent self	.163	2.13 [*]	.286	24.64 ^{***}
Personal meaning from:				
% of relational projects	.175	2.06 [*]		
Independent self	.285	3.35 ^{**}	.122	8.57 ^{***}
Social meaning from:				
% of relational projects	.201	2.53 [*]		
Independent self	.410	5.14 ^{***}	.226	17.93 ^{***}
Stress from:				
% of relational projects	.179	2.01 [*]		
Independent self	-.071	-0.80	.035	2.20
% of relational projects from:				
Independent self	.102	1.14	.010	1.30

^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Note. $N = 123$.

Figure 4

Schematic Model of the Relations Between Independent Self Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects Scores, Personal Project Factor Scores and Well-Being

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

$N = 123$.

Meaning and Stress factor scores also mediated the relation between the proportion of relational projects and well-being in that participants with proportionately more relational projects had higher Social Meaning scores, which were associated with better well-being, and higher Stress factor scores, which were associated with poorer well-being. As in the previous analyses, then, the proportion of relational projects did not mediate the relation between participants' independent self-construals and well-being scores. However, respondents' Social Meaning and Stress scores did mediate the relation between the proportion of participants' projects that were relational and their well-being.

As shown in Table 39 and in Figure 5, the nature of participants' personal projects mediated the relation between their interdependence and well-being scores and collectively all of the predictors explained 33% of the variance in participant's well-being scores. In this case, participants with more interdependent self-construals had proportionally more relational projects, which were associated with higher Social Meaning scores and in turn higher well-being scores. As in the preceding analyses, respondents with proportionately more relational projects had higher Relational and Personal Meaning scores, and higher Stress scores which were associated with poorer well-being. Also there were several marginally significant results worth discussing. As participants' interdependence scores increased their Personal meaning scores decreased. Participants with higher interdependence scores also tended to have higher stress scores, which in turn reduced well-being.

The last analysis examined whether the nature of participants' personal projects mediated the relation between their interpersonal orientation and well-being scores. As shown in Table 40 and Figure 6, the predictor variables together accounted for 32% of the variance in participants' well-being scores. While participants' interpersonal orientation scores did not have any significant direct or indirect effects on their well-being, the proportion of relational projects had an indirect positive effect on well-being through their Social Meaning factor scores. In addition, there were several marginally significant relations that are of interest. First, more interpersonally orientated participants tended to pursue more relational projects. As a result, participants'

Table 39

Results of the Regression of Composite Well-Being onto Personal Project Factor Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects and Interdependence Scores

	Coefficient		Equation	
	β	t	R^2	F
Well-being from:				
Interdependent self	.053	0.66		
% of relational projects	.052	0.58		
Relational	.004	0.32		
Personal meaning	.004	0.41		
Social meaning	.466	3.92 ^{***}		
Stress	-.318	-3.65 ^{***}	.330	9.54 ^{***}
Relational from:				
% of relational projects	.498	6.27 ^{***}		
Interdependent self	.053	0.66	.262	21.86 ^{***}
Personal meaning from:				
% of relational projects	.238	2.66 ^{**}		
Interdependent self	-.153	-1.71 ⁺	.064	4.18 [*]
Social meaning from:				
% of relational projects	.256	2.85 ^{**}		
Interdependent self	-.056	-0.62	.062	4.07 [*]
Stress from:				
% of relational projects	.138	1.53		
Interdependent self	.151	1.68 ⁺	.051	3.32 [*]
% of relational projects from:				
Interdependent self	.223	2.54 [*]	.050	6.47 [*]

⁺ $p < .10$. ^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Note. $N = 123$.

Figure 5

Schematic Model of the Relations Between Interdependent Self Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects Scores, Personal Project Factor Scores and Well-Being

⁺ $p < .10$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

$N = 123$.

Table 40

Results of the Regression of Composite Well-Being onto Personal Project Factor Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects and Interpersonal Orientation

	Coefficient		Equation	
	β	t	R^2	F
Well-being from:				
Interpersonal orientation	.106	1.33		
% of relational projects	.006	0.06		
Relational	.022	0.18		
Personal meaning	-.033	-0.30		
Social meaning	.457	3.79***		
Stress	-.345	-3.93***	.322	9.11***
Relational from:				
% of relational projects	.490	6.26***		
Interpersonal orientation	.113	1.45	.269	22.42***
Personal meaning from:				
% of relational projects	.174	1.96**		
Interpersonal orientation	.148	1.66 ⁺	.060	3.87 [*]
Social meaning from:				
% of relational projects	.241	2.72**		
Interpersonal orientation	.056	0.64	.065	4.26 [*]
Stress from:				
% of relational projects	.155	1.74 ⁺		
Interpersonal orientation	.153	1.72 ⁺	.054	3.51 [*]
% of relational projects from:				
Interpersonal orientation	.164	1.84 ⁺	.021	2.68

⁺ $p = .10$. ⁺⁺ $p < .06$. ^{*} $p < .05$. ^{**} $p < .01$. ^{***} $p < .001$ (two-tailed).

Note. $N = 122$.

Figure 6

Schematic Model of the Relations Between Interpersonal Orientation Scores, Proportion of Relational Projects Scores, Personal Project Factor Scores and Well-Being

$^+ p < .10$, $^{++} p < .06$, $^+ p < .05$, $^{**} p < .01$, $^{***} p < .001$ (two-tailed).

$N = 122$.

interpersonal orientation scores tended to have an indirect positive effect on well-being through the proportion of relational projects and Social Meaning scores. Second, participants' interpersonal orientation scores were marginally related to their Stress scores, which in turn detracted from well-being. Lastly as participants' interpersonal orientation scores increased, so did their Personal Meaning scores.

Taken together, the analyses revealed several interesting findings. As hypothesized, participants' proportion of relational project scores and their Social Meaning scores mediated the relation between their interdependent self-construal and well-being scores. The proportion of relational projects and Personal Project factor scores did not, however, mediate the relations between the other measures of the self, namely gender, independent and interpersonal orientation scores, and well-being. In addition, and in all cases, participants' Social Meaning scores mediated the relation between participants' proportion of relational project scores and their well-being. Thus, although the observed relations between self-construals and well-being were not consistent, the types of projects participants pursued consistently affected their scores on at least one of the Personal Project factors, which in turn affected their well-being.

Alternative explanations. The final analyses were conducted to identify any confounded variables that might provide alternative explanations for the significant relations noted above. These variables included social desirability and participants' demographic characteristics.

Participants were asked if they agreed or disagreed with each of the twenty items comprising Crowne and Marlow's (1960) measure of Social Desirability (e.g., "I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me"), a scale that in past research has had alpha coefficients ranging from .73 to .87. In the present research, the Social Desirability scale had an alpha coefficient of .71 ($M = 10.7$, $SD = 3.6$). As shown in Table 41, Social Desirability scores were related to four of the ten conceptual variables

Table 41

Correlations Between Social Desirability and Measures of the Self, Personal Project Factor and Well-Being Scores

Variable	Social desirability
Measures of the self	
Gender	.06
Independence	.22*
Interdependence	-.01
Interpersonal orientation	-.21*
Proportion of relational projects	.08
Personal project factors	
Relational	.08
Personal meaning	.10
Social meaning	.19*
Stress	-.11
Composite well-being	.29**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

Note. *Ns* ranged from 126 to 139. Gender was coded 1 for women and 2 for men.

examined in this study. Not surprisingly given our society's valuation of independence, higher Social Desirability scores were associated with higher independence and lower interpersonal orientation scores. Participants with higher Social Desirability scores also reported that their personal projects were more Socially Meaningful and that they experienced higher levels of well-being. These findings are similar to those reported by Diener, Sandvik, Pavot and Gallagher (1991), who compared self and observer reports of subjective well-being and observed at best moderate correlation with social desirability ($r = .20$). Importantly, because the effect of Social Desirability was also reflected in the observers' reports of well-being, the authors concluded that social desirability may influence subjective well-being through its impact on underlying happiness, as opposed to Social Desirability *per se*. Nevertheless, because Social Desirability was correlated with two of the three significant predictors of participants' well-being, namely their interdependent self scores and their Social Meaning factor scores, and the criterion measures of well-being, the relations between these scores and well-being was examined while controlling for Social Desirability.

To assess whether Social Desirability provided an alternative explanation, the six regression analysis constituting the analyses were redone for each measure of the self (i.e., gender, independence, interdependence and interpersonal orientation) by entering participants' Social Desirability scores on the first step and the remaining predictors on the second step of the regression analysis. The results revealed that, although Social Desirability was a significant predictor of well-being, the results of the second step replicated the previous findings. Therefore Social Desirability did not provide an alternative explanation for the observed relations between the measures of the self, personal projects and well-being.

The next analyses considered whether participants' demographic characteristics could provide an alternative explanation for the observed relations between participants' self-construals, personal projects and well-being. As presented in Table 42, only

Table 42

Correlations of Demographic Characteristics with Self-construal, Proportion of Relational Projects, Personal Project and Well-Being Scores

Demographic Characteristics						
Scale	Age	Children	Education	Personal income	Family income	Work outside the home
Measures of the self						
Gender	-.02	.01	-.00	.45***	.14	-.23**
Independence	.07	.03	.12	.02	-.08	.03
Interdependence	-.01	-.11	-.02	.01	.03	.07
Interpersonal orientation	-.00	.05	.06	-.08	-.03	-.10
Personal project factors						
Relational	.01	-.12	.15	-.03	-.05	-.00
Personal meaning	.03	.09	.26**	-.01	.03	.06
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.						

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Note. Ns ranged from 124 to 129. Gender was coded 1 for women and 2 for men. Children was coded 1 for yes and 2 for no. Education was coded as 1 for high school, 2 for trades or community college, 3 for B.A. and B.A. honours and 4 for graduate studies. Work outside the home was coded 1 for yes and 2 for no.

Table 42 cont.

Correlations of Demographic Characteristics with Self-construal, Proportion of Relational Projects, Personal Project and Well-Being Scores

Scale	Demographic characteristics					
	Age	Children	Education	Personal Income	Family Income	Work outside the home
Social meaning Stress	-.00	.02	.18*	-.00	.05	.00
	-.10	.04	-.00	-.14	-.04	.14
Proportion of relational projects	.09	.19*	-.01	-.11	.08	.03
Well-being	.17	-.14	.25**	.18*	.20*	-.28**

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Note. *Ns* ranged from 124 to 129. Gender was coded 1 for women and 2 for men. Children was coded 1 for yes and 2 for no. Education was coded as 1 for high school, 2 for trades or community college, 3 for B.A. and B.A. honours and 4 for graduate studies. Work outside the home was coded 1 for yes and 2 for no.

participants' education was significantly related to both their well-being scores and two of the significant predictors of well-being documented in the main analyses, namely their Personal and Social Meaning scores. Therefore, the correlation between participants' Personal and Social Meaning scores and their well-being scores were examined after partialing out their education status. The resulting correlations remained significant, suggesting that education did not account for the observed relations between participants' well-being and their Personal Meaning ($r = .28, p < .01$) and Social Meaning ($r = .46, p < .001$) project factor scores. Next, the relation between gender and marital status was examined, but it was not significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 124) = 0.21, ns$. A series of ANOVAs was conducted on the measures of self-construal, Personal Project factor scores, proportion of relational projects and well-being with their marital status to test whether or not any of these relations were significant. The results indicated that none of these relations were significant. Therefore, the conclusion was reached that participants' demographic characteristics did not provide an alternative explanation for the already reported results.

Discussion

The findings of this study have implications for a number of areas, including cultural and gender differences in self-concepts, the relations between self-construals and the nature of personal projects, the role of self-construals in the relations between the nature of people's daily activities and their well-being, and the measurement of self-construals and personal projects.

Gender Differences

According to a number of theorists (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Lyons, 1983; Miller, 1986/1991), mainstream personality theories have neglected the importance of the relational component of personality and its potential impact on well-being (Gilligan, 1977). Miller and her colleagues (e.g., Miller, 1976/1986; Jordan, 1985/1991) claim that this component of personality is particularly important for women and that, because women are asked to conform to a predominantly male model of mental health, theories of personality and mental health were prejudicial and potentially detrimental to women's well-being. After their extensive review of the literature regarding gender and self-construals, Cross and Madson (1997) concluded that women are indeed more likely than men to have relational self-construals. Moreover, their review led them to suggest that individual differences in self-construals have important implications for self-esteem, aggression, and relationship satisfaction, among other things.

The present research, however, yielded mixed findings regarding the hypothesis that women are more relational than are men, while men are more individuated than women. The results of the q-sort analysis in Study One revealed that women were more likely to be categorized as highly relational than men, but that women and men were equally likely to be categorized as highly independent. Similarly, in both studies women had higher interpersonal orientation scores than did men, but there were no gender differences in independent and interdependent self-construal scores.

Unexpected findings also emerged from the analyses of respondents' personal projects. When the content of participants' projects were classified as relational or nonrelational, women describe a higher number of relational projects than men, however this difference was not significant. Thus, women were not more likely to be engaged in projects that were being done for and with others than by and for themselves. Also, there were no gender differences in the extent to which participants regarded the relational dimensions as relevant to their projects. Indeed, women regarded the standard project dimensions of control, importance, outcome and stress as more important to their projects than did men.

These mixed findings are perplexing. Is the claim that women have relational selves while men have autonomous selves no more than a popular "bandwagon" effect, as suggested by Mednick (1989)? Are the findings regarding gender and the self ideologically determined, with significant gender differences resulting from the alpha bias of cultural and gender feminists (Gilligan, 1982) and gender similarities resulting from the beta bias of feminist empiricists (Hare-Mustin & Maracek, 1988)? Or are such discrepant findings a result of different research methods and perspectives (Hare-Mustin & Maracek, 1988)? That is, do psychoanalytically oriented researchers observe gender differences in the self because they use more qualitative research methods (e.g., case studies, interviews) in contrast to the predetermined and potentially unrepresentative quantitative methods used by feminist empiricists (e.g., fixed format questionnaires)? Although the present research cannot speak to the role of ideology, the finding from the participant-driven Q-sort in Study One and the researcher-driven measures of the self in Studies One and Two converged in suggesting that, while women have more relational self-schemas than men, women and men are equally independent. In effect there may be some truth in both ideological perspectives. Moreover, the present findings may not be at all perplexing given that our society dictates that women both embrace the Western ideal of the autonomous self and comply with social norms regarding "feminine" interdependence (Martin & Ruble, 1997). From this view the women in these samples,

the majority of whom were employed outside the home, appear to have lived up to these social standards.

Impact of Western Ideals

Cultural ideals have a profound impact on people's self-construals. The program of research by Markus and Kitayama (1991; 1994b), for example indicates that people from Western cultural backgrounds have more independent or autonomous self-construals, while those from Eastern cultures have more interdependent self-construals. Moreover, these cultural differences in the self have important effects on both the motives for behaviour and social cognition (for a review see Markus & Kitayama, 1991; 1994b).

Consistent with this, the largely Anglo Saxon participants in both studies viewed themselves as more independent than interdependent. Not only did the nature of participants' self-concepts comply with the Western ideal of the autonomous self, but so too did their activities. The participants in Study Two, for example, pursued more nonrelational than relational projects and did most of their projects by and for themselves rather than with or for others. As indicated by the descriptive analyses of the Personal Project dimension scores, these respondents also regarded the standard 17 dimensions as more important to their projects than the six new relational dimensions. Further, and in line with the Western ideal of being in control and the concern with successful outcomes rather than process, participants gave the highest ratings to the outcome, importance and control aspects of their projects. This is consistent with Baumeister's (1998) discussion of the centrality of being the master of one's life to an individualistic viewpoint.

Finally, and perhaps more importantly, the analyses of the data from Study Two revealed that the participants who describe themselves as having more independent self-construals reported moderately better well-being. Participants' interdependent and interpersonal orientation scores, on the other hand, were independent of their well-being. Thus, not only did these respondents describe themselves in ways congruent with the Western ideal of the individuated self, they also pursued daily activities consistent with this ideal and experienced more positive well-being to the extent that their self-schemas

conformed to our culture's normative expectations. Indeed, both the factor analysis and the correlational analyses of Study Two suggested that relational pursuits were more stressful, which, in turn, detracted from well-being. In this regard several marginal results also merit discussion. Participants' interdependence scores were marginally related to higher stress scores, which were, in turn significantly related to lower well-being scores. Similarly, as participants' interpersonal orientation scores increased, so did their stress scores, which, in turn decreased their well-being. These results suggest that dealing with others is cause for increased stress. This supports the earlier results whereby the more one is concerned for others, the greater the likelihood of increased stress and decreased well-being.

In view of these findings, the implications of self-construals for personal projects and well-being merit further study. For example, it is not clear whether it is conformity with cultural standards or the nature of the independent self in itself that facilitates well-being. Cross-cultural research might usefully speak to this issue by comparing the effects of culturally congruent versus incongruent self-schemas and independent versus nonindependent self-schemas on well-being. Similarly, it is not clear why relational projects were deemed more stressful, could it be that they are culturally incongruent? Given our society's and these participants' concern with control and success, it is conceivable that relational projects are more stressful than nonrelational projects simply because it is more difficult to control other people than oneself. As Josselson (1992, p. 11) stated "American culture prefers what seems controllable, what is achievable through will and striving. Interpersonal responsiveness is too capricious, it seems- too unaffected by our efforts." Indeed survivors of child abuse have been noted to attempt suicide when their efforts to control others have proved futile (e.g., Heney, 1996; Heney & Kristiansen, 1998; Herman, 1992). Given this, it may be useful to examine the effects of well-being as a function of individual differences in the need to control others.

Self-Construals, Daily Activities and Well-Being

Contrary to expectations, hierarchical regression analyses revealed that none of the measures of the self (gender, independence, interdependence and interpersonal orientation) moderated the effects of the nature of participants' personal projects on well-being. As hypothesized, however, the analyses examining the mediated model indicated that the proportion of participants' projects that were relational and their personal project Social Meaning scores mediated the relation between respondents' interdependent self-construal scores and their well-being. Specifically, respondents with more interdependent self-schemas engaged in proportionally more relational projects which, in turn, facilitated Social Meaning and thereby enhanced their well-being. In addition, participants' personal project Social Meaning scores mediated their well-being. In this case, respondents with more independent self-schemas derived more Social Meaning from their daily pursuits, which, in turn, facilitated their well-being. Given that both stronger independent self-construals and stronger interdependent self-construals were associated with greater well-being, albeit by different routes, one might speculate that the clarity of the self-concept, in addition to its content, contributes to well-being. This suggestion is in line with clinical psychology, where problems in self-definition are associated with psychological malaise and diagnoses of various personality "disorders" (e.g., narcissism, borderline personality disorder; American Psychiatric Association, 1994).

The results of these analyses also indicated that the dimensions deemed relevant to participants' personal projects mediated the relation between the relational content of their projects and their well-being. In the analyses involving gender, the interdependent self and interpersonal orientation, more relational projects were associated with projects that were more relationally fulfilling and more personally and socially meaningful. In the analysis involving the independent self, more relational projects were also associated with more stress. Further, more socially meaningful and less stressful projects were, in turn, related to more positive well-being. Thus, the relational content of participants'

projects proved to be an important component in predicting their well-being via its effects on their Personal Projects factor scores.

It is interesting to note that in this research the main predictors of well-being were the Social Meaning and Stress factors. Past research with personal projects indicated that the dimensions of control, outcome and initiation (representing feelings of competency and efficacy) have been strong predictors of well-being (Little, 1999). Yet the present research does not bear this out. In fact, it is the Social Meaning factor scores, not the Personal Meaning factor scores (which included the control and initiation dimensions), that were the significant predictor, along with Stress factor scores. When one examines the correlations between the dimensions representing the Social Meaning factor and well-being, several large and significant correlations emerge between enjoyment and well-being and between progress and well-being. Also, there was a significant correlation between other's view and well-being. The correlations between the dimensions representing the Personal Meaning factor, namely control and outcome and well-being were not as large and the correlation between initiation and well-being was not significant. For these participants, then, the dimensions that comprised the Social Meaning factor, rather than the Personal Meaning factor, were more important for their well-being.

Contrary to the original hypotheses, however, the results of the mediated model analyses appear to suggest that the new Relational factor had no effect on participants' well-being. There was, however, a significant albeit small simple correlation between respondents' Relational factor scores and their well-being (see Table 28). This, together with the fact that a simultaneous regression procedure considers only the unique variance explained by each of the potential predictor variables (Pedhazur, 1982), suggests that the high correlation between the Relational and Social Meaning factor scores (see Table 22) may have obscured the potential of the Relational factor to predict well-being.

Conceptualization of the Relational and Independent Personalities

In Study Two, respondent's scores on Singelis' (1994) independent and interdependent self-construal scales were both positively correlated with their scores on Swap and Rubin's (1984) Interpersonal Orientation scale, and gender differences were observed in participants' interpersonal orientation scores but not their independent or interdependent self-construal scores. Together these findings suggest that the conceptualization and operationalization of the relational and independent self may merit clarification. Are the cross-cultural differences in independent and interdependent self-construals noted by Markus and Kitayama (1991; 1994b) analogous to the gender differences in autonomous and relational self-schemas noted by researchers here in North America, or is our understanding of the autonomous and relational self constrained by our cultural context in ways that make them different from cross-cultural conceptualizations? In this regard Martin and Ruble (1997) opt for the latter option, arguing that the nature of the autonomous and relational selves have yet to be defined clearly and that cross-cultural measures may not be appropriate to the assessment of within-culture individual differences. As Martin and Ruble (1997) stated, "It is interesting to speculate on how these forces may act, interact, or both to exert their influences. Do cultural influences and gender-related influences act as two main effects? Comparisons across culture and gender would provide much needed information about the relative strength of each of these messages" (p. 47).

Both the content of the self-schema measures and the results of this research lend support to Martin and Ruble's (1997) position. Gilligan (1982), Lyons (1983) and the theorists of the Stone Centre (e.g., Jordan, 1985/1990) used the terms *separate* and *connected* to describe two different conceptions or experiences of the self, as essentially autonomous (separate from others) or as essentially in relationship (connected to others). The separate self experiences relationships in terms of "reciprocity," considering others as it wishes to be considered, whereas the connected self experiences relationships as "responses to others in their own terms" (Lyons, 1983, p.134). Although "Jean Baker Miller and her colleagues at the Stone Centre have highlighted the importance of

responsiveness and mutuality, and Carol Gilligan has gotten us thinking about the dilemmas of care and connection fundamental to self-hood that are organizers of identity” (Josselson, 1992, p. 5), Josselson (1992) delineates a more comprehensive model of relatedness that involves eight primary dimensions. The first four dimensions, which emerge early in life, are deemed primary. These are holding (i.e., security and trust), attachment, passionate experience (i.e., drive gratification), and eye-to-eye validation (i.e., the experience of connecting with others by existing in and for them). The secondary dimensions of relatedness, which require cognitive maturation, are idealization and identification with more powerful others, the sense of mutuality that emerges from a bond that is the product of both people, the feeling of embeddedness within and belonging to a group, and tending and caring for others. Viewed from this perspective, Singelis’ (1994) interdependent self-construal scale appears to assess an alternate concept of the relational self. Items such as “If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible” or “I respect people who are modest about themselves.” These items appear to tap the ideal of retaining harmony with others rather than maintaining close connections with others. Moreover, the Eastern interdependent self involves deferring to the perspectives of others. One item, for example, asks “I should take into consideration my parents’ advice when making education/career plans.” In contrast, the relational self as it is understood within our Western culture involves attending to both the self and others in an integrated fashion (Gilligan, 1982). Relative to Singelis’ measures, Swap and Rubins’ (1983) Interpersonal Orientation scale seems to come closer to the notion of the relational self. For example, one item asked “Sometimes I think I take things that other people say to me too personally.” Or the reversal of “I am reluctant to talk about my personal life with people I do not know well.” Given this, it is perhaps not surprising that gender differences were observed in Swap and Rubin’s (1983) but not Singelis’ (1994) measures of the self.

Baumeister and Sommer (1997) offered a different explanation of gender differences in the self, namely that people with independent selves are relational but express their relationality in ways that differ from those of interdependent or relational selves. In this

regard Baumeister and Sommer (1997) draw attention to the distinction between sociality and intimacy: “although men want intimacy too, they may be far more oriented than are women toward nonintimate social connection, such as status hierarchies of groups. The view of men as less social than women may derive from the mistaking of the nonintimate sociality of men for a nonsocial orientation.” (p. 43). Examining the two scales used in this research reveals differences in their consideration of intimacy and sociality. Because Singelis’ interdependent scale emphasizes both family and friends and groups and those in authority in a work environment, it assesses both intimate and social aspects of connecting with others. Given this, it is not surprising that men’s and women’s scores on Singelis’ interdependent scale were not different. On the other hand, Swap and Rubin’s (1983) Interpersonal Orientation scale reflects a more social conceptualization of connecting with others, and thus one would have expected men to score higher than women, but this was not the case. As noted earlier, however, the focus of the Swap and Rubin’s items is concern for others in a social setting rather than the dominance and power over others that Baumeister and Sommer (1997) argued were important for men. In view of this, then it is not surprising that women scored higher than men on this scale. Baumeister and Sommer (1997) have offered an alternative explanation that different types of relationality may be of particular importance to a Western, but not Eastern approach of defining self-construals. If future research used measures that more clearly distinguished between the two types of connecting with others, namely intimacy and sociality, then perhaps gender differences would emerge, but possibly only within a Western context.

One other finding merits discussion in this context and that is the observation that the importance of the relational aspect of the participants’ personal projects varied positively with their independent self-construal scores. Once again, then, the applicability of Singelis’ (1994) cross-culturally derived conceptualization of the independent self to the notion of the separate or autonomous self may be called into question. One would not expect that as participants’ independent self-construal scale scores increased so would their scores on the Relational Personal Project factor. The Relational factor taps such

concerns as reducing conflict, increasing togetherness, helping others and doing things with others. Upon examining the items in Singelis' (1994) independent self-construal scale, many of the items (e.g., "Speaking up in class/meeting is not a problem for me" or "Having a lively imagination is important for me") would not preclude also having the relational concerns as delineated in the Relational factor. Although some of the items of the independent self-construal scale are not consistent with relational concerns, they are in the minority and therefore it is possible that those with independent self-construals could also see the Relational factor as important to their projects. Therefore, while Singelis' (1994) Self-Construal scale may be appropriate for delineating the two types of self-construals across cultures; it may not be appropriate for use within a Western cultural context.

In view of the foregoing discussion, it is clear that there is much yet to be done before we can measure the nature of the self with clarity and confidence. Qualitative research free of researchers' preconceptualizations might be fruitful in this regard, especially if it is designed to examine both cultural and gender differences in the self simultaneously. Such research may also provide insight into the potentially diverse ways people express their autonomous and relational selves, ways that vary as a function of culture, gender and other characteristics related to self-construals, such as dominant versus subordinate group membership.

Issues Regarding Personal Project Analyses

The last aspect of this research is the method that was used, namely Personal Projects Analysis. In this regard there are two points, namely the utility of the new relational dimensions and concerns regarding the project elicitation procedure of PPA.

Given the large correlation between participants' Relational and Social Meaning factor scores, one might conclude that the Personal Projects model does in fact encompass the relational component of personality and that the new relational dimensions were simply redundant. Indeed, several of the dimensions that make up the Social Meaning factor, namely enjoyment, visibility to others, time adequacy, other's view and progress, could be regarded as relevant to the relational self. The fact that

participants' Relational factor scores were positively related to their Stress factor scores whereas their Social Meaning factor scores were not related to their Stress factor scores, however, suggests that the Relational factors taps aspects that are unique and not shared with Social Meaning. While this issue clearly merits further research at this point, the relational aspects of participants' projects seem worthy of consideration.

The second issue concerns the type of projects that were elicited from these participants. When asking participants to list their projects, the PPA usually asks: "We are interested in studying the kinds of activities and concerns that people have at different stages of their lives. 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 (but not always) complete" (Little, 1983). A list of sample projects then follows, projects that are typically slanted toward concrete activities, such as 'cutting the grass,' 'losing ten pounds,' and 'cleaning the garage.' In the present research, however, an equal number of both types of activities and concerns were included in the examples provided to participants. Nevertheless, the majority of the projects listed were nonrelational in nature and participants did not see them as relevant to the relational dimensions.

This lack of relational projects may have been a result of the nature of the sample, the majority of whom were employed in the high technology industry. It is conceivable that the Personal Project Matrix is more conducive to eliciting concrete projects. Alternatively, because PPA asks participants to list what they are going to be doing over the next few weeks. One could speculate that many relational projects are of a long term nature and that being involved with others is more of an ongoing process, than a concrete bounded "activity". In future, then, research participants might be asked to list and rate an equal number of relational and nonrelational.

In order to better understand causality, future research might also attempt to manipulate the types of projects that participants undertake. For example, participants could be assigned a relational or nonrelational project and its impact on well-being could be measured. Alternatively, one might observe the effects of manipulated well-being on the types of projects participants pursue. In regard to the latter, and based on Markus and

Cross (1997), it would be necessary to manipulate well-being differently for people with relational versus independent self-construals. For example, positive versus no feedback on a test tapping their feelings of uniqueness on a concrete task, (e.g., a math test) might be used for people with independent self-construals. For people with relational self-construals, on the other hand, positive feedback might consist of information that they are successfully sustaining good relationships with others (e.g., they are being a good friend). In the end, it is only through further research, not only within a Personal Projects framework, but also through the use of other methods (perhaps qualitative in nature), that we can come to a better understanding of the relational component of personality and its impact on everyday activities and well-being.

Summary

The present research presented evidence that provided partial support for women construing themselves as more relational than men, however, they also construed themselves just as independently as men. These results may have been confounded by the measures of self-construals that still need further research and clarification. Contrary to expectations, the relational dimensions introduced to the existing Personal Project Analysis did not prove to be significant predictors of well-being. The small number of relational projects that were elicited from the participants could have contributed to the nonsignificant results, as would the high correlation between the Relational and Social Meaning factors. However, it would appear that the proportion of participants' projects that were relational mediated the relation between participants' self-construals and their Personal Project factors scores and in turn their well-being. It may be that those who have relational self-construals fulfill their relational needs by the type of the projects they pursue. Further research is needed to delineate the contributions of each of the components examined in this research in order to fully understand their impact on well-being.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Aube, J., Norcliffe, H., Craig, J., & Koestner, R. (1995). Gender characteristics and adjustment-related outcomes: Questioning the masculinity model. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21, 284-295.
- Bakan, D. (1966). The duality of human existence: An essay on psychology and religion. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Baldwin, M. W. (1992). Relational schemas and the processing of information. Psychological Bulletin, 112, 461-484.
- Barnes, M. V. (1986). Burnout in staff nurses: An examination of personality, environmental and coping variables. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada.
- Barrett, P. T., & Kline, P. (1982). Factor extraction: An examination of three methods. Person Study and Group Behavior, 3, 84-98.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), The handbook of Social Psychology, (pp. 680-740). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Sommer, K. L. (1997). What do men want? Gender differences and two spheres of belongingness: Comment on Cross and Madson (1997). Psychological Bulletin, 122, 38-44.
- Blake, C. (1994). Personal Projects, depressive affect and coping styles. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Blevis, B. R. (1987). Personal Projects O-deck: Exploratory analysis of reliability and construct validity. Unpublished honours thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Block, J., & Robins, R. W. (1993). A longitudinal study of consistency and change in self-esteem from early adolescence to early adulthood. Child Development, 64, 909-923.

Bowie-Reed, E. (1984). Personal projects, social networks, and personality: Patterns of influence on subjective well-being. Unpublished honours thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Bradshaw, C. K. (1990). A Japanese view of dependency: What can Amai psychology contribute to feminist theory and therapy? In L. S. Brown, & M. P. P. Root (Eds.), Diversity and complexity in feminist therapy (pp. 67-86). New York: Harrington Park Press.

Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). Meeting at the crossroads. New York: Ballantine Books.

Brown, S. R. (1980). Political subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in political science. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Brunstein, J. C. (1993). Personal goals and subjective well-being: A longitudinal study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 1061-1070.

Burgess, P. D. (1982). The wife/mother/student: Impact of the student role on personal projects system. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Cameron, L. (1984). A personal projects rep grid. Unpublished honours thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Cantor, N., & Kihlstrom, J. G. (1987). Personality and social intelligence. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Carver, L. (1988). Personal project system rating scale: The prediction of emotional well-being. Unpublished honour's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1, 245-276.

Cattell, R. B. (1978). The scientific use of factor analysis in behavioural and life sciences. New York: Plenum Press.

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

Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering. Berkely, CA: University of California Press.

Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. Journal of Health and Science, 24, 385-396.

Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1985). The NEO Personality Inventory manual. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessments Resources.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. Psychological Bulletin, 122, 5-37.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24, 349-354.

Deaux, K. (1992). Personality identity and socializing the self. In G. M. Breakwell (Ed.), Social Psychology of identity and the self concept (pp.9-33). London: Surrey University Press.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. Psychological Bulletin, 95, 542-575.

Diener, E. (1994). Assessing subjective well-being: Progress and opportunities. Social Indicators Research, 31, 103-157.

Diener, E., Emmons, R. S., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49, 71-75.

Diener, E., Larsen, R. J., Levine, S., & Emmons, R. S., (1985). Intensity and frequency: Dimensions underlying positive and negative affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1253-1265.

Diener, E., Sandvik, E., Pavot, W., & Gallagher, D. (1991). Response artifacts in the measurement of subjective well-being. Social Indicators Research, 24, 35-56.

- Eagly, A. H. (1983). Gender and social influence: A social psychological analysis. American Psychologist, 38, 971-981.
- Eagly, A. H. (1990). On the advantages of reporting sex comparisons. American Psychologist, 45, 560-561.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 735-754.
- Emmons, R. A. (1986). Personal strivings: An approach to personality and subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1058-1068.
- Emmons, R. A. (1989). The personal striving approach to personality. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), Goal concepts in personality and social psychology (pp. 87-126). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and society. New York, NY: W. W. Norton Co.
- Fiske, S. T. (1993). Controlling other people: The impact of power on stereotyping. American Psychologist, 48, 621-628.
- Fiske, A. P., Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Nisbett, R. E. (1998). The cultural matrix of Social Psychology. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), The handbook of Social Psychology (pp. 915-579). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Gilligan, C. (1977). In a different voice: women's conceptions of self and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 481-517.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Green, G. D. (1990). Is separation really so great? In L. S. Brown, & M. P. P. Root (Eds.), Diversity and complexity in feminist therapy (pp. 87-104). New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Guisinger, S., & Blatt, S. J. (1994). Individuality and relatedness: Evolution of a fundamental dialectic. American Psychologist, 49, 104-111.
- Hancock, E. (1989). The girl within. New York: E. P. Hutton.

- Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Maracek, J. (1988). The meaning of difference: Gender theory, postmodernism, and psychology. American Psychologist, 43, 455-464.
- Helgeson, V. S. (1994). Relation of agency and communion to well-being: Evidence and potential explanations. Psychological Bulletin, 116, 412-428.
- Helmer, D. (1979). Sex differences in the content and structure of personal projects. Unpublished honours's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Heney, J. (1996). Dying on the inside: Suicide and suicidal feelings among federally incarcerated women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Heney, J., & Kristiansen, C. K. (1998). An analysis of the impact of prison on women survivors of childhood sexual abuse. Women and Therapy, 20, 29-44.
- Herman, J. L. (1992). Trauma and recovery. New York: Basic Books.
- Horley, J. (1984). Personal project profiles and subjective well-being. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- Howell, D. C. (1982). Statistical methods for psychology. Boston: Duxbury Press.
- Hyde, N. (1996). Half the human experience: The psychology of women. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath & Company.
- Jordan, J. V. (1985/1991). The meaning of mutuality. In J. V. Jordan, A. G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J. L. Surrey (Eds.), Women's growth in connection (pp. 81-96). New York: Guildford Press.
- Joseph, R. A., Markus, H. R., & Tafarodi, R. W. (1992). Gender and self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63, 391-402.
- Josselson, R. (1992). The space between us: Exploring the dimensions of human relationships. San Francisco: Joseey-Bass, Inc.
- Kammann, R. & Flett, R. (1983). Affectometer 2: A scale to measure current levels of general happiness. Australian Journal of Psychology, 35, 259-265.

Karoly, P. (1991). A self-regulatory/goal systems perspective. In H. Arkowitz (Ed.), Why don't people change?: New perspectives on resistance and non-compliance. New York: Guilford Publications.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Matsumoto, H., & Norasakkunit, V. (1997). Individual and collective processes in the construction of the self: Self-enhancement in the United States and self-criticism in Japan. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 1245-1267.

Kitzinger, C. (1986). Introducing and developing Q as a feminist methodology: A study of accounts of lesbianism. In S. Wilkinson (Ed.), Feminist social psychology: Developing theory and practice (pp. 151-172). Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Kitzinger, C. (1992). The individuated self concept: A critical analysis of social-constructionist writing on individualism. In G. M. Breakwell (Ed.), Social Psychology of identity and the self concept (pp. 221-250). London: Surrey University Press.

Kitzinger, C. (1999). Research subjectivity and diversity: Q-methodology in feminist psychology. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23, 267-276.

Kwan, V. V. Y., Bond, M. H., Singelis, T. M. (1997). Pancultural explanations for life satisfaction: Adding relationship harmony to self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73, 1038-1051.

Lecci, L. (1988). Social competence and subjective well-being. Unpublished honour's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Little, B. R. (1981). Q-deck questionnaire. Unpublished manuscript Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

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

Little, B. R. (1987). Personal projects and fuzzy selves: Aspects of self-identity in adolescence. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the life span (pp. 230-245). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Little, B. R. (1988). Personal projects research: Method, theory and research. Final report to Social Sciences and Humanities and Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Canada.

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. (1993). Personal projects and the distributed self: Aspects of a conative psychology. In J. Suls (Ed.), Psychological perspectives on the self: Vol. 4 (pp. 157-186). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Little, B. R. (1999). Personality and motivation: Personal action and the conative evolution. In L. A. Pervin and O. P. John (Eds.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (2nd. Edition). New York: Guilford.

Lykes, M. B. (1985). Gender and individualistic vs collectivist bases for notions about the self. Journal of Personality, 53, 356-383.

Lyons, N. P. (1983). Conceptions of self and morality and modes of moral choice: Identifying justice and care in judgments of actual moral dilemmas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.

MacDiarmid, E. W. (1988). Toward a social ecological analysis of gender: A project analytic approach. Unpublished manuscript Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Markus, H., & Cross, S. (1990). The interpersonal self. In L. A. Pervin (Ed.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 576-608). New York: Guilford Press.

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

- Markus, H. & Kitayama, S. (1994a). The cultural shaping of emotion: A conceptual framework. In S. Kitayama & H. R. Markus (Eds.), Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence (pp. 339-352). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Markus, H. & Kitayama, S. (1994b). A collective fear of the collective: Implications for selves and theories of selves. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 568-579.
- Markus, H. & Oyserman, D. (1988). Gender and thought: The role of the self-concept. In M. Crawford & M. Gentry (Eds.), Gender and thought: Psychological perspectives (pp. 100-127). New York: Springer Verlag.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. Annual Review of Psychology, 38, 299-337.
- Markus, H. R., Mullally, P. R., & Kitayama, S. (1998). Selfways: Diversity in modes of cultural participation. In U. Neisser and D. Jopling (Eds.), The conceptual self in context (pp. 25-90). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, C. L., & Ruble, D. N. (1997). A developmental perspective of self-construals and sex differences: Comment on Cross and Madson (1997). Psychological Bulletin, 122, 45-50.
- McGregor, I. D. (1994). Personal projects, meaning and well-being. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- McKeen, N. A. (1984). The personal projects of pregnant women. Unpublished honour's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.
- McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. (1988). Q Methodology. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mednick, M. T. (1989). On the politics of psychological constructs: Stop the bandwagon, I want to get off. American Psychologist, 44, 1118-1123.

Mickelson, W. P. (1984). Personal project systems and health status. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Miller, J. B. (1976/1986). Toward a new psychology of women (2nd. ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Miller, J. B. (1984/1991). The development of women's sense of self. In J. V. Jordan, A. G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J. L. Surrey (Eds.), Women's growth in connection (pp. 11-26). New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Miller, J. B. (1986). What do we mean by relationships? Work in progress, No. 22. Wellesley, MA: Stone Center Working Papers Series.

Moskowitz, D. S., Suh, E. J., & Desaulniers, J. (1994). Situational influences on gender differences in agency and communion. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66, 753-761.

Oishi, S., Diener, E. F., Lucas, R. E., & Suh, E. M. (1999). Cross-cultural variations in predictors of life satisfaction: Perspectives from needs and values. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25, 980-990.

Oke, L. (1985). A personal projects analysis of depression. Unpublished honour's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Omodei, 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. (1979). Personal project systems and perceived life satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Palys, T. S. (1992). Research decisions: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives. Toronto, Ont.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Canada Inc.

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.

Pavot, W., & Diener, E. (1993). The affective and cognitive context of self-reported measures of subjective well-being. Social Indicators Research, 28, 1-20.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1982). Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York; CBS College Publishing.

Phillips, S. D., Little, B. R., & Goodine, L. (1993a). Just managing and women managers: From personal projects to public service. Study prepared for the Canadian Centre for Management Development, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Phillips, S. D., Little, B. R., & Goodine, L. (1993b). Personal projects, perceived environments and the public service: An analysis of gender and management. Paper prepared for the Centre for Management Development, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Pychyl, T. A. (1995). An examination of context-dependent personal project dimensions in the prediction of well-being for graduate students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, 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.

Rhee, E., Uleman, J. S., Lee, H. K., & Roman, R. J. (1995). Spontaneous self-descriptions and ethnic identities in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69, 142-152.

Ruehlman, L. S., & Wolchik, S. A. (1988). Personal goals and interpersonal support and hindrance as factors in psychological distress and well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 293-301.

Sampson, E. E. (1988). The debate on individualism: indigenous psychologies of the individual and their role in personal and societal functioning. American Psychologist, 43, 15-22.

Sampson, E. E. (1993). Celebrating the other: A dialogic account of human nature. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

- Schwalbe, M. L. (1991). Social structure and the moral self. In, J. A. Howard & P. L. Callero (Eds.), The self-society dynamic: Cognition, emotion and action (pp. 281-303). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 580-591.
- Snelling, S. J. (1999). Women's perspectives on feminism: A q-methodology study. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 23, 247-266.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1984). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex-role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. JSAS: Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 4(ms.617), 43-44.
- Stern, L. (1990). Conceptions of separation and connection in female adolescents. In, C. Gilligan, N. P. Lyons, and T. J. Hanmer (Eds.), Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School (pp. 73-87). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stiver, I. P. (1983/1991). Beyond the Oedipus complex: Mothers and daughters. In J. V. Jordan, A. G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J. L. Surrey (Eds.), Women's growth in connection (pp. 97-121). New York: Guildford Press.
- 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.
- Surrey, J. L. (1984/1991). The "self-in-relation." In J. V. Jordan, A. G. Kaplan, J. B. Miller, I. P. Stiver, & J. L. Surrey (Eds.), Women's growth in connection (pp. 162-180). New York: Guildford Press.
- Swap, W. C., & Rubin, J. Z. (1983). Measurement of interpersonal orientation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 208-219.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1983). Using multivariate statistics. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Thom, H. C. (1986). Predicting the successful health care auxiliary student by analysing personal projects and career interests. Unpublished master's theses, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Tong, R. (1989). Feminist thought: A comprehensive introduction. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Veit, C. T., & Ware, J. E., Jr. (1983). The structure of psychological distress and well-being in general populations. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 52, 730-742.

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

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

Young, K. A. (1989). Gilligan's voices in PPA: An analysis of their ecological validity. Unpublished honours thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Zirkel, S., & Cantor, N. (1990). Personal construal of life tasks: Those who struggle for independence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 172-185.

Appendix A

Questionnaires-Study 1

**(Please note the names of the questionnaires
did not appear on participants' copies)**

INFORMED CONSENT

Title of Study: Identifying Relational Constructs

Investigator: Deborah S. James, M.A.

Academic Advisor: Dr. Connie M. Kristiansen

Name of Participant: _____
(Please print)

I hereby agree to participate in the study on self-concepts being conducted by Deborah James and Connie Kristiansen, Ph.D., of Carleton University. I understand that my participation requires me to fill out several questionnaires and a sorting task. My participation is entirely voluntary, that my answers to the questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential, and that I may decline to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. I am aware that, although a summary of the results of this study may be used for publication purposes at a future date, my identity will not be revealed to anyone.

(Please sign.)

(Date)

(Researcher's Signature)

(Date)

INFORMED CONSENT- Q-SORT AUDIO TAPING

Title of Study: Identifying Relational Constructs

Investigator: Deborah S. James, M.A.

Academic Advisor: Dr. Connie M. Kristiansen

Name of Participant: _____
(Please print)

I hereby agree to have my Q-sorting task audio-taped. I may stop the audio taping at any point in time or change my mind about the taping. I understand that the audio tape of this session will be kept in a safe place with only the researcher having access to it. There will be no personal identifiers recorded on the tape, only a number assigned by the researcher. The contents of the tape will be kept strictly confidential, however, I am aware that, a summary of the results of this study may be used for publication purposes at a future date.

(Please sign.)

(Date)

(Researcher's signature)

(Date)

Self-Constructal Scale (Singelis, 1994)

Below are a series of statements which you may agree or disagree with. Using the scale below indicate your level of agreement or disagreement using the space provided before each item.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree			Neutral			Strongly Agree

- _____ 1. I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.
- _____ 2. I'd rather say "No" directly, than risk being misunderstood.
- _____ 3. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
- _____ 4. Speaking up during a class/meeting is not a problem for me.
- _____ 5. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
- _____ 6. Having a lively imagination is important to me.
- _____ 7. I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor/boss.
- _____ 8. I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.
- _____ 9. I respect people who are modest about themselves.
- _____ 10. I am the same person at home that I am a school/work.
- _____ 11. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
- _____ 12. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
- _____ 13. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
- _____ 14. I act the same way no matter who I am with.
- _____ 15. I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans.
- _____ 16. I feel comfortable using someone's first name soon after I meet them, even when they are much older than I am.

Self-Construal Scale (Singelis, 1994)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree		Neutral				Strongly Agree

- ____ 17. It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.
- ____ 18. I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I've just met.
- ____ 19. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with that group.
- ____ 20. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
- ____ 21. If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.
- ____ 22. My personal identity independent of others is very important to me.
- ____ 23. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.
- ____ 24. I value being in good health above everything.

Interpersonal Orientation Scale

Below are a series of statement that you may or may not agree with. Using the scale below, please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement in the space provided before each number.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

- _____ 1. I would rather think about a personal problem by myself than discuss it with others. **
- _____ 2. I consider myself a forgiving person.
- _____ 3. Other people are the source of my greatest pleasure and pain.
- _____ 4. I am interested in knowing what makes people tick.
- _____ 5. When I receive a gift, I find myself thinking about how much it much be worth. **
- _____ 6. Under no circumstances would I buy something I suspected had been stolen.
- _____ 7. I am greatly influenced by the moods of the people I am with.
- _____ 8. Sometimes the most considerate thing one person can do for another is to hide a bit of the truth.
- _____ 9. Sometimes simply talking aloud about things that bother me makes me feel better - regardless of who, if anyone, hears these thoughts.
- _____ 10. My friends and I seem to share the same musical interests.
- _____ 11. I am reluctant to talk about my personal life with people I do not know well. **
- _____ 12. I generally view myself as a person who is not terribly interested in what other people are really like. **
- _____ 13. Sometimes I think I take things that other people say to me too personally.
- _____ 14. It's important for me to work people with whom I get along well, even if that means I get less done.

Interpersonal Orientation Scale

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly
Disagree		Neutral		Strongly
Agree
-
- ___ 15. I often find myself wondering what my boss(es) is really like.
- ___ 16. If I were to share an apartment with somebody, I would want to find out about the person's family background, hobbies, and so forth.
- ___ 17. I would prefer to do poorly on an exam that is machine scored rather than do equally poorly on one that is graded by an instructor.
- ___ 18. I tend to like people who are good looking.
- ___ 19. What others think about my actions is of little or no consequence to me.**
- ___ 20. The more other people reveal about themselves, the more inclined I feel to reveal things about myself.
- ___ 21. When someone does me a favour I don't usually feel compelled to return it.**
- ___ 22. Sitting on a bus or a subway, I sometimes imagine what the person sitting next to me does for a living.
- ___ 23. The more I am with others, the more I tend to like them.
- ___ 24. I would rather be given a simple and thoughtful gift than a more extravagant one that involved less thought and care.
- ___ 25. I am very sensitive to criticism.
- ___ 26. When people tell me personal things about themselves, I find myself feeling close to them.
- ___ 27. One good turn does not necessarily deserve another.**
- ___ 28. I can be strongly affected by someone smiling or frowning at me.
- ___ 29. I find myself wondering what telephone operators are really like.

**reversed items

Q-Sort Items

1. When making a decision, I first consider how it will affect others before considering how it will affect me.
2. I find myself doing things I don't really believe in.
3. I would rather think about a personal problem by myself than get advice from others.
4. It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
5. I don't really care about most things I do.
6. I am not concerned about the impact of my behaviour on others.
7. My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
8. I usually enjoy the things I do.
9. Other people are the source of my greatest pleasure and pain.
10. How I behave depends on the people around in the situation.
11. I usually decide myself what I want to do.
12. I find myself doing things that are really like me.
13. I consider myself to be understanding with others when they are sharing an experience with me.
14. Other people don't think what I am doing is important.
15. Most of what I do really matters to other people.
16. I can't count on anyone else to help me get thing done.
17. I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
18. Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
19. I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
20. I find myself doing things that I really don't believe in.
21. I am usually successful in getting ahead with things.
22. I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I'm not happy with that group.
23. I tend to avoid close interpersonal relationships.
24. What others think about my actions is of little or no consequence to me.

25. I get a lot of support from people close to me.
26. Most of my outings are arranged to suit others.
27. I have my own standards of behaviour.
28. I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
29. There are many people depending on me.
30. My personal identity independent of others is very important to me.
31. I am greatly influenced by the moods of the people I am with.
32. Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.
33. I feel responsible for other people.
34. I would rather not insist on doing an activity, if it hurts another person's feelings.
35. Not many of my friends know what is important to me.
36. I have to believe in something before I'll become involved.
37. Nothing can keep from doing something if I want to do it.
38. Most people know about my plans and activities.
39. It's important for me to work with people with whom I get along well, even if that means I get less done.
40. It is better to follow tradition than to try to do something my way.
41. If I need to talk, there is always someone around to listen.
42. I automatically tune myself into other people's expectations of me.
43. It is important for me to minimize conflict with those people I am close to.
44. Many of my activities are carried out in an effort to please other people.
45. I work hard at achieving the goals that I have set for myself.
46. I usually make my own decisions by myself.
47. I don't try to meet the expectations of others.
48. I always know what I want.
49. I like to help others achieve the goals they have set for themselves.
50. Even though people around me may hold a different opinion, I stick to what I believe in.

51. Many of my activities are often done for the benefit or well-being of others.
52. I consider myself independent and do not like to lean on others for support.
53. My activities often contribute toward a sense of togetherness and harmony with other people.
54. It is important to me that I make a favourable impression on others.
55. Feeling close to others is very important to me.
56. It is important to me to maintain a good relationship with everybody.
57. Many of my activities are often done for my own benefit or well-being.
58. My activities often make me feel powerful or competent.
59. I can be strongly affected by someone smiling or frowning at me.
60. I care about what other people think of me.
61. My friends and family see the things I do as being important.
62. I usually feel in charge of the things I do.
63. I don't feel in control of what I do.
64. I always seem to be doing things for other people.
65. I prefer not to be emotionally involved with other people.
66. People close to me often don't know about the things I am doing.
67. I usually do things with my family.
68. I belong to a crowd of people who are always doing things together.
69. A move from here would separate me from many of the people I am close to.
70. Being emotionally connected to others is very important to me.
71. I like to keep things I am doing to myself.
72. Doing things for others gives me a sense of satisfaction.
73. I would rather do things for myself than for others.
74. I am very attentive to the needs of others.

- 75. I tend to focus on my own need and wants rather than those of others.
- 76. I get great pleasure out of sharing experiences with others.
- 77. I prefer the solitude of my own company.
- 78. By helping others, I feel good about who I am.
- 79. How others feel is important to me.
- 80. How others behave is important to me.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 1) Age _____ Years
- 2) Sex _____ Female _____ Male
- 3) Marital status
 - _____ Common-law spouse
 - _____ Divorced
 - _____ Married
 - _____ Separated
 - _____ Single (never married)
 - _____ Widowed
- 4) Education- degrees, certificates or diplomas you have obtained. (Check as many as applicable)
 - _____ Grade School (indicate your highest grade)
 - _____ Secondary (high) school graduation certificate
 - _____ Trades certificate or diploma
 - _____ Other non-university certificate or diploma (obtained at community college, CAGE, institute of technology etc.)
 - _____ University certificate or diploma **below** bachelor level
 - _____ Bachelor's degree(s) (e.g., B.A., B.Sc., B.A.Sc., LL.B.)
 - _____ University certificate or diploma **above** bachelor level
 - _____ Master's degree(s) (e.g., M.A., M.Sc., MEd.)
 - _____ Degree in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine or optometry (MD., D.D.S., D.M.D., D.V.M., O.D.)
 - _____ Earned doctorate (e.g., Ph.D., D.Sc., D.Ed.)

5) Your personal income (Annual)

☐ Under \$15,000
☐ \$15,000 - 24,999
☐ \$25,000 - 34,999
☐ \$35,000 - 44,999
☐ \$45,000 - 54,999
☐ \$55,000 - 64,999
☐ \$65,000 - 74,999
☐ Over \$75,000

6) Your total family income (Annual)

☐ Under \$15,000
☐ \$15,000 - 24,999
☐ \$25,000 - 34,999
☐ \$35,000 - 44,999
☐ \$45,000 - 54,999
☐ \$55,000 - 64,999
☐ \$65,000 - 74,999
☐ Over \$75,000

7) Ethnic Background

Please indicate your ethnic background (e.g., African Canadian, Caucasian, Chinese, First Nation's Person)

8) Do you work outside the home? (Circle)

Yes / No

If yes: do you work

Full-time / Part-time? (Circle)

9) Where did you learn about this study?

10) Would you be interested in participating in the next phase of this research?

Yes / No (Please Circle)

Q-Sorting Instructions

The task that you are about to undertake will ask you to rank the statements that appear on the index cards into various categories indicating how much each of the items are either like you or not like you.

To begin, sort through the statements and place them into one of three piles; either like you, not like you or neutral (neither like you or not like you). When you have completed that task then begin with the "like me" pile. From this pile, pick **four** statements that are most like you and place them under the heading of +5 that is on the table in front of you. Now, sorting through the unlike me pile of statements pick **four** statements that are most unlike you.

Now go back to the "like me" pile and pick the **five** next like you statements and place them under the +4 heading. Go back to the "unlike me" pile and pick the **five** next unlike you statements and place them under the -4 heading. Now go back to the "like me" pile and pick the **seven** next like you statements and place them under the +3 heading. Go back to the "unlike me" pile and pick the **seven** next unlike you statements and place them under the -3 heading.

Now go back to the "like me" pile and pick the **eight** next like you statements and place them under the +2 heading. Go back to the "unlike me" pile and pick the **eight** next unlike you statements and place them under the -2 heading.

Take the neutral pile of statements and pick **fourteen** statements that fit the neutral category the best and place them under the heading of 0. For the remaining statements in the neutral pile, decide whether or not they are slightly like you or slightly unlike you and place them either under +1 or -1 with the remaining statements from the "like me" and "unlike me" piles.

Now that you have completed the sorting task, take some time and review how you have ranked the statements. Feel free to move any of the items from under one heading to another. However, if you should decide to do this, then one of the statements from the other pile must be switched to the original pile to take the other statement's place. This is done in order to keep the number of statements in each pile as designated.

Q-sort Scoring Sheet

Participant # _____

-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
4	5	7	8	9	14	9	8	7	5	4

-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
----	----	----	----	----	---	----	----	----	----	----

Identifying Relational Constructs Study- Debriefing

The study you just took part in was designed to examine how people view themselves. Previous researchers have proposed that some people are more relational in their self-construals. That is, being in relationships and fitting in with others and the importance of others are central to how they see themselves. A person with a relational self-concept would place a high value on being connected to others. For other people, their self-construals are more independent. They see themselves as autonomous from others and less likely to value being connected to others. These two self-construals have been described as central to how we think about ourselves and how we relate to other people.

The two questionnaires you answered in this study were designed to measure how relational or independent you are. As you may have noticed many of the items in the sorting task were also in the questionnaires. However, the sorting task was a way for you to have more input in describing yourself and how you would group the various statements. This sorting task will enable us to group people who are similar in the way they see themselves.

Thank you for taking the time to volunteer for this study, your time and help is greatly appreciated. If you have any further questions about the study, please feel free to contact me, Deborah James, at 788-2600, ext. 2679. If you have any concerns regarding the study please contact, Dr. Lise Paquet (Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee; 788-2600, ext. 2692 or Dr. Bill Jones (Chair, Department of Psychology; 788-2600, ext. 2648).

Deborah S. James, M.A.

Appendix B

Questionnaires-Study 2

**(Please note that the titles of the various scales did
not appear on participants' copies)**

Informed Consent Form

The purpose of an informed consent is to insure that you understand the purpose of the study and the nature of your involvement. The informed consent must provide sufficient information such that you have the opportunity to determine whether you wish to participate in the study.

Present Study: The Self, Personal Projects and Well-being Study

I hereby agree to participate in the study on personal projects, the self and well-being being conducted by Deborah James (Principal investigator, 520-2600, ext. 2679) and Connie Kristiansen, Ph.D., (Academic advisor, 520-2600, ext. 2674) of Carleton University. The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the different ways people view themselves, their daily activities and their well-being. I understand that my participation requires me to fill out a series of questionnaires asking about my daily activities, personality and well-being. This questionnaire will take approximately 2 to 3 hours and will take place in my home and I will complete the questionnaire over a three day period. I also understand that there are no potential physical or psychological risks in this study. My participation is entirely voluntary, that my answers to the questionnaires will be kept strictly confidential, and that I may decline to answer any question or withdraw from the study at any time and for any reason. I am aware that, although a summary of the results of this study may be used for publication purposes at a future date, my identity will not be revealed to anyone. This informed consent page will be removed from the rest of the questionnaire package in order to ensure anonymity.

Signatures

I have read the description of the Self, Personal Projects and Well-being Study and understand the conditions of my participation. My signature indicates that I agree to participate in the study.

Participant's Name: _____

Participant's Signature: _____

Researcher's Name: _____

Researcher's Signature: _____

Date: _____

If you would like a copy of a summary of the results of this study, please fill in your address below:

Personal Projects Analysis

We are interested in studying the kinds of activities and concerns that people have at different stages of their lives. 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.

Here are some examples of projects:

- Trying to help Gary get along better with others.
- Overcoming fear of meeting new people.
- Getting more outdoor exercise.
- Trying to finish the book I got out of the library.
- Cutting the grass.
- Redecorating the living room.
- Planning a surprise party for my sister.
- Cleaning the garage.
- Spending more time with my kids.
- Trying to clarify my religious beliefs.
- Helping Ellen get through her divorce.

We are also very interested in finding out how people feel about these personal projects, how enjoyable they are, and so on. We would appreciate it if you could begin by just writing down in the next ten minutes as many personal projects as you can that you are engaged in or thinking about at the present time – remember these are not necessarily formal projects, or important ones – we would prefer you to give us more of the everyday kinds of activity or concerns that characterize your life at present.

Brian R. Little, Ph.D., 1983

List of Projects

Please go ahead and write down as many projects as you can in ten minutes.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey 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.

PROJECT DIMENSIONS

Now, copy 10 of your projects into the **PERSONAL PROJECTS MATRIX** (previous 2 pages). Make your description long enough to keep each project clearly in mind. As you can see there is space for 10 projects. **If your initial list is longer than 10 projects, pick the 10 projects that best capture what is most important in understanding your life at this time.** If you wrote less than 10 projects, see if you can think of several more, or break down some of those you listed into several projects. It is important for everyone to try to fill in 10 projects.

In columns 1-10 please rate the extent to which each of your projects has the following characteristics, using **any number from 0 to 10** and put your answers in the Personal Projects Matrix using the following scale:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at					Moderate					A Great
All										Deal

Example: **IMPORTANCE:** If a project was only slightly important to you, you might pick a number somewhere between 1 and 3. In contrast, if this project was very important to you, you might pick a number somewhere between 8 and 10.

1. **Importance:** How important is this project to you at the present time?
2. **Enjoyment:** How much do you enjoy working on this project?
3. **Difficulty:** How difficult do you find it to carry out this project?
4. **Emotional connection:** To what extent does this project help you to be emotionally connected with others?
5. **Visibility:** How visible is this project to the relevant people who are close to you, that is how aware are they that you are engaged in this project?
6. **Control:** How much do you feel you are in control of this project?
7. **Initiation:** How much do you feel responsible for having initiated this project?
8. **Relationships:** How much does this project help you to maintain good relationships with others?
9. **Stress:** How stressful is it for you to carry out this project?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Not at All					Moderate					A Great Deal

10. **Time adequacy:** How much do you feel that the amount of time you spend working on this project is adequate?
11. **Outcome:** How successful do you anticipate the outcome of this project to be?
12. **Togetherness:** How much does this project enhance your sense of togetherness with other people?
13. **Self-identity:** How typical of you is this project?
14. **Other's view:** How important is this project seen to be by relevant people who are close to you?
15. **Value congruency:** To what extent is this project consistent with the values which guide your life?
16. **Conflict:** To what extent does this project minimize conflict with others?
17. **Positive impact:** How much do you feel that this project helps your other projects?
18. **Negative impact:** How much do you feel that this project hinders working on other projects?
19. **With Others:** To what extent can you share this project with others?
20. **Challenge:** To what extent is this project demanding and challenging to you?
21. **Absorption:** To what extent do you become engrossed or deeply involved in this project?
22. **Commitment:** How committed are you to the successful completion of this project?
23. **Help Others:** To what extent does this project enable you to help others?

24. **Progress:** How successful have you been in this project so far?
25. **Support:** To what extent do you feel this project is supported by other people?
26. **Self-worth:** To what extent do you feel that being engaged in this project gives you a sense of self-worth?
27. **Stage:** Projects often go through several stages, which can be visualized along a time line such as this:

0.....1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7.....8.....9.....10
 Awareness Planning Action Completion

Think of each project as moving through stages on such a time-line. Using the scale below, rate the stage of each of your projects.

- 0 to 1: **Awareness:** The idea for this project has just come to you.
- 2: **Transition:** You have the idea for this project and some thoughts on how to approach it. You are deciding whether this project can actually be carried out.
- 3 to 4: **Planning:** You have decided to do this project. You are planning it and obtaining whatever personal and material support it may need.
- 5: **Transition:** You have this project planned out, and you are beginning to (or trying to) actively start this project.
- 6 to 7: **Action:** You are actively working on this project and trying to balance it with your other projects, resources and time commitments.
- 8: **Transition:** You are evaluating this project and your motivation to continue with it, or bring it to completion.
- 9 to 10: **Completion:** This project is coming to a close, or has actually been completed or terminated.

REMAINING PROJECT DIMENSIONS

For the remaining four dimensions please use the space that follows the descriptions of the dimensions to answer the questions for each project.

30. **With Whom?** We are interested in how you carry out your projects, and whether you engage in some projects with a variety of people and engage in other projects exclusively by yourself. Please list the person(s) engaged in this project with you (e.g., friend, girlfriend/boyfriend, spouse, partner, relative, self).
31. **Where?** Please indicate the setting in which you would most likely or most typically carry out this project. Some projects may not be done in any particular setting, in which case you can leave the space blank.
32. **For Whom?** Who are you doing this project for? Is this project being done mainly for yourself or for others?
33. **Why?** Lastly, we hope to learn some of the reasons people have for engaging in their projects. For example, there may be all sorts of reasons for the project 'Finish my B.A. degree' such as: 'To expand my career options'; 'To impress my family'; or 'To please myself'. Please tell us why you are doing this project. We realize these reasons are likely to be complex, and possibly very private, so brief notes are fine.

Please describe these characteristics of your projects using the next 3 pages.

Project 1:

30. **With whom?**

31. **Where?**

32. **For whom?**

33. **Why?**

Project 2:

30. **With whom?**

31. **Where?**

32. **For whom?**

33. **Why?**

Project 3:

30. **With whom?**

31. **Where?**

32. **For whom?**

33. **Why?**

Project 4:

30. **With whom?**

31. **Where?**

32. **For whom?**

33. **Why?**

Project 5:30. **With whom?**31. **Where?**32. **For whom?**33. **Why?****Project 6:**30. **With whom?**31. **Where?**32. **For whom?**33. **Why?****Project 7:**30. **With whom?**31. **Where?**32. **For whom?**33. **Why?**

Project 8:

30. **With whom?**

31. **Where?**

32. **For whom?**

33. **Why?**

Project 9:

30. **With whom?**

31. **Where?**

32. **For whom?**

33. **Why?**

Project 10:

30. **With whom?**

31. **Where?**

32. **For whom?**

33. **Why?**

Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale

Below is a list of the ways you might have felt or behaved in the past month. Please indicate how often you felt that way by rating each item using the following scale:

0 = Rarely or None of the Time

1 = Some or a Little of the Time

2 = Occasionally or a Moderate Amount of Time

3 = Most or All of the Time

-
- ___ 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 the 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 disliked me.
- ___ 20. I could not get "going".

Perceived Stress Scale

These questions ask you about your feelings and thoughts during the past month. In each case you will be asked to indicate how often you felt or thought a certain way. For each question choose from the following alternatives:

0 = never

1 = almost never

2 = sometimes

3 = fairly often

4 = very often

-
- ___ 1. How often were you upset because of something that happened unexpectedly?
 - ___ 2. How often did you feel that you were unable to control the important things in your life?
 - ___ 3. How often did you feel nervous and "stressed?"
 - ___ 4. How often did you deal successfully with irritating life hassles?
 - ___ 5. How often did you feel that you were coping effectively with important changes that were occurring in your life?
 - ___ 6. How often did you feel confident about your ability to handle your personal problems?
 - ___ 7. How often did you feel that things were going your way?
 - ___ 8. How often did you find that you could not cope with all the things that you had to do?
 - ___ 9. How often were you able to control irritations in your life?
 - ___ 10. How often did you feel that you were on top of things?
 - ___ 11. How often were you angered because of things that happened that were outside your control?
 - ___ 12. How often did you find yourself thinking about things that you had to accomplish?
 - ___ 13. How often were you able to control the way you spend your time?
 - ___ 14. How often did you feel difficulties were piling up so high that you could not overcome them?

Satisfaction With Life Scale

Below are five statements, with which you may agree or disagree. Using the scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number on the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest about your response.

1 = strongly disagree

2 = disagree

3 = slightly disagree

4 = neither agree nor disagree

5 = slightly agree

6 = agree

7 = strongly agree

___ 1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

___ 2. The conditions of my life are excellent.

___ 3. I am satisfied with my life.

___ 4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

___ 5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

Specific and Domain Specific Life Satisfaction Scales

Using the following scale, please respond to the following set of questions:

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

COMPLETELY
DISSATISFIED

NEUTRAL

COMPLETELY
SATISFIED

- _____ 1. In general, how satisfied are you with your life as a whole, as it is right now?
- _____ 2. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your physical health at it is right now?
- _____ 3. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your social life as it is right now?
- _____ 4. In general how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your emotional state as it is right now?
- _____ 5. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your work life as it is right now?
- _____ 6. In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your home life as it is right now?

Affectometer 2

This is a questionnaire for reporting how often you have certain feelings, which are related to your emotional satisfaction and life fulfillment.

The items are either sentences or adjective, which describe different feelings about yourself and your life. For each item, please check how often you have had that feeling over the past month, using the following scale:

1 = Not at all

4 = Often

2 = Occasionally

5 = All of the time

3 = Some of the time

-
- ___ 1. My life is on the right track.
 - ___ 2. I seem to be left alone when I don't want to be.
 - ___ 3. I feel I can do whatever I want to.
 - ___ 4. I think clearly and creatively.
 - ___ 5. I feel like a failure.
 - ___ 6. Nothing seems very much fun anymore.
 - ___ 7. I like myself.
 - ___ 8. I can't be bothered doing anything.
 - ___ 9. I feel close to people around me.
 - ___ 10. I feel as though the best years of my life are over.
 - ___ 11. My future looks good.
 - ___ 12. I have lost interest in other people and don't care about them.
 - ___ 13. I have energy to spare.
 - ___ 14. I smile and laugh a lot.

1 = Not at all

4 = Often

2 = Occasionally

5 = All of the time

3 = Some of the time

 ____ 15. I wish I could change some parts of my life.

____ 16. My thoughts go around in useless circles.

____ 17. I can handle any problems that come up.

____ 18. My life seems stuck in a rut.

____ 19. I feel loved and trusted.

____ 20. I feel there must be something wrong with me.

Here is a list of adjectives that are to be rated with the same scale above, indicating how often you have felt each feeling over the past month.

____ 21. Satisfied

____ 31. Optimistic

____ 22. Lonely

____ 32. Withdrawn

____ 23. Free-and-easy

____ 33. Enthusiastic

____ 24. Clear-headed

____ 34. Good-natured

____ 25. Helpless

____ 35. Discontented

____ 26. Impatient

____ 36. Confused

____ 27. Useful

____ 37. Confident

____ 28. Depressed

____ 38. Tense

____ 29. Loving

____ 39. Understood

____ 30. Hopeless

____ 40. Insignificant

NEO

Five-Factor Inventory

Form S

Paul T. Costa, Jr., Ph.D., and Robert R. McCrae, Ph.D.

Instructions

Write only where indicated in this booklet. Carefully read all of the instructions before beginning. This questionnaire contains 60 statements. Read each statement carefully. For each statement fill in the circle with the response that best represents your opinion. Make sure that your answer is in the correct box.

Fill in (SD) if you *strongly disagree* or the statement is definitely false.

Fill in (D) if you *disagree* or the statement is mostly false.

Fill in (N) if you are *neutral* on the statement, you cannot decide, or the statement is about equally true and false.

Fill in (A) if you *agree* or the statement is mostly true.

Fill in (SA) if you *strongly agree* or the statement is definitely true.

For example, if you *strongly disagree* or believe that a statement is definitely false, you would fill in the (SD) for that statement.

Example

Fill in only one response for each statement. Respond to all of the statements, making sure that you fill in the correct response. DO NOT ERASE! If you need to change an answer, make an "X" through the incorrect response and then fill in the correct response.

Note that the responses are numbered in *rows*. Before responding to the statements, turn to the inside of the booklet and enter your name, age, and sex and the date.

1. I am not a worrier.
2. I like to have a lot of people around me.
3. I don't like to waste my time daydreaming.
4. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.
5. I keep my belongings clean and neat.
6. I often feel inferior to others.
7. I laugh easily.
8. Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it.
9. I often get into arguments with my family and co-workers.
10. I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.
11. When I'm under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces.
12. I don't consider myself especially "light-hearted."
13. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.
14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.
15. I am not a very methodical person.
16. I rarely feel lonely or blue.
17. I really enjoy talking to people.
18. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.
20. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.
21. I often feel tense and jittery.
22. I like to be where the action is.
23. Poetry has little or no effect on me.
24. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions.
25. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.
26. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.
27. I usually prefer to do things alone.
28. I often try new and foreign foods.
29. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.
30. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.
31. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.
32. I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy.
33. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.
34. Most people I know like me.
35. I work hard to accomplish my goals.

36. I often get angry at the way people treat me.
37. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.
38. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.
39. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.
40. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.
41. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.
42. I am not a cheerful optimist.
43. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.
44. I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes.
45. Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be.
46. I am seldom sad or depressed.
47. My life is fast-paced.
48. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.
49. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.
50. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.
51. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.
52. I am a very active person.
53. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.
54. If I don't like people, I let them know it.
55. I never seem to be able to get organized.
56. At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide.
57. I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others.
58. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.
59. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.
60. I strive for excellence in everything I do.

Enter your responses here—remember to enter responses across the rows.

SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; N = Neutral; A = Agree; SA = Strongly Agree

1	SD	D	N	A	SA	2	SD	D	N	A	SA	3	SD	D	N	A	SA	4	SD	D	N	A	SA	5	SD	D	N	A	SA
6	SD	D	N	A	SA	7	SD	D	N	A	SA	8	SD	D	N	A	SA	9	SD	D	N	A	SA	10	SD	D	N	A	SA
11	SD	D	N	A	SA	12	SD	D	N	A	SA	13	SD	D	N	A	SA	14	SD	D	N	A	SA	15	SD	D	N	A	SA
16	SD	D	N	A	SA	17	SD	D	N	A	SA	18	SD	D	N	A	SA	19	SD	D	N	A	SA	20	SD	D	N	A	SA
21	SD	D	N	A	SA	22	SD	D	N	A	SA	23	SD	D	N	A	SA	24	SD	D	N	A	SA	25	SD	D	N	A	SA
26	SD	D	N	A	SA	27	SD	D	N	A	SA	28	SD	D	N	A	SA	29	SD	D	N	A	SA	30	SD	D	N	A	SA
31	SD	D	N	A	SA	32	SD	D	N	A	SA	33	SD	D	N	A	SA	34	SD	D	N	A	SA	35	SD	D	N	A	SA
36	SD	D	N	A	SA	37	SD	D	N	A	SA	38	SD	D	N	A	SA	39	SD	D	N	A	SA	40	SD	D	N	A	SA
41	SD	D	N	A	SA	42	SD	D	N	A	SA	43	SD	D	N	A	SA	44	SD	D	N	A	SA	45	SD	D	N	A	SA
46	SD	D	N	A	SA	47	SD	D	N	A	SA	48	SD	D	N	A	SA	49	SD	D	N	A	SA	50	SD	D	N	A	SA
51	SD	D	N	A	SA	52	SD	D	N	A	SA	53	SD	D	N	A	SA	54	SD	D	N	A	SA	55	SD	D	N	A	SA
56	SD	D	N	A	SA	57	SD	D	N	A	SA	58	SD	D	N	A	SA	59	SD	D	N	A	SA	60	SD	D	N	A	SA

Have you responded to all of the statements? _____ Yes _____ No

Have you entered your responses in the correct boxes? _____ Yes _____ No

Have you responded accurately and honestly? _____ Yes _____ No

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 1) Age _____ Years
- 2) Sex _____ Female _____ Male
- 3) Marital status
- _____ Common-law spouse
- _____ Divorced
- _____ Married
- _____ Separated
- _____ Single (never married)
- _____ Widowed
- 4) Education- degrees, certificates or diplomas you have obtained. (Check as many as applicable)
- _____ Grade School (indicate your highest grade)
- _____ Secondary (high) school graduation certificate
- _____ Trades certificate or diploma
- _____ Other non-university certificate or diploma (obtained at community college, CEGEP, institute of technology etc.)
- _____ University certificate or diploma below bachelor level
- _____ Bachelor's degree(s) (e.g., B.A., B.Sc., B.A.Sc., LL.B.)
- _____ University certificate or diploma above bachelor level
- _____ Master's degree(s) (e.g., M.A., M.Sc., M.Ed.)
- _____ Degree in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine or optometry (M.D., D.D.S., D.M.D., D.V.M., O.D.)
- _____ Earned doctorate (e.g., Ph.D., D.Sc., D.Ed.)

5) Your personal income (Annual)

☐ Under \$15,000
☐ \$15,000 - 24,999
☐ \$25,000 - 34,999
☐ \$35,000 - 44,999
☐ \$45,000 - 54,999
☐ \$55,000 - 64,999
☐ \$65,000 - 74,999
☐ Over \$75,000

6) Your total family income (Annual)

☐ Under \$15,000
☐ \$15,000 - 24,999
☐ \$25,000 - 34,999
☐ \$35,000 - 44,999
☐ \$45,000 - 54,999
☐ \$55,000 - 64,999
☐ \$65,000 - 74,999
☐ Over \$75,000

7) Ethnic Background

Please indicate what you consider you ethnic background (e.g., African Canadian, Asian, First Nations Person, French Canadian)

8) Do you work outside the home? (Circle)

Yes / No

If yes: do you work

Full-time / Part-time? (Circle)

9) Where did you learn about this study?

Personal Projects, the Self and Well-Being: Debriefing

The study that you just participated in was designed to examine the relation between how a person construes themselves (either as relational or independent) and their personal projects and subjective well-being. Recently researchers have suggested that most people construe themselves in one of two ways, one, relational or two, independent. For someone with a relational self-construal, relationships and being connected to others is central to who they are. For those with an independent self-construal, being autonomous and individualistic is central to who they are. Given these two different types of self-construal, this research examined the impact of self-construals on personal projects and subjective well-being.

The personal projects analysis (PPA) package was enhanced with dimensions that would be more appropriate for those who were relational. The original PPA package was more appropriate for those who were more independent in their self-construals. It is expected that the new dimensions will be better able to predict well-being for those who are relational and the original dimensions will be better able to predict those who are independent.

If these predictions are true then the results of this study has many implications. It may be that for well-being, those who construe themselves as relational have different emotional needs and this may help in a variety of settings (e.g., therapy, health psychology). The same would be true for those who construe themselves in a more individualistic way.

Thank you for taking the time to volunteer for this study, your time and help is greatly appreciated. If you have any further questions about the study, please feel free to contact me, Deborah James, at 788-2600, ext. 2679. If you have any concerns regarding the study please contact, Dr. Lise Paquet (Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee; 788-2600, ext. 2692 or Dr. Bill Jones (Chair, Department of Psychology; 788-2600, ext. 2648).

Deborah S. James, M.A.

Appendix C
Categories of Personal Projects

Categories of Personal Projects

Personal Projects can be sorted in to content categories by considering the general types of activities involved in the elicited projects. A categorization scheme facilitates the examination of common themes across individuals. For example, are projects dealing with academic pursuits more stressful than occupations task, or do leisure activities ameliorate the potentially negative effects of stressful projects?

Although categorization is an attempt to partition activities into specialized domains or core elements, some overlap of categories may exist with certain projects. When categorizing projects, coders should be aware that many activities are multifaceted, e.g., Sally's involvement in intramural basketball may be mainly for fun (LEISURE) but she knows that it will also help her to lose five pounds (HEALTH/BODY). Classification should be based on the primary focus of the activity, e.g., Sally's basketball should be categorized as a LEISURE activity.

1. OCCUPATIONAL/ACADEMIC

This category includes actual work or tasks on the job (e.g., finish report) and school related projects (e.g., assignments, essays, exams, reading). The subcategories are:

1.1 Academic projects

1.2 Job-related projects

NOTE: This category would not include recreational reading (LEISURE) or a course on learning to play bridge.

2. HEALTH/BODY

This category includes activities relating to appearance, health, fitness (e.g., lose weight, stop smoking, work out, jog, sleep, play a sport with a fitness goal clearly in mind and not for recreational purposes).

NOTE: This category would not include recreational sporting activities (LEISURE).

3. INTERPERSONAL

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

3.1 Family (projects involving parents, spouse, grandparents, etc. as focus either individually or in a group, e.g., visiting my grandmother, taking my mum to do her grocery shopping).

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

3.3 Interpersonal secondary (assume intimate projects are secondary unless family members or intimate friends are specified: projects dealing with acquaintances such as classmate, bosses, 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).

5. LEISURE

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

5.1 Entertainment (e.g., Television, Movies, Museums, Theatre, Rock or Classical Concerts).

5.2 Parties/Dances.

5.3 Hobbies/ Recreational activities (e.g., Stamp collecting may involve knitting or building projects; interest courses such as a quilting course; favourite pastimes such as tinkering with a car; learning or playing a game such as bridge, chess).

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

5.5 Drinking/Drugs (e.g., getting high, not stop taking drugs (HEALTH/BODY)).

5.6 Pleasure reading and writing, letter writing.

5.7 Vacation projects (planning, packing, organization).

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

5.9 Enjoying your pet (e.g., playing with my cat not taking the dog for a walk ADMINISTRATIVE/MAINTENANCE).

6. ADMINISTRATIVE/MAINTENANCE

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

6.1 Mundane activities relating to finding a place to live or obtaining employment (e.g., registering at an Employment Centre, filling out job applications not taking a French course to improve employability (OCCUPATIONAL/ACADEMIC)).

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

6.3 Car maintenance (e.g., taking the car in for lub and oil change, changing the filter not buying a new car (LEISURE pleasure shopping)).

6.4 Paying the bills, arranging financing.

6.5 Getting registered for a course or program.

6.6 Tasks involving your pet (e.g., taking your dog for a walk, taking my pet to the vet for distemper shots not having fun with Spot (LEISURE)).

6.7 Administrative/maintenance metaprojects (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 that be helpful resources. For example, if a project is listed on as "Mary", was phrased as "breaking up with Mary" in which case the project could 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/