PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Personal Projects, Meaning and Well-Being

Ian D. McGregor

**Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and
Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts**

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

August, 1994

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN
IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE
LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL
LIBRARY OF CANADA TO
REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR
SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY
ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR
FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS
AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED
PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE
IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE
PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE
NATIONALE DU CANADA DE
REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER
OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA
THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET
SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT
POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE
CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES
PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP
OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER
THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR
SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT
MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE
REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER
PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE
DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE
SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES
EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-
CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU
AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON
AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-02991-3

Canada

Name

Ian M. C. G. G. G.

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Psychology

SUBJECT TERM

0525

SUBJECT CODE

U.M.I.

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern 0401
Literature 0294
Classical 0295
Comparative 0297
Medieval 0298
Modern 0316
African 0591
American 0305
Asian 0352
Canadian (English) 0355
Canadian (French) 0593
English 0311
Germanic 0312
Latin American 0315
Middle Eastern 0313
Romance 0314
Slavic and East European

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
Archaeology 0326
Cultural 0327
Physical 0310
Business Administration 0272
General 0770
Accounting 0454
Banking 0338
Management 0385
Marketing 0501
Canadian Studies 0503
Economics 0505
General 0508
Agricultural 0509
Commerce-Business 0510
Finance 0511
History 0358
Labor 0366
Theory 0351
Folklore 0578
Geography
Gerontology
History
General

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science 0615
General 0616
International Law and Relations 0617
Public Administration 0814
Recreation 0452
Social Work 0626
Sociology 0627
General 0938
Criminology and Penology 0631
Demography 0628
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0629
Individual and Family Studies 0630
Industrial and Labor Relations 0700
Public and Social Welfare 0344
Social Structure and Development 0709
Theory and Methods 0999
Transportation 0453
Urban and Regional Planning
Women's Studies

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology 0306
General 0287
Anatomy 0308
Biostatistics 0309
Botany 0379
Cell 0329
Ecology 0353
Entomology 0369
Genetics 0793
Limnology 0410
Microbiology 0307
Molecular 0317
Neuroscience 0416
Oceanography 0433
Physiology 0821
Radiation 0778
Veterinary Science 0472
Zoology
Biophysics 0786
General 0760
Medical

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
General 0300
Audiology 0992
Chemotherapy 0567
Dentistry 0350
Education 0769
Hospital Management 0758
Human Development 0982
Immunology 0564
Medicine and Surgery 0347
Mental Health 0569
Nursing 0570
Nutrition 0380
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0354
Occupational Health and Therapy 0381
Ophthalmology 0571
Pathology 0419
Pharmacology 0572
Pharmacy 0382
Physical Therapy 0573
Public Health 0574
Radiology 0575
Recreation

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry 0485
General 0749
Agricultural 0486
Analytical 0487
Biochemistry 0488
Inorganic 0738
Nuclear 0490
Organic 0491
Pharmaceutical 0494
Physical 0495
Polymer 0754
Radiation 0405
Mathematics 0605
Physics 0986
General 0606
Acoustics 0608
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0748
Atmospheric Science 0607
Atomic 0798
Electronics and Electricity 0759
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0609
Fluid and Plasma 0610
Molecular 0752
Nuclear 0756
Optics 0611
Radiation 0463
Solid State
Statistics
Applied Sciences
Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering 0537
General 0538
Aerospace 0539
Agricultural 0540
Automotive 0541
Biomedical 0542
Chemical 0543
Civil 0544
Electronics and Electrical 0348
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0794
Materials Science 0548
Mechanical 0743
Metallurgy 0551
Mining 0552
Nuclear 0549
Packaging 0765
Petroleum 0554
Sanitary and Municipal System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

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

Personal Projects, Meaning and Well-Being

submitted by Ian D. McGregor
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Thesis Supervisor

Chairman, Department of Psychology

Carleton University

August, 1994

Abstract

One hundred and forty eight undergraduate psychology students completed an adapted version of Personal Projects Analysis (Little, 1983) in this exploration of the relationship between meaning and well-being. Based on the theories of McAdams (1993) and Vallacher and Wegner (1985), we hypothesized that highest well-being would be reported when personal projects ("doings") were thematically congruent with the identities ("beings") of their actors. A new, ipsatively based identity categorization procedure revealed no such relationship between well-being and being-doing congruence. Instead, in an apparently compensatory pattern, well-being was enhanced; for agentic identities when their projects were absorbing and supported by others, for communal identities when their projects were fun, for hedonistic identities when their projects were progressing well, and for generative identities when their projects were manageable.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Brian Little for his mentorship, wealth of ideas, generous feedback, infectious enthusiasm and inexhaustible sense of humour. The encouragement and guidance of other lab members, especially Kevin Wilmut, Tim Pychyl and Laura Goodine is also gratefully acknowledged. Most of all, I would like to thank my long-suffering friends and family for their patient support over these past two very agentic years. "Studies show" that I would have been miserable without it.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Personal Projects Analysis.....	2
Adaptations to the Method for this Research.....	4
Categorization of Participants into Identity Groups.....	4
Addition of New Meaning Dimensions.....	5
Augmentation of Well-Being Measure Battery.....	6
Guiding Hypothesis.....	6
Method.....	7
Sample.....	7
Description of Measures.....	8
Personal Projects Analysis (PPA).....	8
Purpose in Life Scale (PIL).....	9
Life Satisfaction Scale.....	9
Domain Specific Life Satisfaction Scales.....	10
CES - Depression.....	10
Perceived Stress Scale.....	10
Positive Affect.....	11
Demographic and Personal Information.....	11
Data Analysis.....	11
Results.....	12
Descriptive Information.....	12
Factor Structure of Well-Being Measures.....	16
The Relationship Between Project Dimension Ratings and Well-Being Factors.....	20
Categorization Into Identity Groups.....	23

Descriptives Within Categories.....	27
Comparison of Well-Being Scores Between Groups.....	30
"Doings": Factor Structure of Dimensional Means.....	31
Correlates of Well-Being Within Identity Groups.....	32
Discussion.....	38
The Relationship Between Meaningful Personal Projects and Well-Being.....	38
Identity Categorization.....	41
The Maintenance of Meaning.....	43
Conclusions.....	46
Footnotes.....	48
References.....	60
Appendix A - Participant Recruitment Notice.....	70
Appendix B - Informed Consent Form and Debriefing.....	72
Appendix C - Materials Used in this Research.....	76
Demographic and Personal Information.....	77
The Purpose In Life Test.....	78
Life Satisfaction Scale.....	81
Domain Specific Satisfaction Scales.....	81
CES-Depression Scale.....	83
Perceived Stress Scale.....	84
Positive Affect Scale.....	85
Personal Projects Analysis.....	86
Evaluation.....	97
Appendix D - Materials Included in the Package But Not Used In This Research.....	98
Personal Projects Analysis Part Two.....	99

Personal Projects Analysis Part Three.....	102
Personal Projects Analysis Part Four.....	105
"You Are Eighty Five Years Old".....	106
NEO-AC Personality Inventory.....	108
Appendix E - Tables.....	115
Table 15 - "Being" Factors: Factor Analysis of PPA Ipsative Dimensional Associations with Self-Identity (complete table).....	116
Table 16 - "Doing" Factors: Factor Analysis of PPA Dimensional Means (complete table).....	117
Table 17 - Internal Consistency of PPA Dimensions and Well-Being Scales.....	120
Appendix F - Sample List of Participant Personal Projects.....	122
Appendix G - Sample Comments from Participant Evaluations.....	125

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Description</u>
1	Means and Standard Deviations of Personal Project Dimensions.....14
2	Factor Analysis of Well-Being Measures.....17
3	Factor Analysis of the Purpose in Life Test Items.....18
4	Correlations of Standard PPA Dimensions with Well-Being Factors.....21
5	Correlations of Newer PPA Dimensions with Well-Being Factors.....22
6	"Being" Factors: Factor Analysis of t-scores of Ipsative Dimensional Associations With Self-Identity.....24
7	Demographic Information.....28
8	Means and Standard Deviations of Identity Central Dimensions.....29
9	Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors Overall.....32
10	Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Achievers.....33
11	Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Agentics.....34
12	Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Communs.....35
13	Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Hedonists.....36
14	Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Generatives.....37

15	"Being" Factors: Factor Analysis of PPA Ipsative Dimensional Associations with Self-Identity (complete table).....	116
16	"Doing" Factors: Factor Analysis of PPA Dimensional Means (complete table).....	118
17	Internal Consistency of PPA Dimensions and Well-Being Scales.....	120

Introduction

it is the nature of . . . things to be destroyed by defect and excess . . . the man who flies from and fears everything and does not stand his ground against anything becomes a coward, and the man who fears nothing at all but goes to meet every danger becomes rash; and similarly the man who indulges in every pleasure and abstains from none becomes self-indulgent, while the man who shuns every pleasure, as boors do, becomes in a way insensible; temperance and courage, then, are destroyed by excess and defect, and preserved by the mean. (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* c. 336 B.C., cited in Kaplan & Ross, 1958, pp. 183-184.)

The ineffective maintenance of meaning in life is often implicated as the cause of social and psychological problems (Baumeister, 1992; Frankl, 1963; Tillich, 1952). Meaninglessness has been linked with alienation and disengagement (Klinger, 1977), antisocial behaviors (Black, 1973; Padelford, 1974), alcoholism, (Crumbaugh, 1968), suicide (Baumeister, 1990) and psychological distress (Kobasa, Maddi & Kahn, 1982; Palys & Little, 1983; Crumbaugh, 1968). Several different methodological approaches have been recruited in attempts to study meaning in life. This research uses Personal Projects Analysis (PPA) to explore the relationship between meaning and well-being.

The study of meaning in life is often left to philosophy because it is difficult to operationalize and quantify. Traditional paper and pencil questionnaires have had limited utility ¹. As a method, PPA has promise

because of several unique qualities ideally suited to the study of meaning. Despite these advantages, PPA research over the past fifteen years has found the direct relationship between meaning and well-being to be less robust than theoretically expected (Little, 1988; Wilson, 1990). This study implemented three methodological adaptations to clarify the relationship between meaning and well-being. First, new dimensions were added to augment the usual PPA operationalization of meaning; second, ipsatively based categorization attempted to clarify what past reliance on normative analyses may have blurred; and third, well-being measures more sensitive to the detection of meaning were included.

Personal Projects Analysis

Personal Projects Analysis has conventionally operationalized meaning as the extent to which mid-level goals are self-rated as: being enjoyable (enjoyment), having one's commitment (commitment), being congruent with core values (value congruence), representing one's self-identity (self-identity), being personally absorbing (absorption), contributing to a sense of self-worth (self-worth) and being important (importance). Higher well-being scores are expected to accompany project systems with higher ratings on these dimensions of meaningful action. The guiding assumption is that goals and intentions are the vehicles of meaning. Similarly, action identity theory posits that a sense of self is symbolically mediated by action, a process described by Vallacher and Wegner as evolving dynamically between "doing" and "being" (1985).

Personal projects, like other personal action constructs (PAC) (Little, 1989), such as current concerns (Klinger, 1977), life tasks (Cantor, et al, 1987),

and personal strivings (Emmons, 1986) reflect the contextual, temporal, and intentional properties of behavior. Unlike more conventional units of analysis, PAC units represent a shift from a "having" to a "doing" emphasis in personality (Cantor, 1990). No longer considered to be passive repositories of traits and responders to stimuli, people are viewed as active agents, engaged in meaningful action in context (Little, 1933; Bruner, 1991). Based on a new, narrative root metaphor (Sarbin, 1986; McAdams, 1985b), PAC units are more able to access the relational and intentional aspects of lives than units based on the conventional computer processing model. Relational and intentional properties of behavior are considered germane to the maintenance of meaning (Rickman, 1961; De Vogler & Ebersole, 1981, 1983, 1985).

Furthermore, consistent with its Kellian roots (Kelly, 1955; Little, 1972), PPA takes a credulous approach toward the research participant. Each participant provides the personally relevant content for his or her own units of analysis (projects) and the dimensional ratings of these projects are taken at face value. Although such credulity introduces the limitations inherent in all self-report methods, it also confers several benefits. Since the units are self-generated and personally salient, they are more likely than conventional standardized test items to evoke rich and conscientiously reported data (Little, 1987b).

As well as having benefits for the researcher, PPA has been found by many research participants to be personally rewarding and interesting² (see Appendix G for sample participant comments from this research). Furthermore, unlike conventional inventories which focus primarily on classification, PPA is directly applicable to treatment. Being intimately linked with social ecological idiosyncrasies, a PPA diagnosis naturally unpacks into strategies for clinical intervention (Little, 1987b; Little, 1992).

In summary, PPA is appropriate for the study of meaning and well-being for three reasons. First, the personal project is a unit capable of tapping into the temporal/contextual embeddedness and intentionality of personality. Second, it is a credulous method that evokes high quality data which can be analyzed ipsatively or normatively, qualitatively or quantitatively. Finally, there are ethical and practical benefits of PPA. Research participants find it personally rewarding, and in clinical usage, its assessments can translate directly into intervention strategies.

Despite this supportive theory and method, however, personal project meaning dimensions have not proven to be as robustly associated with well-being as some other dimensions assessed by PPA. In a recent meta-analysis (Wilson, 1990), dimensions appraising project stress, difficulty, control, progress and likelihood of successful outcome, were significantly and robustly associated with life-satisfaction while the traditional meaning dimensions were not. Although individual studies have linked other project dimensions to well-being, these more instrumental dimensions appear to be the normatively important predictors of well-being (Palys, 1979; Palys & Little, 1983).

Adaptations to the Method for this Research

Categorization of Participants into Identity Groups

One possible explanation for this finding could be that whereas instrumental dimensions are normatively related to well-being, meaning dimensions might be differentially salient. For example, if well-being were associated with the meaning dimension, enjoyment, for group A but not for group B, and the meaning dimension, value congruency, for group B but not group A, then neither dimension would emerge from normative analyses as a

strong predictor. If this were the case, meaning dimensions would come into sharp relief if groups were given independent consideration. The notion that meaning is configured in different ways by different people is represented by McAdams' theory of meaning as a life story. People are seen as constructing thematically coherent identities, often centering on agentic or communal motifs (McAdams, 1993). As in action identity theory (Vallacher & Wegner, 1985), McAdams claims that living within the parameters of these identities provides people with a sense of meaning and well-being.

Past attempts at identity categorization using personal projects analysis have provisionally identified alternative profiles³ that roughly parallel themes of agency, communion and hedonism in the meaning literature⁴. The procedures used to date, however, have usually grouped people based on what they were doing⁵, which may have confounded personal orientations with social ecological influences. If a person was engaged in projects high in enjoyment, and low in stress, then this person would be categorized as hedonistic regardless of whether or not they personally resonated with their hedonistic projects.

Recognizing the possible influence of one's social ecology in determining what projects one undertakes, this research sought to increase fidelity by basing categorization on ipsative dimensional correlations with self-identity. For example, if a person's project ratings on enjoyment and other hedonistically central dimensions were highly correlated with project ratings on self-identity, then the person was categorized as hedonistic.

Addition of New Meaning Dimensions

A second possible explanation for the relatively disappointing relationship between the meaning dimensions and well-being could be that 'he

conventional PPA meaning dimensions have provided inadequate coverage of various domains of meaning. Exploiting the modular flexibility of PPA, new dimensions were added based on the meaning and well-being literature⁶. Dimensions such as "communion" and "others'-benefit" were added to more clearly define the communal orientation; "power" and "self-benefit" the agentic orientation; and "pleasure" and "fun" the hedonistic orientation. Definitions used for each of the dimensions in this study are given in Appendix C.

Augmentation of the Well-Being Measure Battery

A third possible explanation for the ostensibly weak relationship between meaningful projects and well-being could be that the standard triad of well-being measures: life satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect, fail to represent the deeper, more meaningful aspects of well-being. Indeed, meaning has been described as necessary but not sufficient for happiness (Baumeister, 1992)). Happiness and meaning have also been described as orthogonal (McAdams, 1993). The Purpose in Life test (Crumbaugh, 1968) was included in the battery of well-being measures in an attempt to ensure that the more meaningful aspects of well-being were being detected.

Guiding Hypothesis

By using these three adaptations we expected that agentic, communal and hedonistic identity groups would emerge and that, consistent with the notions expressed in action identity theory and McAdams' theory of meaning, being-doing congruence would predict well-being within each group. For example, we expected that people categorized as having agentic identities would show enhanced well-being if engaged in projects rated highly on power

and self-benefit, that communal identities would report highest well-being when engaged in projects rated highly on communion and others' benefit, and so on.

Method

Sample

One hundred and forty eight participants were recruited (see Appendix A for recruitment poster) from a large, televised introductory psychology course, and received academic credits for their participation. Data were collected in five group sessions with 13 to 40 participants per session. Each session was three hours long; the first hour and a half was used to collect data for this study, the second hour and a half to collect data for another study. Participants were embedded in a distinctive ecology: the first three days of the Christmas exam break (Dec. 6, 7 and 8) when many were completing term assignments and planning their study schedules. This time frame had the advantage of being a minor transition period with a significant press for both agentic (i.e. exam performance) and communal (i.e. Christmas preparation) behavior. As such, self-relevant information from both domains should have been relatively accessible. Despite the length of the data collection session there was no indication that participants were not answering conscientiously. Comments were favourable and participants reported that they enjoyed the data collection session (see Appendix G for participant comments). It must be acknowledged, however, that although this sample was recruited from a televised course, with many of the participants being mature and part-time students, it was still a predominantly young, demographically homogeneous sample. Future research is needed to determine the generalizeability of these findings.

Description of Measures

Several considerations guided the choice of measures included in this study. While the exploratory nature of this research required a broad band of reliable instruments, more specific, rationally derived satisfaction measures also provided commensurability with past PPA research. Furthermore, life-satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect measures were included to represent the tripartite structure of subjective well-being⁷. Each measure is briefly described in the following section.

Personal Projects Analysis

Participants were asked to complete the Personal Project Analysis package found in Appendix C. Substantial relationships have been demonstrated between PPA dimensions and depression (Little, 1988), life satisfaction (Malys & Little, 1983), domain specific life satisfaction (Lecci, 1990), meaning (Horley, 1984) and NEO-PI dimensions (Little, Lecci & Watkinson, 1992).

Subjects were primed with examples, and given ten minutes to generate a list of personal projects that they were "engaged in or intending to begin over the next month or so". From this "project dump" they were asked to select the ten projects that, "together provide the most complete and informative overview of your life". A rating matrix was then completed in which the ten selected projects were rated from zero to ten on a number of dimensions, 18 of them having been frequently used in past PPA research and 17 added specifically for this research.

Little (1983) has developed and termed the modular PPA assessment package the Personal Projects Analysis Kit (PPAK). Unlike more conventional

and rigid assessment techniques, PPA modules can be used selectively and tailored to specific research needs. In this research, the Project Elicitation List and the Personal Project Rating Matrix modules were used. These modules, with definitions of the core and newly added dimensions, are presented in Appendix C.

Purpose in Life Scale (PIL)

The PIL (Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1964) was designed to measure Frankl's (1963) concept of noogenic neurosis: an emptiness of purpose in life. Growing out of the principles of existential philosophy, the concept of noogenic neurosis describes a vacuum of perceived meaning in existence. The PIL contains 20 items scored on a seven point semantic differential scale. It has been the most widely used measure of the construct and its internal structure appears to be superior to other meaning scales (Chamberlain & Zika, 1988). The PIL has demonstrated significant relationships with a number of personality, adaptational and well-being measures (Zika & Chamberlain, 1987; see Chamberlain & Zika, 1988), and has proven reliability (Crumbaugh, 1968; Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1964; Meier & Edwards, 1974; Reker, 1977).

Life Satisfaction Scale

An 11 point scale was used to assess the extent to which respondents are satisfied with life in general. This scale has shown consistent relationships with personality and PPA variables (Palys, 1979; Palys & Little, 1983). Burisch (1984a, 1984b) has demonstrated that such short, simple, undisguised, rationally derived scales can have equal or superior reliability to longer, empirically based inventories.

Domain Specific Satisfaction Scales

Schwartz (1991), noting some problems with global life-satisfaction measures, advocates domain specific measures as less likely to elicit responses based on recency, current mood, social desirability and other potential confounds. Single item, eleven-point satisfaction scales were used to assess subjective well-being in five domains: social/relational, personal/emotional, academic/vocational, health and administration/maintenance. Lecci (1990) found similar measures to be significantly correlated with a number of PPA and NEO-PI dimensions.

CES-Depression

The CES-D index (Radloff, 1977) assesses state rather than trait depressive symptomatology. It was used as one of the measures of affect to complement the more cognitive appraisals of life satisfaction. The 20 items instruct respondents to consider and rate actions and feelings of the past week on a four point scale. The CES-D has shown significant correlations with PPA dimensions (Little, 1988), and was designed not for clinical assessment but for investigating the relationships between depressive symptomatology and other variables across population subgroups (Radloff, 1977).

Perceived Stress Scale

The PSS (Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein, 1983) is a 14 item instrument designed to measure, on a five point scale, how often respondents feel stressed. Unlike the popular Life-Event Scale (Holmes & Rahe, 1967), it can tap directly into perceived stress by accessing affect due to unspecified daily hassles, idiosyncratically construed stressful events, and anticipatory stress.

Positive Affect Scale

The positive affect module of the Affect Balance Scale (Bradburn, 1969) contains five "yes or no" questions about recent positive affect. It is a widely used scale with proven construct validity (Larson, Diener & Emmons, 1985).

Demographic and Personal Information

Data on demographic variables of age, sex, relationship status, financial status, employment status, living arrangements, parental occupation and high school GPA were collected.

Data Analyses

Because a broad band of intercorrelated well-being measures were examined, the first procedure was a principal components analysis used to explore for a possible multidimensional well-being factor structure. This was also aimed at reducing the degrees of freedom for further procedures. Subsequently, zero order Pearson correlations between project dimension means and well-being factors were calculated in an attempt to replicate previous research on the normative predictive utility of PPA dimensions and to reveal the normative predictive utility of the new PPA dimensions being explored.

In the second phase, correlations between project dimensions and outcome factors were explored within ipsatively based identity groups. Again, in order to preserve degrees of freedom, principal components of project-dimension means were used instead of the dimensional means themselves.

Categorization was based on ipsative dimensional correlations with the self-identity dimension. After correlations between self-identity and each of the

other PPA dimensions were computed for each subject, t-scores representing the strength of each correlation were recorded (with a negative sign added if the correlation was negative)⁸. For variables that had no variance for a certain participant (i.e. if a person listed all their projects as "10" on value congruency) zeros were used to replace the undefined arithmetic solution for the correlation. This seemed intuitively defensible since variables with little variance yield low correlations (Zimmerman & Little, 1982). From the modified t-scores, a principal components analysis was computed to illuminate how the ipsative dimensional correlations with self-identity cohered. Subjects were then categorized based on their relative ranks on the emergent self-identity factors.

The categorization algorithm was as follows. If all ranks for a person were less than or equal to 73 (the median), the person was not included in any group. Otherwise, individuals were grouped based on the highest ranking of their factor scores. For example, if a person was ranked as sixth on agency, tenth on communion, fortieth on hedonism and ninety-fifth on achievement, he or she would be categorized as agentic. When highest ranks were tied, scores on other groups were considered, agency and achievement being considered as related and communion and hedonism considered together (McAdams, 1993). When both agency and communion ranks were greater than or equal to 50, the case was categorized into a "generativity" group⁹.

Results

Descriptive Information

As shown in table 1, project dimension means indicated that these students were engaged in meaningful projects (see Appendix F for sample list

of projects). Projects were self-rated as highest on the dimensions of: importance (7.8), initiation (8.3), value congruency (8.1), self-benefit (7.9), and purpose (8.5). Projects rated highly on these dimensions included academic projects such as "study for exams" and "complete paper", and social projects such as "finish making Christmas gifts" and "organize party". Dimensional variance was similar to that found in previous research (Blake, 1994; Wilmut, 1993).

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Personal Project Dimensions^a

Standard dimensions	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Importance	7.8	1.2
Enjoyment	6.0	1.5
Difficulty	5.6	1.6
Visibility	5.3	1.8
Control	7.3	1.7
Initiation	8.3	1.3
Stress	5.1	1.7
Time pressure	4.7	2.0
Outcome	7.2	1.4
Self-identity	6.9	1.3
Others' view	6.3	1.6
Value congruency	8.1	1.2
Net impact	6.5	1.6
Progress	4.5	1.9
Challenge	6.4	1.5
Absorption	5.2	1.5
Self-worth	7.3	1.3
Commitment	7.2	1.4

Table 1 (continued)

Means and Standard Deviations of Personal Project Dimensions

Newer dimensions ^b	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Future-self	5.9	1.9
Significance	6.6	1.6
Fun	5.3	1.5
Pride	6.8	1.5
Self-benefit	7.9	1.2
Others' benefit	4.8	2.0
Power	6.2	1.7
Communion	5.4	1.7
Risk	4.8	2.0
Pleasure	5.9	1.6
Trust	6.8	1.7
Support	6.6	1.5
Purpose	8.5	1.0
Affiliation	4.3	1.6
Health	7.0	1.5
Creativity	5.5	1.7
Consumption	4.3	1.8

Note. N = 146.

^astandard deviations were calculated at the person-level. ^bFuture-self, Support, Fun, Self-benefit and Others' benefit were used by Phillips, Little and Goodine (1993).

Factor Structure of Well-Being Measures

In an attempt to simplify, stabilize and increase power for data analyses, all of the outcome measures, including three orthogonal principal components derived from the PIL¹⁰, were reduced to three principal components¹¹. As shown in table 2, the first represented general social/emotional well-being; the second had goal clarity/satisfaction, administrative satisfaction and work satisfaction as the highest loadings; the third was made up almost exclusively of the PIL factor 5, which consisted of items such as "My personal existence is very purposeful and meaningful", "If I could choose, I would like nine more lives just like this one", "If I should die today, I would feel that my life has been very worthwhile", "In thinking of my life I always see a reason for my being here", "As I view the world in relation to my life, the world fits meaningfully with my life". This third principal component seems to represent a global evaluation of existential meaning (see table 3).

These three outcome measures were seen as representing a gradient towards increasing meaning. Items loading onto factor one referred mostly to affect and general satisfaction in life's various domains. Items with the words purpose and meaning were not involved. Factor one then seemed to be the least meaning-oriented factor. Factor two began to include items referring to the purpose and meaning in the context of goals and aims, and was therefore seen as describing the "micro-meanings" in life. Factor three was clearly a more "macro-meaning" factor, primarily describing purpose and meaning in life, in general. These three factors, labelled social/emotional well-being, goal satisfaction and existential meaning, served as the criterion measures for the subsequent analyses.

Table 2
Factor Analysis of Well-Being Measures

Scale	Factor		
	1	2	3
Life satisfaction	.64	.46	.32
Work satisfaction	.35	.62	.11
Social satisfaction	.74	-.15	.09
Emotional satisfaction	.70	.28	.24
Health satisfaction	.62	.11	-.01
Admin satisfaction	.14	.74	-.09
CESD depression	-.66	-.42	-.35
PSS stress	-.51	-.51	-.43
Positive affect	.52	.37	.31
PIL factor 1	0	.83	.02
PIL factor 4	.85	-.02	-.13
PIL factor 5	.05	-.07	.93

Note. N = 146. These are varimax-rotated principal components. Only loadings above .60 in absolute magnitude are bolded to emphasize the unique structure of each factor. Percentages of variance for factors 1-3 are: 47, 33, 20 respectively.

Table 3

Factor Analysis of Purpose in Life Test Items

PIL item	Factor				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Usually exuberant/ enthusiastic	.15	.10	.12	.80	.06
2. Life to me seems always exciting	.04	-.15	.12	.80	.19
3. Have very clear goals and aims in life	.75	.06	-.08	.09	.19
4. Existence is purposeful/meaningful	.38	-.02	.22	.48	.48
5. Every day is constantly new and different	.12	.04	.16	.72	.14
6. Would like nine more lives like this one	.26	-.26	.08	.52	.48
7. Will do many things after retiring	.04	-.76	.36	.03	.06
8. Am achieving life goals	.36	.17	-.10	.54	.08
9. Life is full of exciting good things.	.25	-.11	.14	.68	.40
10. So far life has been very worthwhile	.40	.08	.22	.31	.46
11. Always see a reason for my being here	.21	-.21	-.10	.18	.73
12. World fits meaningfully with my life	.29	.24	.25	.13	.43
13. I am a very responsible person	.70	-.06	.06	.19	-.24
14. People are free to make all life choices	0	-.01	.79	.16	.01
15. Prepared for and unafraid of death	.01	.68	.28	.04	.02
16. I've never thought about suicide	-.10	.11	.14	.15	.74
17. Find meaning/purpose/mission in life	.60	-.13	.04	.30	.30
18. I am in control of my life	.20	.05	.67	.14	.20
19. Pleasure and satisfaction in life tasks	.49	.29	.25	.54	.11
20. Clear goals and a satisfying life purpose	.67	.02	.27	.19	.39

Table 3 (continued)**Factor Analysis of Purpose in Life Test Items**

Note. **N** = 146. These are varimax-rotated principle components. Loadings above .30 in absolute magnitude are bolded. Percentages of variance for factors 1-5 are: 23, 12, 14, 30, 21 respectively.

The Relationship Between Project Dimension Ratings and Well-Being Factors

As shown in table 4, the more instrumental dimensions (outcome, difficulty, control and progress) and their affectively tinged corollaries (stress and enjoyment) were the most highly associated with well-being among the standard PPA dimensions. This finding is consistent with past research (Wilson, 1990). As shown in table 5, trust, pleasure and fun are the newer dimensions most highly associated with well-being. In order to protect against alpha-inflation, only probabilities below $p < .01$ were given primary consideration, and two tailed tests of significance were used even though all significant correlations were in the theoretically expected direction.

Table 4

Correlations of Standard PPA Dimensions with Well-Being Factors

PPA dimensions	Well-being factors		
	S.E	G	E.M.
Importance	-.05	.08	.11
Enjoyment	.26**	.23*	.11
Difficulty	-.24**	-.11	-.19
Visibility	.07	.04	-.05
Control	.25**	.14	.21
Initiation	.15	.07	.04
Stress	-.29***	-.16	-.18
Time pressure	-.08	-.15	-.04
Outcome	.37***	.25**	.22*
Self-identity	.11	.23*	.08
Others' view	-.11	.05	-.06
Value congruency	.12	.17	.03
Net impact	.05	-.15	-.05
Progress	.22*	.24**	-.13
Challenge	-.16	.02	-.07
Absorption	.15	.04	-.01
Self-worth	.02	-.05	.18
Commitment	.07	.17	-.02

Note. N = 146. S.E. = Social-emotional satisfaction; G = Goal satisfaction; E.M. = Existential meaning.

*p<.01, **p<.005, ***p<.001.

Table 5

Correlations of Newer PPA Dimensions with Well-Being Factors

PPA dimensions	Well-being factors		
	S.E	G	E.M.
Future-self	-.07	-.01	-.06
Significance	-.02	-.04	.15
Fun	.25**	.10	.17
Pride	.07	.02	.11
Self-benefit	-.04	-.02	.10
Others' benefit	-.10	.03	.04
Power	.03	-.09	.10
Communion	-.04	0	.04
Risk	-.17	-.08	-.16
Pleasure	.25**	.16	.25**
Trust	.29***	.18	.12
Support	.19	.17	.01
Purpose	-.11	.15	.09
Affiliation	.12	-.06	0
Health	.10	0	.12
Creativity	.06	0	-.01
Consumption	.07	-.02	.07

Note. N = 146. S.E. = Social-emotional satisfaction; G = Goal satisfaction; E.M. = Existential meaning.

*p<.01, **p<.005, ***p<.001.

Categorization into Identity Groups

One of the guiding assumptions of this research was that there could be alternative routes to meaning. Following the ideas of McAdams (1993), meaning here was considered to be a function of identity: a personal construction built around a central theme that forms the "moral tone" (Vallacher & Wegner, 1985) of lives. According to this perspective, a sense of meaning could be derived from a coherent identity constructed around any one of a number of themes, such as power, intimacy or fun.

As expected, a principal components analysis of each participant's ipsative dimensional associations with self-identity¹² revealed several recognizable identity orientations. As shown in table 6, the first four of these principal components clearly represent themes of agency (highest loading was future-self, .76), achievement (highest loading was outcome, .77), hedonism (highest loading was fun, .80) and communion (highest loading was communion, .78)¹³. These factors will be referred to as being factors since they describe how people are and will be distinguished from doing factors which describe characteristics of the personal projects that people are doing.

Interestingly, most of the conventional meaning dimensions -- importance, value congruency, absorption, self-worth and commitment -- loaded primarily onto the agency factor. Enjoyment was an exception, helping to define the hedonism factor. The conventional stress, structure and efficacy dimensions together defined the achievement orientation. The communion factor consisted primarily of the newer dimensions: communion, others' benefit, affiliation, trust and support; plus others' view of importance (one of the conventional community dimensions).

Table 6

**"Being" Factors: Factor Analysis of t-scores of Ipsative Dimensional
Associations With Self-identity**

Factors			
Agency	Hedonism	Achievement	Communion
Future-self (.76)	Fun (.80)	Outcome (.77)	Communion (.78)
Self-worth (.73)	Enjoyment (.76)	Control (.71)	Oth. benefit ^a (.75)
Self-benefit (.73)	Pleasure (.74)	Difficulty (-.70)	Affiliation (.62)
Importance (.70)	Stress (-.52)	Progress (.57)	Support (.37)
Purpose (.69)	Oth ^b . view (-.51)	Stress (-.50)	Others' view (.35)
Significance (.69)	Creativity (.36)	Challenge (-.43)	Trust (.33)
Psych. risk ^c (.67)	Health (.35)	Initiation (.38)	
Commit. ^d (.66)	Time pres ^e (-.32)		
Pride (.52)			

Note. $N = 146$. These are varimax rotated principal components. Loadings in absolute magnitude above .50 are given for agency, and above .30 for the other factors. See table 15 in Appendix E for complete table of loadings.

Percentages of variance are, from left to right; 27, 16, 13, 12 respectively.

^aOth. benefit = Others' benefit, ^bOth. view = Others' view of importance, ^cPsych. risk = Psychological risk, ^dcommit. = commitment, ^eTime pres. = Time pressure.

Although the scree plot criterion yielded eight identity factors, only the first four were retained for future analyses because of their theoretical relevance and because they were the only four to account for more than ten percent of the variance each (see table 15 in Appendix E for loadings onto all eight factors). Factor scores were retained for each participant and converted into ranks so that each individual had a ranking on agency-identity, achievement-identity, communion-identity and hedonism-identity. Based on these rankings, each individual was categorized exclusively into one of the four groups. Additionally, participants ranking highly on both agency and communion were grouped into a fifth, "generativity" group (achievement, $n=34$; agency, $n=35$; communion, $n=36$; hedonism, $n=32$; generativity, $n=35$). Nine participants were low on all four identity factors and were not categorized¹⁴.

The construct validity of this categorization is attested to by the projects of prototypical group members. One prototypical agentic, Peg Bundy (she gave herself this pseudonym after the popular television sitcom character known for her sarcasm, criticism and sexual appetite) rated the following projects as most self-identical: "trip to Thunder Bay", "make myself happy", "make others happy", "lose weight", "try to do well on exams". Her positive future self was "doing my M.A. in psych".

A prototypical achiever, "Candy", rated the following projects as most self-identical: "stay on top of school readings", "try to finish study notes soon", "put in at least 8-10 hours of studies". His positive future self was "I would like to see myself as a police officer with investments in property and living comfortably".

"Sunshine", a prototypical communal, rated the following as most self-identical: "knitting sweaters", "spend more time with grandson", "spend more time with spouse", "getting our family closer together", "try to fulfill some needs

of aging mom over telephone", "read more". Her positive future self was "satisfied with life totally; enjoying all the aspects I've listed under personal projects".

"Blunt", a prototypical hedonist, listed "keeping a positive attitude", "spend time with friends over holidays", "go snowboarding", and "ask girl I like out" as most self-identical. He did not list a positive future self.

"Squirt", a prototypical generative listed "teaching figure skating", "writing x-mas cards" and "preparing youth group for x-mas eve church (at home)" as most self-identical. Her positive future self was, "have an exciting and stable career, perhaps happily married or in a stable, loving relationship."

Descriptives Within Categories

As shown in table 7, individuals in different groups shared similar demographic conditions with the exceptions of communals who were more likely to be female and have more children, and agentics who were more likely to be male. Also, as shown in table 8, individuals in different identity groups seemed on average to be doing similar kinds of projects. This suggests that identity is not necessarily a function of behavior. One concern was that variance on project dimensions would be truncated within identity categories defined by those dimensions, i.e, that most of the scores for that dimension would be crowded toward an extreme end of the 0-10 scale. This was not the case. The results in table 8 show that , with one exception, means and variances of identity-central dimensions were consistent across identity categories. Only fun had a significantly higher mean for hedonists than for achievers, $F(3,133) = 4.03, p < .01$. Overall, there did not appear to be a pattern of elevated means and truncated variance for identity-central dimensions.

Table 7

Demographic Information

Demographic	Total	Identity orientation ^a				
		1	2	3	4	5
Age	22.8	22.8	22.2	24.4	22.3	22.6
Sex (male:female)	66:80	13:21	21:14	11:25	15:17	14:21
Number of children	.2	.1	.3	.4	.1	.1
Highschool marks ^b	4.7	4.7	4.3	4.8	5.1	4.6
Work hours per week	10.5	8.5	10.1	12.7	11.5	11.1
Financial security ^c	5.3	5.0	5.6	5.3	5.5	4.7

^a1=achievement, 2=agency, 3=communion, 4=hedonism, 5=generativity. ^b4.3 = 74%, 5.1 = 69% (see scale in Appendix C). ^cRated on a scale from 0 = financially stressed to 10 = financially secure.

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations of Identity-Central Dimensions

Dimension	Identity group							
	Achievers		Agentics		Communals		Hedonists	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Outcome	6.9	1.4	7.0	1.2	7.2	1.5	5.8	1.5
Future-self	5.9	2.0	6.2	1.5	5.5	2.3	6.3	1.7
Communion	5.5	1.4	5.0	1.6	5.5	1.9	5.9	1.9
Fun	4.6	1.4	5.5	1.7	5.5	1.4	5.8	1.5

Note. Outcome was the highest loading onto the achievement-identity factor, future-self onto the agency-identity factor, communion onto the communion-identity factor and fun onto the hedonistic-identity factor.

Comparison of Well-Being Scores Between Groups

The most basic question to ask is, are there adaptive and maladaptive identities? Are hedonists happier than agentics? Are communals finding their lives more meaningful than hedonists? Multivariate analysis of variance among the five groups indicated no significant differences, at the $p < .05$ level, in any of the three criterion variables, Pillais trace approximate $F(9, 399) = 1.24$, $p < .27$. While subsequent studies with improved n-variable ratios need to be carried out, it would provisionally seem from this cross-section of the population that there are alternatively viable identity-orientation routes to meaning and well-being.

"Doings": Factor Structure of Dimensional Means

Prior to assessing the importance of meaning dimensions within the identity categories, the dimensional means were entered into a principal components analysis to stabilize the data and to reduce the number of statistical tests required. Ten doing factors resulted, with the following percentages of variance and primary loadings:

1. Self-benefit(18%) - self-benefit(.76), self-worth(.69), power(.65)
2. Difficulty(14%) - difficulty(.82), stress(.81), challenge(.67)
3. Fun (13%) - fun(.85), pleasure(.78), enjoyment(.77)
4. Importance(11%) - importance(.71), commitment(.63), self-identity(.60)
5. Support(11%) - support(.75), trust(.64), visibility(.59)
6. Others' benefit(8%) - others' benefit(.85), communion(.64), significance(.35)
7. Progress(6%) - net impact(.65), progress(.47), purpose(-.44)
8. Absorption(6%) - absorption(.69), health(.39), affiliation(-.27)

9. Consumption(6%) - consumption(.74), initiation(-.56), affiliation(.42)

10. Creativity(6%) - creativity(.69), power(.34), control(.33)

(See Appendix E, table 16 for complete table of loadings.)

Correlates of Well-Being Within Identity Groups

As shown in table 9 and consistent with the correlations reported for the whole group, project difficulty was the factor most highly associated with well-being. As shown in tables 10-14 however, correlations within identity groups give more discriminating information. Each identity-group seems to have characteristic doing factor associations with social/emotional well-being¹⁵: for agentics, support ($p < .01$) and absorption ($p < .01$); for communals, fun ($p < .003$); for hedonists, progress ($p < .01$); and for generatives, difficulty ($p < .001$). To protect against alpha inflation due to the large number of post-hoc tests made, two-tailed significance tests were used even though all of the significant correlations were in the expected directions, and only probabilities below $p < .01$ were given primary consideration.

Table 9

Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors (Overall)

<u>Doing</u> factors	Well-being factors		
	S.E.	G	E.M.
Self-benefit	-.07	-.11	.15
Difficulty	-.29 ****	-.17 *	-.20 *
Others' benefit	-.08	.03	-.04
Fun	.26 ***	.08	.21 *
Importance	.01	.24 ***	0
Progress	.10	-.08	- .16
Absorption	.10	.05	-.07
Consumption	.02	-.08	.02
Creativity	.05	-.01	.01
Support	.22 **	.16	0

Note. N = 146. S.E. = Social-emotional satisfaction; G = Goal satisfaction; E.M. = Existential meaning.

*p<.01 **p<.005 ***p<.001 ****p<.0005

Table 10

Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Achievers

<u>Doing factors</u>	<u>Well-being factors</u>		
	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>E.M.</u>
Self-benefit	-.03	-.09	.20
Difficulty	-.15	-.03	-.09
Others' benefit	-.20	-.35	.14
Fun	.18	.09	-.06
Importance	-.14	.34	.07
Progress	-.11	-.26	-.28
Absorption	.22	.17	.07
Consumption	.27	-.14	-.01
Creativity	.04	.06	0
Support	.15	.10	.12

Note. $n = 34$. S.E. = Social-emotional satisfaction; G = Goal satisfaction; E.M. = Existential meaning.

* $p < .01$

Table 11

Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Agentics

<u>Doing factors</u>	<u>Well-being factors</u>		
	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>E.M.</u>
Self-benefit	-.17	-.22	.13
Difficulty	-.26	-.29	-.14
Others' benefit	.02	.27	-.17
Fun	.36	-.07	.26
Importance	.18	.33	-.03
Progress	.13	.1	-.01
Absorption	.43 *	-.06	-.08
Consumption	.15	-.10	.01
Creativity	-.05	.07	-.23
Support	.41 *	.20	-.05

Note. $n = 36$. S.E. = Social-emotional satisfaction; G = Goal satisfaction; E.M. = Existential meaning.

* $p < .01$

Table 12

Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Communals

<u>Doing factors</u>	<u>Well-being factors</u>		
	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>E.M.</u>
Self-benefit	-.27	-.03	-.05
Difficulty	-.27	-.24	-.26
Others' benefit	-.09	.22	-.07
Fun	.48 **	.11	.22
Importance	-.04	.05	-.03
Progress	.05	-.13	-.24
Absorption	-.13	.05	-.22
Consumption	-.19	.03	.11
Creativity	.12	-.04	.09
Support	-.06	.33	-.13

Note. $n = 36$. S.E. = Social-emotional satisfaction; G = Goal satisfaction; E.M. = Existential meaning.

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .005$

Table 13

Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Hedonists

<u>Doing factors</u>	<u>Well-being factors</u>		
	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>E.M.</u>
Self-benefit	.16	-.19	.29
Difficulty	-.38	-.14	-.19
Others' benefit	-.16	-.01	.16
Fun	-.04	.19	.30
Importance	-.06	.26	-.10
Progress	.43 *	-.02	-.18
Absorption	-.01	.03	.17
Consumption	-.18	-.15	.12
Creativity	.09	-.04	.16
Support	.40	.10	-.04

Note. $n = 32$. S.E. = Social-emotional satisfaction; G = Goal satisfaction; E.M. = Existential meaning.

* $p < .01$

Table 14

Correlations Between "Doing" Factors and Well-Being Factors for Generatives

<u>Doing factors</u>	<u>Well-being factors</u>		
	<u>S.E.</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>E.M.</u>
Self-benefit	-.17	.11	-.17
Difficulty	-.53 ***	-.02	.18
Others' benefit	-.01	.27	-.04
Fun	.19	.01	.08
Importance	-.01	.12	.20
Progress	.31	-.12	-.21
Absorption	-.20	.22	-.10
Consumption	-.36	.04	-.07
Creativity	.02	-.06	.03
Support	.38	.13	-.11

Note. $n = 35$. S.E. = Social-emotional satisfaction; G = Goal satisfaction; E.M. = Existential meaning.

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .005$ *** $p < .001$

Discussion

The Relationship Between Meaningful Personal Projects and Well-Being

The main hypothesis of this research was that being-doing congruence would be associated with increased well-being. We expected that people would report the most meaning and happiness when their personal projects resonated with their self-identity. This expectation was not confirmed. Instead, personal project meaning dimensions were central in the definition of identity, and thereby potentiated characteristic instrumental dimensions as important correlates of well-being within each identity-group. Moreover, the project dimensions associated with well-being for each identity were not thematically congruent with identity as had been hypothesized, but rather seemed to be compensatory.

PPA meaning dimensions also did not appear to have averaged each other out across groups as had been anticipated. It appeared instead as if the meaning dimensions simply were not very highly correlated with well-being, normatively nor within groups. Furthermore, it appeared as though PPA dimensions were not as effective at predicting the more meaningful aspects of well-being as they were for general social/emotional well-being¹⁶. Future studies are required to determine if other personal action constructs such as life tasks (Cantor, 1986) or personal strivings (Emmons, 1989) may prove to have better success, being less behaviorally based. This could be easily assessed by using PPA as a "mother board" into which to plug other PAC units (see for example; Goodine, Little, Melia-Gordon & Sourani, 1993)

Given the above findings, it appears that the effect of meaningful behavior on well-being is indirect . Looking only at the normative results in

table nine, and making an assumption of directionality, one might counsel an unhappy client to undertake less difficult, more achievable projects, to engage in projects that were more fun and pleasurable, and to build a more supportive social ecology.

With knowledge of a clients identity orientation however, intervention could be more focused¹⁷. As indicated in tables 10-14, hedonists could be advised to focus primarily on progress, agentics on support and absorption, communals on fun and generatives on reducing difficulty. These characteristically salient factors for each group seem to represent a compensatory pattern. The hedonist who just wants to have fun could be urged to get more organized (net impact) and to be more disciplined at sticking to tasks (progress) -- or essentially to "buckle down". The self-striving agentic who may tend to alienate others could be advised to cultivate an interpersonally supportive ecology (trust, support and visibility) -- to become a "team player". Also, agentics could be advised to engage in some intrinsically rewarding projects so that they would become absorbed in the "here and now". The "heavy" communal could benefit from "lightening up" and trying to have fun (enjoyment, fun and pleasure). The Promethian generative could be directed to undertake more achievable (outcome, control) and less difficult (difficulty, challenge, time pressure, stress, risk) projects, to scale down large projects, and to focus on achieving "small wins"¹⁸ (Weick, 1984) -- essentially to "take it easy".

This compensatory advice may, however, intrude on a delicate balance between meaning and social/emotional well-being. Each identity group shows evidence of a trade-off in patterns of dimensional correlations with social/emotional well-being on one hand, and with the more meaningful aspects of well-being -- goal satisfaction and existential meaning -- on the other.

The dilemma is most apparent in the paradoxical correlation pattern seen for communals for whom goal satisfaction is positively correlated with others' view of importance, $r = .33$, but for whom others' view of importance is negatively correlated with social/emotional well-being, $r = -.5$. Also, the interpersonal vulnerability that their communal identity prescribes causes psychological risk to be correlated, $r = -.49$, with social/emotional well-being. It appears as though orienting toward meaning compromises their social/emotional well-being while orienting toward social/emotional well-being offends their sense of identity.

Achievers show a similar pattern. Goal satisfaction is negatively correlated with communion, $r = -.44$ (this makes sense given that communion is correlated, $r = .43$, with challenge and challenge is a significantly negative loading onto their achievement identity factor $(-.43)$) but support is positively correlated, $r = .24$, with social/emotional well-being.

Further evidence of this compensatory pattern can be seen for agentic. Goal satisfaction is correlated with identity relevant dimensions; outcome, $r = .50$; progress, $r = .37$; commitment, $r = .39$, while compensatory dimensions; trust¹⁹, $r = .63$; and enjoyment, $r = .51$ are associated with social/emotional well-being.

Similarly, hedonists showed their highest existential meaning correlation with pleasure, $r = .49$; while outcome, $r = .65$ and control, $r = .51$ showed compensatory associations with social/emotional well-being.

Finally, for generatives, goal satisfaction is correlated with communion, $r = .36$, others benefit, $r = .35$, and others view of importance $r = .54$, while, in the compensatory pattern seen above; control, $r = .62$; stress, $r = -.47$; outcome, $r = .64$; challenge, $r = -.44$; and risk, $r = -.44$ are associated with social/emotional well-being.

In summary, the dimensional trends within each identity group confirm the trend in the doing factor correlations with well-being. Meaning and social/emotional well-being seem to be balanced in a compensatory pattern.

Identity categorization

The identity factors were remarkably interpretable and converge with a number of theoretical models. Additionally, just as the PPA method has unpacked the havings of personality (Little, Lecci & Watkinson, 1992), the categorization procedures used in this research show promise for unpacking the beings of identity. Furthermore, as a "thought-operant" method (McClelland, 1980; Emmons & McAdams, 1991), it promises to expose a more fundamental self than conventional self-concept inventories (McClelland, Koestner & Weinberger, 1989; Higgins, 1987) while still retaining quantitative rigor and convenience. Moreover, the flexible and modular qualities of this method could be potentially useful in explorations and interventions into intrapersonal, interpersonal and cross-cultural identity issues.

Recall that the four most prominent identity orientations, and their primary loadings, identified by the principal components analysis of ipsative correlations with self-identity were: agency (future self .76, self-worth .73, self-benefit .73), achievement (outcome .77, control .72, difficulty -.70), communion (communion .78, others' benefit .75, affiliation .62) and hedonism (fun .80, enjoyment .76, pleasure .74). These map partially onto personality, social motives and identity theory.

In the NEO-AC personality inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1985), extraversion could be seen to correspond with agency, agreeableness with communion and conscientiousness with achievement. Another personality

taxonomy, the interpersonal circumplex describes a model built around the axes of agency and communion (Wiggins, 1991). Also, McClelland and colleagues (McClelland, 1984), have identified four primary "social motives" thought to guide behavior; intimacy (communion), achievement (achievement) affiliation (hedonism) and power (agency). McAdams, in pioneering work on identity (1985b, 1993) has extended earlier work on these motives, to describe how people construct identities which constellate around these themes. Most recently, he has explored the implications of the generative merger of power and intimacy themes. With the present study, the focus has been shifted away from the traits that people have and what people are motivated to do, to the identities that people construct and the selves that they are being.

Alongside these taxonomies are several theories proposing costs and benefits of the different identity themes. Kasser and Ryan (1993) present evidence that agentic orientations may lead to decreased well-being. Omodei and Wearing (1990) present evidence that both telic (agentic and achieving) and autotelic (communal and hedonistic) tendencies are associated with increased well-being. Lecci (1992) suggests that both social meaning (communion) and personal meaning (agency) are necessary for well-being. Emmons has linked communal personal strivings with increased well-being. The strongest predictor of well-being in personal projects research (outcome) would suggest that well-being is contingent upon achievement.

In the present study, none of the identity groups were significantly higher on any of the well-being factors than any of the other groups. Despite the lack of established validity and reliability of these methods, and despite the obvious problem in proving the null hypothesis, the findings lend provisional support to a model of equally viable alternative routes to meaning and well-being. If future research bears this out, this method of identity categorization holds

considerable potential for helping to understand how identities are constructed and maintained because it dissects them into dimensional components. It would also provide a useful heuristic for investigating the cross-impact of identities intrapersonally, interpersonally and cross-culturally. Greater understanding of identity diversity could lead to increased tolerance. Perhaps moving away from normative assumptions could give rise to a new, more tolerant "golden rule" -- "do unto others as their identity would have you do unto them".

Future research needs to explore the viability of these identity orientations across the lifespan, and their mutability. At other stages in life, it is possible that certain orientations could become more or less viable. If this were the case, and if identities were mutable, the method of identity categorization proposed in this research could provide an intervention technique capable of stimulating identity awareness, and amenable to an unpacked version of fixed role therapy (Kelly, 1955) for identity change.

The Maintenance of Meaning

Just as there are several theories supporting the link between lifestyle and well-being, there are similarly a number of theories linking particular lifestyle orientations to meaning. Baumeister (1992) depicts meaning as arising from agentic pursuits that enhance the self. More communal perspectives have been advanced by DeVogler and Ebersole (1981, 1983, 1985), who found relationships to be central for meaning; and McGregor (1992a), who reported significant correlations between communion and meaning for men and women.

More thematically neutral perspectives include those of Little, Vallacher

and Wegner, and McAdams. Little sees project meaning as arising when one's personal projects satisfy several self-relevant dimensions (Little, 1989), and life meaning as arising when one's project system as a whole integrates disparate sources of influence (Little, 1987a). Similarly, the action identity theory advanced by Vallacher and Wegner (1985) depicts meaning as dependent on the degree to which actions are coherently organized to symbolize a unified self. McAdams (1993) elaborates on this conception of meaning, claiming that people construct identities by selectively organizing their past into thematically coherent "life stories" that extend into the future. Meaning is then achieved by living the story. From these perspectives, meaning involves "acts of meaning" (Bruner, 1991). The doing aspect of personality is emphasized.

The results of this research failed to support the centrality of doing in the maintenance of meaning. Doing was related to social/emotional well-being, but even there it was not in the hypothesized manner. Instead of a link between self-congruent behavior and well-being, self-compensatory behavior was associated with increased well-being. One important concern is that this compensatory pattern might represent a statistical artifact, for example; perhaps it is not psychometrically possible for participants with high mean communion dimension scores to be categorized as communals, because the truncated variance associated with the elevated scores would prevent large ipsative correlations with self-identity. This explanation is unlikely for two reasons. First, even individuals with the highest dimensional means had some variance in scores; there were very few instances where dimensional ratings had no variance across the ten projects. Second, even if the ranges for identity-central dimensions were truncated, the range for self-identity would be correspondingly truncated. Despite this truncation, correlations would still tend to be higher than correlations between self-identity and identity-noncentral dimensions because

the pattern of covariation would be less random. For example, if a communal identity was engaged in exclusively communal projects rated mostly as tens and nines, then self-identity ratings would tend to have a similar distribution. Correlations would likely be higher than between self-identity and another dimension that had a wider range but that did not covary with self-identity.

If we accept our findings, that suggest doings aren't central for meaning, then how is meaning maintained? Possibly it is a more purely cognitive construct than previously thought. Just having a coherent identity may sustain a sense of meaning: How one behaves might be less relevant than how one thinks about oneself. It could be that McAdams' properties of a good life story: coherence, openness, credibility, differentiation, reconciliation and generativity, may be those that protect it from disintegration over time as the story is challenged by life's vicissitudes. Indeed, Herman (1992) depicts meaninglessness as a sense of randomness resulting from trauma induced disillusionment of personal beliefs. A personal myth that is incoherent, closed, non-credible, undifferentiated and unreconciled would be more vulnerable in the face of challenge.

The generativity criterion, which according to McAdams comes into play around midlife, could be the ultimate insurance against disintegration of meaning. With growing awareness of one's mortality, identity themes of agency, communion, hedonism and achievement could seem increasingly trivial. Upon death the agentically striving self is humbled, the communal self faces permanent separation, and the achievement and hedonistic self-stories are truncated. Only generative themes linking the self with the larger social context remain intact. The generative story can attain symbolic immortality (Becker, 1973) by merging with the collective story of society and the next generation.

If meaning is primarily a cognitively mediated construct, it makes sense that none of the identity themes emerged as more strongly correlated with meaning than the others. For this young sample (median age =20, modal age =19), embedded in an ecology with an extremely high press for agency and a seasonal press for communion, mortality is not likely a salient concern.

Future studies need to extend this empirical snapshot into a longitudinal design. There is a prevalent popular belief in the "transformation myth". This myth depicts the highly agentic person who is unhappy, until a close brush with the reality of his or her own mortality stimulates radical change to more communal identity, with an attendant increase in personal happiness and meaning. Probably rooted in the Christian notion of "gaining new life by dying to the self", it is the theme of numerous recent popular films²⁰. Longitudinal studies across the adult lifespan are required to test the veracity of this myth. Cross sectional studies with older populations could also be helpful in determining if identities remain equally viable in later stages in life. Investigations into the question of how mutable identity is, are also required. How closely related is identity to stable personality traits? Can it be influenced in the laboratory by interventions designed to increase awareness of personal mortality?

Conclusions

The purpose of this research was to investigate the relationship between well-being and meaning in personal projects. It was hypothesized that augmentation of the well-being measures, categorization of participants into ipsatively based identity groups, and addition of new theoretically relevant

meaning dimensions would heighten the profile of meaning dimensions in the prediction of well-being.

Contrary to expectations, meaning dimensions were still not strong direct predictors of well-being, at any level. Instead, meaning dimensions were central in the definition of the identity configurations, thereby mediating which instrumental dimensions best predicted social/emotional well-being. Social support and absorption were salient for agentics, fun for communals, progress for hedonists and difficulty for generatives. These findings fail to confirm the notion put forward by McAdams (1993) and Vallacher and Wegner (1985), that meaning is a function of being-doing congruence. Instead, a compensatory pattern emerged, reminiscent of Aristotle's "golden mean". To increase social/emotional well-being, agentic identities may be advised to become "team players" and "live in the present", communal identities to "lighten up", hedonistic identities to "buckle down" and generative identities to "take it easy".

Footnotes

1. The construct validity of the Purpose in Life (PIL) test was initially demonstrated with clinical populations, adequately discriminating between "normals", psychiatric outpatients and hospitalized alcoholics. Concurrence was also demonstrated by correlating PIL scores with therapists' ratings of their patients' "purposefulness" (Crumbaugh & Maholick, 1964). Later (Crumbaugh, 1968), in a larger sample, the PIL was found to discriminate between "normal" groups ranging from successful professionals involved with volunteer organizations, to active leading Protestant parishioners, to college undergraduate students, to hospitalized non-psychiatric patients.

The PIL has not demonstrated its utility in more homogeneous samples like the one in the present research. In an attempt to augment the PIL, Crumbaugh (1977) developed the Seeking of Noetic Goals Test (SONG) to measure the strength of motivation to find meaning in life. He theorized that some individuals would tend to mitigate their meaninglessness by orienting toward future meaning. Future studies with young subjects should use the SONG along with the PIL because future selves are more salient for younger individuals (Goodine et al., 1993).

2. "Comments made by the subjects, both during and after completion of the study tasks, suggested that the tasks were experienced as interesting, as meaningful, and, for many, as affording new and striking insights into the ways they led their lives. Comments indicated that the procedures used were successful in achieving high levels of subject cooperation and involvement in the research task" (Omodei & Wearing, 1990, p. 764).

3. Past PPA attempts at categorization have provisionally identified agentic/achievement, communal and hedonistic lifestyles. The first evidence hinting at these groups comes from a comparison of well-being predictors across different populations. Yard (1980) found control and outcome to be the highest correlates of life satisfaction for RCMP employees. Palys (1979) contrastingly found enjoyment to be the highest correlate of life satisfaction in a population of undergraduate university students. Loh (1981), studying Indochinese refugees, found visibility, challenge, self-identity and others' view to be the highest predictors of life satisfaction. If interpreted in terms of the being-doing congruence model, these findings could be interpreted as depicting achieving Mounties, hedonistic students and communal refugees taking different routes to life satisfaction. If interpreted in light of the compensation model suggested by this study, these profiles would suggest that the Mounties were hedonistic, the university students were communal and the refugees were agentic.

Research using modal profile analysis (Skinner, 1980), has revealed a compatible picture. Horley (1984), found four modal profiles, three of which resembled those suggested above. A "hedonist" profile was characterized by high project enjoyment and low difficulty, stress and negative impact scores. An "adventurist's" profile was marked by low enjoyment but high challenge and difficulty. It was also characterized by high positive impact and low negative impact. An "over-committed Promethian" profile was characterized by projects perceived as important, self-controlled, self-initiated, low on progress and high on difficulty. Many of the projects in this group involved helping others. It appears that the hedonist, the adventurist, and the Promethian profiles are

thematically similar to the three previously identified lifestyles of hedonism, agency and communion.

In a similar study by Rodway (1983), three lifestyles were identified. The first, with high project "time adequacy" and low "negative impact", "difficulty" and "stress", resembled a hedonism profile. The second, with highest project scores on "challenge", "positive impact" and "difficulty", appeared to be the profile of an agentic. The third, with highest scores on "outcome" and "value congruence" and lowest scores on "positive impact", "time adequacy" and "progress", does not seem to be consistent with other research.

Finally, Lecci (1990) used modal profile analysis of NEO-PI personality factors in combination with step-wise multiple regression to identify the personal project dimensions most predictive of well-being within each profile. The first profile was of the conscientious/non-neurotic whose well-being was linked primarily to the presence of structure and the absence of stress in her projects. The second profile characterized by high scores on agreeableness and high scores on extraversion showed well-being as predicted predominantly by projects high in self-initiation and social support. The third profile involved high scores on extraversion, high scores on openness, and low scores on neuroticism. Efficacy was the primary predictor of adaptation, and meaning had an unusually low association. Interpreted in terms of the being-doing congruence model, these three groups resemble hedonistic, communal, and achievement profiles. Seen in light of the compensatory findings from this study however, these groups could be interpreted as representing communal, agentic, and hedonistic identities.

4. According to Dilthey (Rickman, 1961), meaning occurs when people feel temporally and ecologically embedded. A factor analysis of Crumbaugh's

Purpose in Life scale revealed four ways that this embeddedness can be achieved (Chamberlain & Zika, 1988). First, clear goals temporally extend and ecologically embed individuals. Second, feeling significant or existentially important justifies the pursuit of these goals. Third, efficacy and autonomy have a dual function. They can be instrumental in successfully implementing goals, and can also serve as goals in themselves. Fourth, pleasurable incentives, enthusiastically and optimistically pursued, provide the substrate for goals.

More specifically, Little (1989) describes meaning as occurring when goals are absorbing, enjoyable, considered important in the short term, value congruent, involving one's commitment consistent with one's self-identity, and promoting a sense of self-worth. From a slightly different perspective, Baumeister (1989) implicates goal purpose, efficacy/control, value justification, and superiority/self-worth as the tenets of meaning.

Klinger (1977) predicates meaning on the pursuit of incentives that provide reliable affective rewards. He recommends the pursuit of "innate satisfiers" such as food, warmth, sex and rest because they are easily attainable and therefore not prone to disillusionment; and because they are relatively "hard-wired" to affective reward and resistant to habituation. In seeming contradiction to Klinger, for Maddi (1967, 1970) meaninglessness occurs when one sees oneself as "nothing more than a player of social roles and an embodiment of biological needs". If other people and the environment exist only with reference to self, then the self is isolated as the only primary reality. Similarly, this orientation alienates one from oneself by eliminating the symbolic and psychological aspects of experience. Maddi's solution to this "premorbid" or "existentially neurotic" state is developed in the description of "hardiness" (Kobassa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982), which depicts a personality that is committed

to and involved in his or her environment while a sense of control or efficacy is maintained.

DeVogler and Ebersole (1981, 1983, 1985), in studies of young adults, adolescents, and older adults have found interpersonal relationships to be consistently the most commonly reported contexts for meaning, and also the source of the deepest meanings reported. Wong (1989), in a study on aging, found meaning to be supported by reminiscence, the pursuit of pleasurable activities, helping others, optimism, and religiosity and spirituality.

Three streams emerge from this review that roughly align with the four factors from the factor analysis of the P.I.L.. The first two P.I.L. factors emphasize the importance of having goals that are considered worth doing. As seen in DeVogler and Ebersole, Maddi and Wong, these goals most often entail personal or spiritual relationships. These first two P.I.L. factors seem to jointly describe a "communal involvement" theme. The third P.I.L. factor is clearly related to efficacy/control or agency/achievement. Baumeister's conception of meaning and Little's efficacy, structure and perhaps social support factors seem to mirror this emphasis in P.I.L. factor three. P.I.L. factor four centers on pleasure, excitement and enthusiasm. Klinger's explication of meaning and Little's meaning dimensions of absorption and enjoyment emphasize this "hedonism" factor.

5. Past attempts at categorization have been based on what people were doing (Rodway, 1983; Horley, 1984; Lecci, 1990) using modal profile analysis (Skinner, 1980). Modal profile analysis identifies typical patterns of project ratings. People are categorized into profiles based on the characteristics of their projects. The degree to which their project characteristics resemble those of the profile prototype determines the strength of their loading onto that profile.

6. We chose 17 newer dimensions in an attempt to more comprehensively represent the meaning literature and to add clearer definition to meaning orientations incipient in PPA research to date. Five of these dimensions (future self, self-benefit, others' benefit, support and fun) have been previously used by Phillips, Little and Goodine (1993). Six of these dimensions (future self, significance, pride, self-benefit, power and purpose) were expected to clarify an agency orientation. We added six dimensions (others' benefit, communion/harmony, psychological risk, trust, affiliation, social support/hindrance) to clarify a communal orientation. Five dimensions (fun, consumption, creativity, health and pleasure) were added to clarify a hypothesized hedonism factor.

The new dimensions were typically more specific than the conventional ones. As such, they could be more useful for intervention. It would be a more focused task for a person to work on developing trust in interpersonal relations than it would be to work on enjoying projects more, making them less stressful, or increasing chances of success. It might be that by developing trust relationships with project peers, one would enjoy the projects more, find them less stressful and consequently be more likely to succeed.

7. Although there is considerable agreement on the tripartite structure of well-being (cognitive life-satisfaction, positive affect and negative affect), there is support for a four dimensional approach that divides negative affect into anxiety and depression components (Headey, Kelley & Wearing, 1989). In this study, the negative pole of the Bradburn Affect Balance Scale is replaced by the Perceived Stress Scale and the CES-D depression scale to reflect this four dimensional approach.

8. Probabilities were not used because the range of probabilities would not have been continuous. We used t-scores instead of r-values because they produced a more favourable distribution. Future research using this procedure might find additional benefit in transforming the t-scores. Most of the variables had significantly skewed and kurtotic distributions.

9. McAdams (1992) describes generativity as the creation of a "self-defining legacy" that may be offered to society as a gift. By being generative, people can defy death by having their creations represent them after death. According to McAdams (1992), these legacies need to be of some use or importance to other people, and as such are "derivatives of two general motivational tendencies in human lives, aptly described by Bakan (1966) as *agency* and *communion*" (p.1005). McAdams (1993) further identifies generativity as an important characteristic of a viable, meaning identity.

Becker (1973) similarly emphasizes the importance of the generative merger of agency and communion. His assumption is that the truth of the human condition is unbearable: seeing ourselves as "trembling accidents germinated on a hothouse planet" (p. 55), as "clawing and grasping for breath in a universe beyond our ken" (p. 27). It is only by heroic attempts to make ourselves into gods (agency) or by attempts to merge with others (communion) that we can avoid awareness of our reality. He attributes most neuroses to difficulty balancing these "twin ontological motives": the desire to affirm oneself and the desire to surrender oneself. "On one hand, one merges with the world around him and loses his own claim to life. On the other hand, one cuts oneself off from the world in order to make ones own complete claim and so loses the ability to live and act in the world on its terms" (p. 182). According to Becker, the

optimal solution is to combine the most intensive Eros of self-expression with the most complete Agape of self-surrender. By a process of transference beatification, we deify others and then have someone worthy of receiving our heroic, self-expressive creation. It is by these self-deceptive processes that we find meaning in the face of our own mortality.

10. PIL factor three was not included as an outcome measure because it appeared to represent the personality trait of internal locus of control (item 14, "I am absolutely free to make all like choices" and item 18, "My life is in my hands and I am in control of it"), and as such was not deemed appropriate as a criterion variable. Factor two was excluded because the items loading onto it appeared to have been interpreted contrary to the intentions of the test. The two most significant loadings, items 7 and 15, referenced events that may not have been salient to the young sample; retirement and death.

The scale reliability analysis supported the deletion of these factors. The respective squared multiple correlations between items 7, 14, 15, 18 and the rest of the PIL were four of the five lowest of the 20 items. They averaged R^2 s of .26 as compared to the average of the other 16 items of .55.

11. The three principle components analyses (PCAs) used in this research were chosen over factor analyses (FAs) because, given the exploratory nature of the research, an empirical summary of the data set (PCA) was deemed more appropriate than a theoretical solution "uncontaminated" by unique and error variability (FA). PCA was chosen over other extraction techniques on the recommendation of Tabachnick and Fidell (1989) who recommend it as "the solution of choice for the researcher who is primarily interested in reducing a large number of variables down to a smaller number of components" (p. 626).

Orthogonal rotation was chosen because factor intercorrelations following oblique rotation were generally below .3, therefore not justifying the more complex procedure.

12. Cronbach alpha coefficients for project dimensions ranged between .53 and .82 (see Appendix E, table 17). These values are similar to those found by Blake (1994) and Lecci (1990). The Cronbach alpha coefficient for self-identity was .58, indicating sufficient variance to render its ipsative correlations with the other dimensions meaningful.

13. The labels for the agency, communion and achievement factors were taken from McAdams (1993). McAdams describes agency as "the individual's striving to separate from others, to master the environment, to assert, protect, and expand the self. The aim is to become a powerful and autonomous 'agent', a force to be reckoned with" (p.69). Communion is described as the individual's attempt to "lose his or her own individuality by merging with others, participating in something that is larger than the self, and relating to other selves in warm, close, intimate, and loving ways" (p. 69). Achievement oriented people are described as having a "consistent preference for experiences of feeling competent and doing better in the performance of tasks . . . very efficient and levelheaded in their career pursuits; they are likely to take prudent and moderate risks" (p. 70).

14. A closer look at these "residuals" (Barron, 1955), gives rise to some interesting speculation. They did not load highly onto any of the eight being factors, but as a group, these nine individuals reported a higher (almost significantly) average existential meaning than any of the identity groups. A

closer look at the actual text of their projects suggests that this group shares a focus on sexual and romantic fantasies.

"Beavis", a 21 year old female, works out a lot and fantasizes about "meeting that good looking guy from school". "Penguin", a 19 year old female has divorced parents and an ulcer, and is engaged and planning her wedding. "Wayne", a 21 year old male, lists as his projects; "get off parole and get life together" and "fend for myself or die". The project system of "Dutch", a 20 year old male, revolves around playing his clarinet, having sex, getting dates, and meeting women. He describes his past as involving death, drugs, abuse, suicide, murder, booze and hard work. "Tomcat", a 20 year old male, emphasizes his parents' divorce, getting over his recent breakup with his girlfriend, and finding emotional security. "Shawn", a 24 year old male, lists the projects of finding a compatible female partner for a threesome with him and his wife, having sex, and being good looking. He also likes to jam and play his electric guitar. "Beemer", a 19 year old female describes herself as just getting engaged and as having been "saved" by her boyfriend. "Dave Hetfield", a 19 year old male, wants to "find a girlfriend", "get married" and "get a house". "M.F.," a 20 year old male wants to "find a girlfriend".

It could be that this young group is managing to avoid existential crisis by focusing their attention on immediate, concrete and often physical projects. Indeed, Baumeister (1992) describes similar attentional strategies as "escapes from the self", techniques used to blot out the painful meaninglessness of existence.

15. These differences were not due to differences in gender. For males the highest associations with social/emotional well-being were fun, $r = .43$, $p < .0003$,

and negative difficulty, $r = -.37$, $p < .003$. For females, support, $r = .31$, $p < .006$, was the highest correlate.

16. There were more significant dimensional correlations at the $\alpha = .05$ level with social/emotional well-being than with the goal satisfaction factor or the existential meaning factor. The frequencies were respectively 46:24:12. This gave a chi-square value of 26.17 which was significant well beyond the $p < .001$ level.

17. There were no significant correlations between doing factors and any of the well-being measures for achievers. This could be because achievers define themselves by manageability. It appears that for other identity groups, certain characteristic manageability dimensions compensate for the requirements of identity themes with a resultant influence on social/emotional well-being. For achievers there seems to be a reverse meaning-manageability tradeoff because their sense of meaning is built on manageability. It is interesting to note that although not quite significant, $F(3, 133) = 2.3$, $p = .08$, achievers had the lowest scores on meaning while generatives had the highest. It could be that while other identity groups are willing to pursue meaning at the expense of some manageability (and social-emotional well-being), achievers seem inclined to pursue manageability at the expense of meaning.

18. Weick (1984) defines "small wins" as "concrete, complete, implemented outcomes of moderate importance". They are "controllable opportunities that produce visible results". They serve as solutions to a specific limited set of problems. Weick contends that social problems seldom get solved because they are framed in ways that overwhelm peoples' abilities to do anything about

them. They get framed beyond the "bounds of rationality". When well meaning optimists aim themselves at big unrealistic wins, the inevitable big flops often lead people to abandon their expectations and hopes, adopting skepticism and inaction as inoculation against future setbacks. Weick argues that a strategy of small wins is more realistic, more psychologically sound, more likely to recruit support, and more likely to achieve aggregate results.

19. Whereas past measures of trust (e.g. Rotter, 1980) have viewed it as a personality variable, this study used a credulous and ecologically sensitive measure of trust, one that recognizes variable trustworthiness of people and situations. It promises to be a fruitful new dimension for future PPA research. The saliency of trust for agentics has been found elsewhere. Gurtman (1992) found that agentic personalities tended to have interpersonal problems in areas of competitiveness, envy, resentment and vindictiveness. Additionally, those with low scores on the Rotter Trust Scale tended to inhere in the dominant hostile (agentic) quadrant of the interpersonal circumplex.

20. Several recent films in the popular media, such as *Regarding Henry*, *The Doctor*, *The Fisher King* and *Groundhog Day*, have relied on the transformation myth theme.

References

- Bakan, D. (1966). The duality of human existence: isolation and communion in Western man. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Barron, F. (1955). A case study of a residual. In A. Burton & R. E. Harris (Eds.), Clinical Studies of Personality. New York: Harper.
- Battista, J., & Almond, R. (1973). The development of meaning in life. Psychiatry, 36(11), 409-427.
- Baumeister, R.F. (1989). The problem of life's meaning. In L.A. Pervin (Ed), Goal concepts in personality and social psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1990). Suicide as escape from self. Psychological Review, 97,90-113.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1991). Escaping the self. New York: Basic Books.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1992). Meanings in life. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Becker, E. (1973). The denial of death. New York: The Free Press.
- Bellah, R. A., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). Habits of the heart: individualism and commitment in American life. Berkely: University of California Press.
- Black, W. A. M. (1973). Time perspective, purpose in life, extraversion and neuroticism in New Zealand prisoners. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 12, 50-60.
- Blake, C. (1984). Personal projects, depressive affect and coping styles. Unpublished master's thesis. Carleton Universtiy, Ottawa.
- Bradburn, N. M. (1969). The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago: Aldine.
- Bruner, J. (1986). Actual minds. possible worlds. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Bruner, J. (1991). Acts of meaning. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Burisch, M. (1984a). You don't always get what you pay for: measuring depression with short and simple versus long and sophisticated scales. Journal of Research in Personality, 18, 81-98.
- Burisch, M. (1984b). Approaches to personality inventory construction: a comparison of merits. American Psychologist, 39, 214-222.
- Cantor, N. & Langston, P.M. (1989). Ups and downs of life tasks in a life transition. In L.A. Pervin (Ed), Goal concepts in personality and social psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum
- Cantor, N. (1990). From thought to behavior: "having" and "doing" in the study of personality and cognition. American Psychologist, 45(6), 735-750.
- Cantor, N., Norem, J.K., Niedenthal, P.M., Langston, C.A., & Brewer, A.M. (1987). Life tasks, self-concept ideals, and cognitive strategies in a life transition. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 1178-1191.
- Chamberlain, K., & Zika, S. (1988). Measuring meaning in life: an examination of three scales. Personality and Individual Differences, 9(3), 589-596.
- Costa, P. T., McCrae, R. R., & Norris, A. H. (1981). Personal adjustment to aging: longitudinal prediction from neuroticism and extraversion. Journal of Gerontology, 36, 78-85.
- Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1985). The NEO personality inventory. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources
- Crumbaugh, J. C. (1968). Cross-validation of purpose-in-life test based on Frankl's concepts. Journal of Individual Psychology, 24, 74-81.
- Crumbaugh, J. C., & Maholick, L. T. (1964). An experimental study in existentialism: the psychometric approach to Frankl's concept of noogenic neurosis. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 20, 200-207.

- Diener, E. & Emmons, R.A. (1985). The independence of positive and negative affect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47(5), 1105-1117.
- DeVogler, K. L., & Ebersole, P. (1981). Adults' meaning in life. Psychological Reports, 49, 87-90.
- DeVogler, K. L., & Ebersole, P. (1983). Young adolescents' meaning in life. Psychological Reports, 52, 427-431.
- DeVogler-Ebersole, K., & Ebersole, P. (1985). Depth of meaning in life: Explicit rating criteria. Psychological Reports, 56, 303-310.
- Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: emergence of the five-factor model. Annual Review of Psychology, 41, 417-440.
- Dilthey, W. (1977). Ideas concerning a descriptive and analytic psychology. In W. Dilthey, Descriptive psychology and historical understanding (R. Laner & K. Heiges, Trans.). The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. [Original work published 1910]
- Emmons, R. A. (1986). Personal strivings: an approach to personality and subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51(5), 1058-1068.
- Emmons, R. A. & McAdams, D.P. (1991). Personal strivings and motive dispositions: exploring the links. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 17(6), 648-654.
- Frankl, V. E. (1963). Man's search for meaning (I. Lasch, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press. (Original work published 1959)
- Gee, T. (1992). Personal project dimensions - of course! Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Goodine, L. A., Little, B. R., Melia-Gordon, M. L., & Sourani, L. (1993). Possible selves and personal projects: A time perspective on the distributed self.

Paper presented at the Canadian Psychological Association meeting.
Montreal, Canada.

- Gualtieri, A. R. (1984). The vulture and the bull. University Press of America, Lanham, MD.
- Gurtman, M. B. (1992). Trust, distrust, and interpersonal problems: a circumplex analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62(6), 989-1002.
- Hays, W.L. (1988). Statistics. Orlando: Hold, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Headey, B., & Wearing, A. (1991). Subjective well-being: a stocks and flows framework. In F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), Subjective well-being: an interdisciplinary perspective. Toronto: Pergamon Press.
- Herman, J. L. (1992). Trauma and Recovery. Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-discrepancy: a theory relating self and affect. Psychological Review, 94, 319-340.
- Holmes, S., & Rahe, R. H. (1967). The Social Readjustment Rating Scale. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 11, 213-218.
- Horley, J. (1984). Personal project profiles and subjective well-being. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Jemmot, J. B. (1988). Social motives and susceptibility to disease: stalking individual differences in health risks. Journal of Personality, 55, 267-298.
- Kaplan, J.D. & Ross, W.D. (1958). The Pocket Aristotle. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Kasser, T. & Ryan, M. (1993). A dark side of the American dream: correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65(2), 410-422.
- Kelly, G. A. (1955). The psychology of personal constructs. New York: W.W. Norton.

- Klinger, E. (1977). Meaning and void: inner experience and the incentives in people's lives. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Publishers.
- Kobasa, S. C., Maddi, S. R., & Kahn, S. (1982). Hardiness and health: A prospective study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42(1), 168-177.
- Larsen, R. J., Deiner, E., & Emmons, R. A. (1985). An evaluation of subjective well-being measures. Social Indicators Research, 17, 1-18.
- Lecci, L. (1990). Personality, personal projects, and adaptation to university. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Lecci, L., Karoly, P., Briggs, C. & Kuhn, K. (1992). Specificity and generality of motivational components in depression: a personal projects analysis. Paper presented at the American Psychological Society Annual Convention, June 20, 1992, San Diego, California.
- Little, B. R. (1972). Psychological man as scientist, humanist and specialist. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 6, 95-118.
- Little, B. R. (1983). Personal projects: A rationale and method for investigation. Environment and Behavior, 15, 273 - 309.
- Little, B. R. (1987a). Personality and the environment. In D.Stokols & I. Altman (Eds.). Handbook of environmental psychology, pp205-244. New York: Wiley.
- Little, B. R. (1987b). Personal projects analysis: a new methodology for counselling psychology. NATCOM, 13, 591-614.
- Little, B. R. (1987c). Personal projects and fuzzy selves: aspects of self-identity in adolescence. In T. Honess & K. Yardley (Eds.), Self and identity: Perspectives across the lifespan New York: Routledge, Kejan Paul.

- Little, B. R. (1988). Personal projects analysis: theory, method and research. Report to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of 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. 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., Carlsen, N., Glavin, G. Y., & Laverly, J. (1981). Personal projects analysis across the life span. Unpublished report to Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Little, B. R., Lecci, L., & Watkinson, B. (1992). Personality and personal projects: linking big five and PAC units of analysis. Journal of Personality, 60, 502-525.
- Loh, P. F. (1981). Personal projects, social networks, and the adaptation of Indochinese refugees. Unpublished bachelor's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Maddi, S. R. (1967). The existential neurosis. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 72(4), 311-325.
- Maddi, S. R. (1970). The search for meaning. In A. W. Page (Ed.), The Nebraska symposium on motivation (pp. 134-183). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. American Psychologist, 41, 954-969.

- McAdams, D. P. (1985b). Power, intimacy and the life story: Personological inquiries into identity. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- McAdams, D. P. (1993). The stories that we live by: personal myths and the making of the self. New York: William Morrow and Company.
- McAdams, D. P., Ruetzel, K, & Foley, J. M. (1986). Complexity and generativity at mid-life: relations among social motives, ego development and adults' plans for the future. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50(4), 800-807.
- McAdams, D. P. & St. Aubin, E. (1992). A theory of generativity and its assessment through self-report, behavioral acts, and narrative themes in autobiography. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62(6), 1003-1015.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961). The achieving society. New York: Free Press.
- McClelland, D.C. (1980). Motive dispositions: the merits of operant and respondent measures. Review of Personality and Social Psychology 1, 10-41.
- McClelland, D. C. (1984). Human motivation. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.
- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. (1953). The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- McClelland, D. C., Koestner, R. & Weinberger, J. (1989). How do self-attributed and implicit motives differ? Psychological Review, 96(4), 690-702.
- McGregor, I. D. (1992a). Agency and communion at home and at work: polarized men and non-polarized women. Unpublished honours thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa
- McGregor, I. D. (1992b). Splinting the self: from inflation to salvation. Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University, Ottawa

- Meier, A., & Edwards, H. (1974). Purpose in Life Test: age and sex differences. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 30, 384-386.
- Mishler, E. G. (1979). Meaning in context: Is there any other kind? Harvard Educational Review, 49 (1), 1-19.
- 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.
- Padelford, B. L. (1974). Relationship between drug involvement and purpose in life. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 30, 303-305.
- Palys, T. S. (1979). Personal project systems and perceived life satisfaction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- 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.
- Phillips, S.D., Little, B.R., & Goodine, L. (1993). Personal projects, perceived environments and the public service: an analysis of gender and management. Study prepared for the Canadian Centre for Management Development.
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: a new self-report depression scale for research in the general population. Applied Psychological Measurement, 1, 385-401.
- Reker, G. T., & Cousins, J. B. (1979). Factor structure, construct validity and reliability of the Seeking of Noetic Goals (SONG) and Purpose in Life (PIL) tests. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 35(1), 85-91.
- Reker, G. T., Peacock, E. J., & Wong, P. T. P. (1987). Meaning and purpose in life and well-being: A life-span perspective. Journal of Gerontology, 42(1), 44-49.

- Rickman, H. P. (1961). Meaning in history: W. Dilthey's Thoughts on History and Society. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Rodway, B. (1984). An exploration of the feasibility of a taxonomy of personal project systems. Unpublished Bachelor's thesis, Carleton University. Ottawa.
- Rotter, J. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. American Psychologist, 35(1), 1-7.
- 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(2), 293-301.
- Ruffin, J. E. (1984). The anxiety of meaninglessness. Journal of Counseling and Development, 63(September), 40-42.
- Sarbin, T. (1986). The narrative as a root metaphor for psychology. In T. Sarbin (Ed.), Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct. New York: Praeger.
- Schwarz, N., & Strack, F. (1991). Evaluating one's life: a judgment model of subjective well-being. In F. Strack, M. Argyle, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), Subjective well-being: an interdisciplinary perspective Toronto: Pergamon Press.
- Tillich, P. (1952). The courage to be. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Vallacher, R. R. & Wegner, D. M. (1985). A theory of action identification. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Van Hook, E., & Higgin, E. T. (1988). Self-related problems beyond the self-concept: Motivational consequences of discrepant self-guides. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55(4), 625-633.
- Weick, K. E. (1984). Small wins: redefining the scale of social problems. American Psychologist, 39(1), 40-49.

- Wiggins, J. S. (1991). Agency and communion as conceptual coordinates for the understanding and measurement of interpersonal behavior. In W. M. Grove & D. Cicchetti (Eds.), Thinking clearly about psychology. Volume 2: Personality and psychopathology, 89-113. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wilmut, K. (1993). Personal projects, well-being, and the social ecology of early adolescence. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Wilson, D. A. (1990). Personal project dimensions and perceived life-satisfaction: a quantitative synthesis. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Winter, D. G. (1973). The power motive. New York: Free Press.
- Wong, P. T. P. (1989). Personal meaning and successful aging. Canadian Psychology, 30(3), 516-522.
- Yard, G. F. (1980). Personal project system variables as predictors of job satisfaction and performance effectiveness in members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Zika, S., & Chamberlain, K. (1987). Relation of hassles and personality to subjective well-being. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 155-162.
- Zimmerman, D., & Little, B. R. (1982). Mathematical and applied aspects of ipsative measurement. Unpublished manuscript, Social Ecology Laboratory, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa.

Appendix A

Participant Recruitment Notice

FOUR CREDITS

71

PSYCHOLOGY 49.100

Experiment Title: PERSONAL PROJECTS AND MEANING STUDY
Experimenter's Name & Room # IAN MCGREGOR A405 LOC8
Experimenter's Phone No. 825-2170
Location of Experiment: MACKENZIE BUILDING Rms 4332 AND 4342
Experiment Number: 93 070
Faculty Advisor: DR. BRIAN LITTLE

BRIEF DESCRIPTION

This is a straight forward study in which you will be asked to do three things:

1. You will be asked to complete a number of standard paper and pencil questionnaires.
2. You will be asked to think about and write down ten "personal projects" that you are currently engaged in or thinking about" - such as "doing my laundry", "making Christmas present for mum", "studying for exams", "playing squash with Pat" etc etc.
3. You will be asked to rate these projects on a number of dimensions such as how "enjoyable" is each project or how "stressful" is each project.

Complete confidentiality will be maintained. This is a time efficient way for you to get all of your experimental credits completed in one sitting.

SUBJECTS WILL RECEIVE FOUR (4)! CREDIT(S) FOR THIS EXPERIMENT.

YOU MUST: KEEP A RECORD OF THE EXPERIMENTER'S NAME
TITLE OF THE EXPERIMENT
LOCATION AND TIME.

IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO KNOW WHERE AND WHEN THE EXPERIMENT IS HELD.

SIGN-UP SHEETS FOR THIS EXPERIMENT ARE UNDERNEATH. PLEASE PROVIDE ALL INFORMATION REQUESTED.

Appendix B

Consent Form and Debriefing

INFORMED CONSENT

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: Personal Projects and Meaning

Research Personnel: The following people are involved in this research project and may be contacted at any time. Ian McGregor (principal investigator, 788-2600, ext. 2697), Dr. Brian Little (faculty sponsor, same phone). Should you have any ethical concerns about this study then please contact Dr. Lise Paquet (Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee 788-2600, ext. 2692) or Dr. W. Jones (Chair, Department of Psychology, 788-2600, ext. 2648).

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to examine the kinds of things that people are doing in their everyday lives, the values and meanings associated with these "projects", and their relationships with personality variables, and well-being measures.

Task Requirements: You will be responding to a number of pen and paper questions. Most will be very short rating scales. Some will require more detailed and considered responses about the kinds of things you are doing, valuing and deriving meaning from in your life.

Duration and Locale: The session will last approximately three hours. It will take place in the MacKenzie Building at Carleton University.

Potential Risk/Discomfort: There are no potential physical or psychological risks in this study. Some of the questions will require you to think carefully about the most central concerns in your life. Although most people find this process to be enjoyable and beneficial, some may experience it as demanding.

Anonymity /Confidentiality: The information collected in this session is confidential. It will be coded such that your name is not associated with your

answers. The coded data is made available only to the researchers associated with this project.

Right to Withdraw: You have the right to withdraw from the process at any time without academic penalty.

I have read the above description of the Personal Projects and Meaning 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: _____

Date: _____

DEBRIEFING (please take this page home with you)

The purpose of this study is to investigate the experience of meaning in the everyday activities of our lives. Just as we can understand the meaning of a word when we hear it in context, our lives are experienced as meaningful when they are related to their contexts in satisfying ways. The research you participated in is based on a methodology that addresses "personal projects" in context in order to investigate the relationship between meaning and well being. Overall, two questions guide our research.

- 1) Does everyone find meaning in their lives in the same way?**
 - 2) If not, are some approaches to meaning in life more healthy than others?**
-

We would like to thank you very much for participation in this research. Your time and efforts are greatly appreciated! If this session has stirred up any personal issues or has upset you in any way, please feel free to contact any of the following resources:

Carleton University counselling and Student Life Services, 788-2600 ext. 6600

The Ottawa Distress Centre, 2328-3311

Carleton University Health Services, 788-2600 ext. 6674

If you have any questions or comments about this research, then please feel free to contact Ian McGregor (principal investigator, 788-2600, ext. 2697) or Dr. Brian Little (faculty sponsor, same phone). Should you have any ethical concerns about this study then please contact Dr. Lise Paquet (Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee, 788-2600 ext. 2692) or Dr. W. Jones (Chair, Department of Psychology, 788-2600, ext. 2648).

Appendix C

Materials Used in This Research

Demographic Information

1. Age _____
 2. Gender: Male__ Female__
 3. Are you involved in an ongoing close relationship (i.e. boyfriend, girlfriend, commonlaw, partner, spouse)? _____
 4. If so, how long have you been in this relationship? _____
 5. Do you have any dependent children? _____ How many? _____
 6. Who do you live with? (Parents, partner, children, room-mates, alone)

 7. Occupation of parents:
 Mother _____
 Father _____
 8. Please circle the overall academic average you attained in your final year of studies prior to attending University (i.e. highschool, OAC, CEGEP etc).
 1. over 90% 2. over 85% 3. over 80% 4. over 75% 5. over 70%
 6. over 65% 7. over 60% 8. 60% or less.
 9. Are you employed while attending Carleton? Yes No (Circle One)
 If yes, please give a short description of your job _____

 and estimate the number of hours worked per week ____.
 10. Do you feel financially secure?
- Financially secure 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 Financially stressed

Scale 1

For each of the following statements, circle the number that would be most nearly true for you. Note that the numbers always extend from one extreme feeling to its opposite kind of feeling. "Neutral" implies no judgement either way. Try to use the "neutral" rating as little as as possible.

1. I am usually:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
completely bored			(neutral)			exuberant enthusiastic

2. Life to me seems:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
always exciting			(neutral)			completely routine

3. In life I have:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no goals or aims at all			(neutral)			very clear goals and aims

4. My personal existence is:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
utterly meaningless without purpose			(neutral)			very purposeful and meaningful

5. Every day is:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
constantly new and different			(neutral)			exactly the same

6. If I could choose, I would:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
prefer never to have been born			(neutral)			like nine more lives just like this one

7. After retiring, I would:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			(neutral)			
do some things I have						loaf completely
always wanted to						the rest of my life

8. In achieving life goals I have:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			(neutral)			
made no progress						progressed to
whatever						complete
						fulfillment

9. My life is,:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			(neutral)			
empty, filled only						running over with
with despair						exciting good
						things

10. If I should die today, I would feel that my life has been:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			(neutral)			
very						completely
worthwhile						worthless

11. In thinking of my life, I:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			(neutral)			
often wonder						always see a reason
why I exist						for my being here

12. As I view the world in relation to my life, the world:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			(neutral)			
completely						fits meaningfully
confuses me						with my life

13. I am a:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
			(neutral)			
very irresponsible						very responsible
person						person

14. Concerning people's freedom to make their own choices, I believe people are:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
absolutely free to make all life choices			(neutral)			completely bound by limitations of heredity and environment

15. With regard to death, I am:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
prepared and unafraid			(neutral)			unprepared and frightened

16. With regard to suicide, I have:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
thought of it seriously as a way out			(neutral)			never given it a second thought

17. I regard my ability to find a meaning, purpose, or mission in life as:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
very great			(neutral)			practically none

18. My life is:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
in my hands and I am in control of it			(neutral)			out of my hands and controlled by external factors

19. Facing my daily tasks is:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
a source of pleasure and satisfaction			(neutral)			a painful and boring experience

20. I have discovered:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no mission or purpose in life			(neutral)			clear-cut goals and a satisfying life purpose

Scale 2

**For the following statements,
circle the number on the scale below that comes closest to how you feel.**

- 1) In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **life as a whole** as it is right now?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Completely
Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied

- 2) In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **work/academic life** as it is right now?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Completely
Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied

- 3) In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your **social life** as it is right now?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Completely
Dissatisfied Neutral Satisfied

- 4) In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your emotional state as it is right now?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Completely Dissatisfied Neutral Completely Satisfied

- 5) In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your physical health as it is right now?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Completely Dissatisfied Neutral Completely Satisfied

- 6) In general, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with how well you are managing your everyday **administrative tasks** e.g. doing laundry, paying bills, returning library books?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Completely Dissatisfied
 Neutral
Completely Satisfied

Scale 3

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

Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)	=0
Some or a little of the time (1-2 days)	=1
Occasionally or a moderate amount of time (3-4 days)	=2
Most or all of the time (5-7 days)	=3

DURING THE PAST WEEK:

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

Scale 4

The questions in this scale ask you about your feelings and thoughts **during the last month**. In each case, you will be asked to indicate *how often* you felt or thought a certain way. Although some of the questions are similar, there are differences between them and you should treat each one as a separate question. The best approach is to answer each question fairly quickly. That is, don't try to count up the number of times you felt a particular way, but rather indicate the alternative that seems like a reasonable estimate. For each question choose from the following alternatives. Write the appropriate number to the left of each question.

0-never 1-almost never 2-sometimes 3-fairly often 4-very often

During the past month:

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

Scale 5

Please answer **yes** or **no** to the following five items asking about your feelings over the last few weeks.

During the past few weeks have you ever felt:

- ___1. particularly excited or interested in something?
- ___2. proud because someone complimented you on something you did?
- ___3. pleased about having accomplished something?
- ___4. on top of the world?
- ___5. that things were going your way?

2 of/de 2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

Personal Projects Analysis

We are interested in studying the kinds of activities and concerns that people have in 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:

- Completing my English essay.
- Trying to help Gary get along better with others.
- Overcoming fear of meeting new people.
- Getting more outdoor exercise.
- Try to finish the book Allan gave me.
- Taking a trip to Ottawa.
- Cutting the grass.
- Finding a part-time job.
- Improving my relationship
- Trying to clarify my religious beliefs.
- Redecorating my apartment.
- Losing ten pounds.
- Making a birthday present for my sister.

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 are intending to begin over the next month or so - remember these are not necessarily formal projects or important ones - we would prefer you to focus more of the everyday kinds of activity or concerns that characterize your life at present.

List of Projects

Please go ahead and write down as many as you can in ten minutes (please write as clearly as you can).

This image shows a full page of handwriting practice paper. It features multiple sets of three horizontal lines: a solid top line, a dashed middle line, and a solid bottom line. These sets are repeated vertically across the entire page to provide a guide for letter height and placement. The background is plain white, and the lines are black. There is no text or other markings on the page.

Completing the Matrix

Now, copy the projects in as brief a form as possible on to the matrix at the end of this section. Just make your description long enough to keep each project clearly in your mind. As you can see, there is space for 10 projects. If your initial list contains more than ten, select the ten that together provide the most complete and informative overview of your life. If you wrote down fewer than ten, see if you can think of some more, or break down some of those you listed into several projects. It is important for everyone to try to fill in ten projects.

In columns 1 to 18 please rate each of your projects using **any** number from 0 to 10 on the following dimensions. Please rate all ten projects on one dimension at a time, for example, rate each project on importance, then proceed to rate each project on enjoyment and so on. If any of the words or descriptions I have used are not clear, or if you find some parts to be confusing, please be sure to ask me for clarification. Thanks.

1. Importance: How important is each project to you at the present time? (Use 10 if the project is very important to you and 0 if it is not at all important to you).
2. Enjoyment: How much do you enjoy working on each project? (use 10 if you enjoy it a great deal and 0 if you do not enjoy it at all).
3. Difficulty: How difficult do you find it to carry out each project? (use 10 for a project that you find very difficult to carry out and 0 for one that you do not find difficult at all).
4. Visibility: How visible is each project to other people, that is, how aware do you think others are that you are doing this project? (use 10 for a project that is very visible to those around you and 0 for a project which is not at all visible to those around you).

5. Control: How much do you feel you are in control of each project? (use 10 if you feel in complete control of the project and 0 if you feel you have no control over the project at all).
6. Initiation: How much do you feel that it was your decision to take on each project? (use 10 if you feel fully responsible for having initiated the project and 0 if you have taken no part whatsoever in initiating the project).
7. Stress: How stressful it is for you to carry out each project? (use 10 if the project is very stressful to carry out and 0 if a project is not stressful at all).
8. Time Pressure: How much do you feel that the amount of time available for working on each project is adequate? (use 10 if you feel the amount of time you have for the project is not at all adequate and 0 if you feel that the amount of time available for the project is perfectly adequate).
9. Outcome: What do you anticipate the outcome of each project to be? (use 10 if you think that a project will be extremely successful and 0 if you think that a project will turn out to be a total failure).
10. Self-Identity: Most of us have some projects that are "really us", and some others that we don't really feel "ourselves" when doing. For example, I feel really "Ian-like" when doing my "master's thesis" project, but quite "un-Ian-like" when doing my "send Christmas cards" project. To what extent does each of your projects feel distinctly "you" - like a personal trademark - as opposed to being quite alien to you? (use 10 if you really identify with the project i.e. if it is "really you" and 0 if the project is decidedly alien i.e. "really not you").

11. Others' View: How important do you think each project is seen to be by other people - or - if the project is unknown to others, how important do you think they would see it to be if they knew about it? (use 10 if a project is seen by others as very important and 0 if it is seen by others as not important at all).
12. Value Congruency: To what extent is each project consistent with the values which guide your life? (use 10 if a project is totally in line with your values and 0 if a project is totally against your values).
13. Net Impact: How much do you feel that each project helps or hinders your other projects? (use 10 if the project greatly helps you to progress on your other projects and 0 if the project seriously hinders your progress on other projects).
14. Progress: How successful you have been in each project so far? (use 10 to indicate that you have been very successful and 0 to indicate that you have not had any success yet at all).
15. Challenge: To what extent is each project challenging for you? (use 10 if a project is highly challenging and 0 if it is not challenging at all).
16. Absorption: Sometimes people get so absorbed in a project that they become oblivious to their surroundings e.g. they may not even notice the telephone ring. To what extent do you become engrossed or deeply involved in each project? (use 10 if you tend to get highly absorbed in the project and 0 if you tend to be uninvolved when doing it).

17. **Self-Worth:** To what extent you feel that being engaged in each project contributes to your sense of self-worth? (use 10 if you feel it contributes highly to your sense of self-worth and 0 if it does not contribute to your sense of self-worth at all).
18. **Commitment:** How committed are you to the completion of each project? (use 10 if you are totally committed and are determined to succeed no matter what gets in your way, use 0 if you are not at all committed and could easily forget about the project if something else came up).

19. **Future-Self:** Most of us have some conception of what kind of person we would like to be several years down the road, the kind of "future-self" that we aspire to and would be delighted to become. Imagine and jot down below how you would like to see yourself in five years.
-
-
- To what extent does each project help you to move toward becoming this desired, future-self? (use 10 if it greatly helps and 0 if it does not help at all).
20. **Significance:** How important or significant does each project make you feel when engaged in it? (Use 10 if the project makes you feel very significant and 0 if the project does not make you feel significant at all).
21. **Fun:** Some projects are intrinsically fun, whimsical or delightful. How much fun is each project for you? (Use 10 if it is extremely fun and 0 if it is not fun at all).
22. **Pride:** How proud are you to be engaged in each project? (Use 10 if extremely proud i.e. if you would want others to know you had this project, and 0 if not proud at all i.e. if you would not want others to know you had this project).
23. **Self benefit:** To what extent is each project oriented toward your own benefit or well-being? (Use 10 if it is highly oriented toward your own benefit and 0 if it is not self-beneficial at all).
24. **Others' benefit:** To what extent is each project oriented toward the benefit or well-being of others? (Use 10 if it is highly oriented toward the benefit of others and 0 if it is not oriented toward others' benefit at all).

25. **Power:** In the eyes of others, how powerful or competent do you think each project make you appear? (Use 10 if extremely powerful or competent and 0 if not powerful or competent at all).
26. **Communion:** To what extent does each project contribute toward a sense of togetherness and harmony with other people or your environment? (Use 10 if the project is extremely communal and 0 if it is not communal at all).
27. **Psychological Risk:** How much psychological risk is associated with each project, i.e. being ridiculed or rejected, feeling stupid or having hopes disappointed if the project were to fail? (Use 10 if extremely risky and 0 if not risky at all).
28. **Pleasure:** To what extent is each project pleasurable, i.e., comfortable, relaxing, self-indulgent or hedonistic? (Use 10 if it is very pleasurable and 0 if it is not pleasurable at all).
29. **Trust:** Often there are people who help us begin, carry out, or complete our projects. As well, others are often affected by the outcome of our projects. To what extent do you feel you can trust the most significant other person associated with each project? If you absolutely can not think of anyone who might be associated with a certain project, then for that project only, indicate to what extent you feel you can trust people around you in general. (Use 10 if you trust him or her completely and 0 if you do not trust him or her at all).

30. Net social support/hindrance: Overall, do you feel that other people relevant to each project are more helpful or detrimental to its completion? (Use 10 if overall, you feel that the project is highly supported by others, and 0 if overall you feel that the project is highly hindered by others. If you are neither supported nor hindered, or if you are equally supported and hindered, please use 5).
31. Purpose: How strongly do you feel that there good reasons or justifications for pursuing each project, i.e., how confident are you that each project is the "right" thing for you to be doing? (Use 10 if the project is extremely purposeful and 0 if it is without purpose).
32. Affiliation: To what extent does each project involve interaction with other people? (Use 10 if the project involves interaction with many other people and 0 if it is done in solitude).
33. Health: How healthy does each project make you feel while doing it? (Use 10 if the project makes you feel extremely healthy and 0 if it does not make you feel healthy at all).
34. Creativity: How much creativity does each project require of you? (Score 10 for high creativity projects and 0 for a completely routine, non-creative project).
35. Consumption: To what extent does each project involve "bought experiences or possessions" (i.e., expensive equipment, fashion, movies, restaurants, travel, etc.). (Score 10 if bought experiences or possessions are central to the project, and zero if the project does not involve bought experiences or possessions at all).

Personal Projects Matrix 1

Projects																		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1																		
2																		
3																		
4																		
5																		
6																		
7																		
8																		
9																		
10																		
	Importance	Enjoyment	Difficulty	Visibility	Control	Initiation	Stress	Time Pressure	Outcome	Self-Identity	Other's View of Importance	Value Congruency	Net Impact	Progress	Challenge	Absorption	Self-Worth	Commitment

Personal Projects Matrix 2		
Projects	Future Self	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

Evaluation

Thank you for participating in our research. Your efforts are very much appreciated! Could you please take a few moments to evaluate the process you have just completed?

What did you like about this session?

What didn't you like?

Do you have any suggestions about how we could make this session better?

Any other comments?

Appendix D

Materials Included in the Package But Not Used in this Research

Personal Projects Part Two

In this section, please return to the ten personal projects that you rated earlier, and select the two that **together are most characteristic or give the most accurate picture of you**. Please list these "defining projects" below.

1. _____
2. _____

On the next few pages, please describe **who** else will be involved in these "defining projects" with you, **where** you will carry them out, and the reasons **why** you are engaged in them. **Try to concentrate on your own personal reasons and values**. These reasons do not have to be profound or impressive (although they may be).

For example; you may wish to lose weight for any or all of the following reasons: to feel physically better, to be more attractive to Craig, to impress my boss, to decrease my chance of heart disease, to exercise my willpower, to be more agile on the squash court, to feel better about my self, to fit into my clothes etc. etc.. Describe all of the reasons you can think of that are personally **relevant to you**.

[illegible]

DEFINING PROJECT #2

With whom? _____

Where? _____

Why?

Personal Projects Part Three

Once you have listed all of the reasons you can think of as to what is your personal incentive for each of your two most defining projects, take a look at what you have written and **ask yourself again, "why" but this time at as ultimate a level as you can.** For example, if one of my reasons for losing weight is to impress my boss, why do I want to do that? It may be that having a successful career is extremely important to me and I want to do whatever I can to get there.

But still, WHY is it so important to me to have a successful career? Maybe it is so that I'll be able to financially support a family, maybe it is so that I'll be able to think of myself as successful, maybe it is so that other people will value me, maybe it is because I'd really like to be 'rich and powerful', maybe it is so that I will be able to have some influence to correct social problems in society, maybe it is so that I will be able to afford the many pleasures that I enjoy so much in life etc etc.

In the following section, please try to describe **your** "ultimate reasons or values" that surround each defining project. Try to make sure that you really get in touch with your own personal orientations and not just something that sounds plausible. Get as "ultimate" as you can without feeling that you are guessing or that your responses are getting vague, fuzzy or obvious i.e., "to be happy".

DEFINING PROJECT #1

Please describe and explain your "ultimate reasons or values" associated with this project?

[illegible]

This image shows a full page of white paper with horizontal dashed black lines, typical of primary-ruled notebook paper. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the entire width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings present.

Personal Projects Part Four

Finally, we are very interested in any elaboration you might have on what factors in your life have led you to be oriented in the ways that you have indicated. Please describe any significant events, turning points, peak experiences, "rock bottom" experiences, role models, religious beliefs, or philosophical orientations, that have contributed to the reasons or values you mentioned in the previous sections?

This image shows a full page of white paper with horizontal dashed black lines, typical of primary-ruled notebook paper. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings present.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

FORM "S" INSTRUCTIONS

Please read all these instructions carefully before beginning. Use a No. 2 pencil to complete your responses on the accompanying answer sheet. Please mark all your answers on the answer sheet. Please DO NOT write in the test booklet.

Please enter your pseudonym in the name section of the computerized scoring sheet, and then fill in the corresponding circles below each box. Also, please note the instructions for how to correctly fill in the circles.

The questionnaire contains 240 statements. Please read each item carefully and fill in the one answer that best corresponds to your agreement or disagreement.

Fill in "1" if the statement is definitely false or if you strongly disagree.

Fill in "2" if the statement is mostly false or if you disagree.

Fill in "3" if the statement is about equally true or false, if you cannot decide, or if you are neutral on the statement.

Fill in "4" if the statement is mostly true or if you agree.

Fill in "5" if the statement is definitely true or if you strongly agree.

There are no right or wrong answers, and you need not be an "expert" to complete this questionnaire. Describe yourself honestly and state your opinions as accurately as possible.

Answer every item and be sure to fill in the circles completely. Note that the answers are numbered down the columns on the answer sheet. Please make sure that your answer is marked in the correctly numbered space. If you make a mistake or change your mind, erase your first answer completely. Then fill in the circle that corresponds to your correct answer. After you have answered the 240 items, please answer the following three questions on the answer sheet as numbers 241, 242, and 243.

241. I have tried to answer all of these questions honestly and accurately.

242. Have you responded to all of the statements?

243. Have you entered your responses in the correct areas?

1. I am not a worrier.
2. I really like most people I meet.
3. I have a very active imagination.
4. I tend to be cynical and skeptical of others' intentions.
5. I'm known for my prudence and common sense.
6. I often get angry at the way people treat me.
7. I shy away from crowds of people.
8. Aesthetic and artistic concerns aren't very important to me.
9. I'm not crafty or sly.
10. I would rather keep my options open than plan everything in advance.
11. I rarely feel lonely or blue.
12. I am dominant, forceful, and assertive.
13. Without strong emotions, life would be uninteresting to me.
14. Some people think I'm selfish and egotistical.
15. I try to perform all the tasks assigned to me conscientiously.
16. In dealing with other people, I always dread making a social blunder.
17. I have a leisurely style in work and play.
18. I'm pretty set in my ways.
19. I would rather cooperate with others than compete with them.
20. I am easy-going and lackadaisical.
21. I rarely overindulge in anything.
22. I often crave excitement.
23. I often enjoy playing with theories or abstract ideas.
24. I don't mind bragging about my talents and accomplishments.
25. I'm pretty good about pacing myself so as to get things done on time.
26. I often feel helpless and want someone else to solve my problems.
27. I have never literally jumped for joy.
28. I believe letting students hear controversial speakers can only confuse and mislead them.
29. Political leaders need to be more aware of the human side of their policies.
30. Over the years I've done some pretty stupid things.
31. I am easily frightened.
32. I don't get much pleasure from chatting with people.
33. I try to keep all my thoughts directed along realistic lines and avoid flights of fancy.
34. I believe that most people are basically well-intentioned.
35. I don't take civic duties like voting very seriously.
36. I'm an even-tempered person.
37. I like to have a lot of people around me.
38. I am sometimes completely absorbed in music I am listening to.
39. If necessary, I am willing to manipulate people to get what I want.
40. I keep my belongings neat and clean.
41. Sometimes I feel completely worthless.
42. I sometimes fail to assert myself as much as I should.
43. I rarely experience strong emotions.
44. I try to be courteous to everyone I meet.
45. Sometimes I'm not as dependable or reliable as I should be.

46. I seldom feel self-conscious when I'm around people.
47. When I do things, I do them vigorously.
48. I think it's interesting to learn and develop new hobbies.
49. I can be sarcastic and cutting when I need to be.
50. I have a clear set of goals and work toward them in an orderly fashion.
51. I have trouble resisting my cravings.
52. I wouldn't enjoy vacationing in Las Vegas.
53. I find philosophical arguments boring.
54. I'd rather not talk about myself and my achievements.
55. I waste a lot of time before settling down to work.
56. I feel I am capable of coping with most of my problems.
57. I have sometimes experienced intense joy or ecstasy.
58. I believe that laws and social policies should change to reflect the needs of a changing world.
59. I'm hard-headed and tough-minded in my attitudes.
60. I think things through before coming to a decision.
61. I rarely feel fearful or anxious.
62. I'm known as a warm and friendly person.
63. I have an active fantasy life.
64. I believe that most people will take advantage of you if you let them.
65. I keep myself informed and usually make intelligent decisions.
66. I am known as hot-blooded and quick-tempered.
67. I usually prefer to do things alone.
68. Watching ballet or modern dance bores me.
69. I couldn't deceive anyone even if I wanted to.
70. I am not a very methodical person.
71. I am seldom sad or depressed.
72. I have often been a leader of groups I have belonged to.
73. How I feel about things is important to me.
74. Some people think of me as cold and calculating.
75. I pay my debts promptly and in full.
76. At times I have been so ashamed I just wanted to hide.
77. My work is likely to be slow but steady.
78. Once I find the right way to do something, I stick to it.
79. I hesitate to express my anger even when it's justified.
80. When I start a self-improvement program, I usually let it slide after a few days.
81. I have little difficulty resisting temptation.
82. I have sometimes done things just for "kicks" or "thrills."
83. I enjoy solving problems or puzzles.
84. I'm better than most people, and I know it.
85. I am a productive person who always gets the job done.
86. When I'm under a great deal of stress, sometimes I feel like I'm going to pieces.
87. I am not a cheerful optimist.
88. I believe we should look to our religious authorities for decisions on moral issues.
89. We can never do too much for the poor and elderly.
90. Occasionally I act first and think later.

91. I often feel tense and jittery.
92. Many people think of me as somewhat cold and distant.
93. I don't like to waste my time daydreaming.
94. I think most of the people I deal with are honest and trustworthy.
95. I often come into situations without being fully prepared.
96. I am not considered a touchy or temperamental person.
97. I really feel the need for other people if I am by myself for long.
98. I am intrigued by the patterns I find in art and nature.
99. Being perfectly honest is a bad way to do business.
100. I like to keep everything in its place so I know just where it is.
101. I have sometimes experienced a deep sense of guilt or sinfulness.
102. In meetings, I usually let others do the talking.
103. I seldom pay much attention to my feelings of the moment.
104. I generally try to be thoughtful and considerate.
105. Sometimes I cheat when I play solitaire.
106. It doesn't embarrass me too much if people ridicule and tease me.
107. I often feel as if I'm bursting with energy.
108. I often try new and foreign foods.
109. If I don't like people, I let them know it.
110. I work hard to accomplish my goals.
111. When I am having my favorite foods, I tend to eat too much.
112. I tend to avoid movies that are shocking or scary.
113. I sometimes lose interest when people talk about very abstract, theoretical matters.
114. I try to be humble.
115. I have trouble making myself do what I should.
116. I keep a cool head in emergencies.
117. Sometimes I bubble with happiness.
118. I believe that the different ideas of right and wrong that people of other societies have may be valid for them.
119. I have no sympathy for panhandlers.
120. I always consider the consequences before I take action.
121. I'm seldom apprehensive about the future.
122. I really enjoy talking to people.
123. I enjoy concentrating on a fantasy or daydream and exploring all its possibilities, letting it grow and develop.
124. I'm suspicious when someone does something nice for me.
125. I pride myself on my sound judgment.
126. I often get disgusted with people I have to deal with.
127. I prefer jobs that let me work alone without being bothered by other people.
128. Poetry has little or no effect on me.
129. I would hate to be thought of as a hypocrite.
130. I never seem to be able to get organized.
131. I tend to blame myself when anything goes wrong.
132. Other people often look to me to make decisions.
133. I experience a wide range of emotions or feelings.
134. I'm not known for my generosity.
135. When I make a commitment, I can always be counted on to follow through.

136. I often feel inferior to others.
137. I'm not as quick and lively as other people.
138. I prefer to spend my time in familiar surroundings.
139. When I've been insulted, I just try to forgive and forget.
140. I don't feel like I'm driven to get ahead.
141. I seldom give in to my impulses.
142. I like to be where the action is.
143. I enjoy working on "mind-twister"-type puzzles.
144. I have a very high opinion of myself.
145. Once I start a project, I almost always finish it.
146. It's often hard for me to make up my mind.
147. I don't consider myself especially "light-hearted."
148. I believe that loyalty to one's ideals and principles is more important than "open-mindedness."
149. Human need should always take priority over economic considerations.
150. I often do things on the spur of the moment.
151. I often worry about things that might go wrong.
152. I find it easy to smile and be outgoing with strangers.
153. If I feel my mind starting to drift off into daydreams, I usually get busy and start concentrating on some work or activity instead.
154. My first reaction is to trust people.
155. I don't seem to be completely successful at anything.
156. It takes a lot to get me mad.
157. I'd rather vacation at a popular beach than an isolated cabin in the woods.
158. Certain kinds of music have an endless fascination for me.
159. Sometimes I trick people into doing what I want.
160. I tend to be somewhat fastidious or exacting.
161. I have a low opinion of myself.
162. I would rather go my own way than be a leader of others.
163. I seldom notice the moods or feelings that different environments produce.
164. Most people I know like me.
165. I adhere strictly to my ethical principles.
166. I feel comfortable in the presence of my bosses or other authorities.
167. I usually seem to be in a hurry.
168. Sometimes I make changes around the house just to try something different.
169. If someone starts a fight, I'm ready to fight back.
170. I strive to achieve all I can.
171. I sometimes eat myself sick.
172. I love the excitement of roller coasters.
173. I have little interest in speculating on the nature of the universe or the human condition.
174. I feel that I am no better than others, no matter what their condition.
175. When a project gets too difficult, I'm inclined to start a new one.
176. I can handle myself pretty well in a crisis.
177. I am a cheerful, high-spirited person.
178. I consider myself broad-minded and tolerant of other people's lifestyles.
179. I believe all human beings are worthy of respect.
180. I rarely make hasty decisions.

181. I have fewer fears than most people.
182. I have strong emotional attachments to my friends.
183. As a child I rarely enjoyed games of make believe.
184. I tend to assume the best about people.
185. I'm a very competent person.
186. At times I have felt bitter and resentful.
187. Social gatherings are usually boring to me.
188. Sometimes when I am reading poetry or looking at a work of art, I feel a chill or wave of excitement.
189. At times I bully or flatter people into doing what I want them to.
190. I'm not compulsive about cleaning.
191. Sometimes things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me.
192. In conversations, I tend to do most of the talking.
193. I find it easy to empathize—to feel myself what others are feeling.
194. I think of myself as a charitable person.
195. I try to do jobs carefully, so they won't have to be done again.
196. If I have said or done the wrong thing to someone, I can hardly bear to face them again.
197. My life is fast-paced.
198. On a vacation, I prefer going back to a tried and true spot.
199. I'm hard-headed and stubborn.
200. I strive for excellence in everything I do.
201. Sometimes I do things on impulse that I later regret.
202. I'm attracted to bright colors and flashy styles.
203. I have a lot of intellectual curiosity.
204. I would rather praise others than be praised myself.
205. There are so many little jobs that need to be done that I sometimes just ignore them all.
206. When everything seems to be going wrong, I can still make good decisions.
207. I rarely use words like "fantastic!" or "sensational!" to describe my experiences.
208. I think that if people don't know what they believe in by the time they're 25, there's something wrong with them.
209. I have sympathy for others less fortunate than me.
210. I plan ahead carefully when I go on a trip.
211. Frightening thoughts sometimes come into my head.
212. I take a personal interest in the people I work with.
213. I would have difficulty just letting my mind wander without control or guidance.
214. I have a good deal of faith in human nature.
215. I am efficient and effective at my work.
216. Even minor annoyances can be frustrating to me.
217. I enjoy parties with lots of people.
218. I enjoy reading poetry that emphasizes feelings and images more than story lines.
219. I pride myself on my shrewdness in handling people.
220. I spend a lot of time looking for things I've misplaced.
221. Too often, when things go wrong, I get discouraged and feel like giving up.
222. I don't find it easy to take charge of a situation.
223. Odd things—like certain scents or the names of distant places—can evoke strong moods in me.
224. I go out of my way to help others if I can.
225. I'd really have to be sick before I'd miss a day of work.

- 226. When people I know do foolish things, I get embarrassed for them.
- 227. I am a very active person.
- 228. I follow the same route when I go someplace.
- 229. I often get into arguments with my family and co-workers.
- 230. I'm something of a "workaholic."
- 231. I am always able to keep my feelings under control.
- 232. I like being part of the crowd at sporting events.
- 233. I have a wide range of intellectual interests.
- 234. I'm a superior person.
- 235. I have a lot of self-discipline.
- 236. I'm pretty stable emotionally.
- 237. I laugh easily.
- 238. I believe that the "new morality" of permissiveness is no morality at all.
- 239. I would rather be known as "merciful" than as "just."
- 240. I think twice before I answer a question.

Appendix E

Tables

Table 15

"Being" Factors: Factor Analysis of PPA Ipsative Dimensional Associations with Self-Identity (complete table)

PPA dimension	Being factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Standard dimensions								
Importance	.70							
Enjoyment				.76				
Difficulty		-.70						
Visibility					.69			
Control		.71						
Initiation		.38					.43	
Stress		-.50		-.52				
Time pressure	.37			-.32		-.34		
Outcome		.77						
Others' view	.38		.35	-.51				
Value congruency	.39					.71		
Net impact	.44				-.44		.38	
Progress		.57						
Challenge	.31	-.43						
Absorption	.37				.63			
Self-worth	.73							
Commitment	.66				.39			

Table 15 (Continued)

"Being" Factors: Factor Analysis of PPA Ipsative Dimensional Associations with Self-Identity

Newer dimensions ^b	Being factors							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Future-self	.76							
Significance	.69							
Fun				.80				
Pride	.52						.47	
Self-benefit	.73							
Others' benefit			.75					
Power	.36						.57	
Communion			.78					
Risk	.67							
Pleasure	.31			.74				
Trust			.33			.46		
Support			.37			.52	.35	
Purpose	.69					.52		
Affiliation			.62					
Health	.36			.35		.40		
Creativity				.36			.46	.34
Consumption								.78

Note. N = 146. These are varimax rotated principal components. Loadings greater than >.3 in absolute magnitude are given. Percentages of variance for factors 1-8 were: 27, 13, 12, 16, 8, 9, 9, 6 respectively.

Table 16

"Doing" Factors: Factor Analysis of PPA Dimensional Means

Standard dimensions	<u>Doing factors</u>									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Importance					.71					
Enjoyment				.77						
Difficulty		.82								
Visibility										.59
Control		-.46							.33	.42
Initiation				.37				-.56		
Stress		.81								
Time pressure		.59							-.33	
Outcome		-.57			.31					.40
Self-identity				.42	.60					
Others' view	.44		.34							.45
Value congruency	.31				.51					.35
Net impact	.40					.65				
Progress					.42	.47				.31
Challenge		.67								
Absorption							.69			
Self-worth	.69									
Commitment					.63					

Table 16 (continued)

"Doing" Factors: Factor Analysis of PPA Dimensional Means

Newer dimensions ^b	Doing factors									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Future-self	.63					.31				
Significance	.58		.35							
Fun				.85						
Pride	.55									
Self-benefit	.76									
Others' benefit			.85							
Power	.65								.34	
Communion	.49		.64							
Risk		.46							.31	
Pleasure	.34			.78						
Trust										
Support										.64
Purpose	.46				.40	-.43				
Affiliation			.35					.42		.31
Health	.55						.39			
Creativity									.69	
Consumption								.74		

Note. N = 146. These are varimax rotated principal components. Loadings greater than >.3 in absolute magnitude are given. Percentages of variance for factors 1-10 were: 18, 14, 8, 13, 11, 6, 6, 6, 6, 11 respectively.

Table 17

Internal Consistency of PPA Dimensions and Well-Being Scales

Measure	Cronbach alpha coefficient value
Importance	.71
Enjoyment	.58
Difficulty	.68
Visibility	.69
Control	.76
Initiation	.71
Stress	.68
Time pressure	.75
Outcome	.73
Self-identity	.58
Others' view	.67
Value congruency	.76
Net impact	.69
Progress	.73
Challenge	.64
Absorption	.64
Self-worth	.63
Commitment	.74

Table 17 (continued)

Internal Consistency of PPA Dimensions and Well-Being Measure Scales

Measure	Cronbach alpha coefficient value
Future-self	.68
Significance	.69
Fun	.53
Pride	.73
Self-benefit	.56
Others' benefit	.68
Power	.77
Communion	.61
Risk	.78
Pleasure	.65
Trust	.82
Support	.77
Purpose	.64
Affiliation	.62
Health	.73
Creativity	.68
Consumption	.60
PIL (purpose in life test)	.87
Satisfaction scales	.75
CESD (depression)	.89
PSS (stress)	.87

Appendix F

Sample List of Participant Personal Projects

Projects

Explain to my daughter why I divorced her father

Clean the fish bowl

Keep my faith in God

Remembering that people care for me

Be more pleasant

MEETING A MAN!

Fix the leaking toilet in the bathroom

Improving my relationship with my father

Increase my bench press

Going to my volunteer job at the Red Cross every Thursday instead of calling in with excuses every second Thursday.

Trying to be right

Showing my cats affection

Working on 1994 objectives at work

Doing something nice and especially unexpected for either my mom or a friend (or even the dog).

Try to help from talking too much about the baby

Stop beating boyfriend (playfully)

Making personalized Christmas gifts

Trying to clarify my sexuality

Trying to overcome my depression which has lasted three years

Get laid

Beat Mike in pool

Trying to get through the month with my boyfriend on holidays in Singapore

Organize x-mas candle lighting service (youth group's involvement)

Trying to grow my short hair longer

Read some interesting books concerning with religious life
Get over with my exams (have 5 exams)
Spend "real time" with my wife
Return to a more spiritual based living standard
End my relationship with the guy I'm seeing
Tell a friend off for obnoxious attitude
Overcoming my fear of talking to girls
Teach sis how to drive
Make a cheesecake
Get a new wardrobe
Watching Sportsline
Help Jen not be such a bitch (room-mate)
Do what is best for myself
Getting myself off of parole
Finding time to read the newspaper daily
Helping my failing business
Trying to help my depressed soon-to-be-ex-husband
Get in shape - lose 20-25 pounds
Get up in the morning
Try to understand how mythological archetypes and classical ideology relates to a world that is pre-occupied with material gain
Grow a fu-man-chu beard
Learn to be more friendly - not a snob
Drink a lot of water
Find a compatible female partner for a threesome with my wife
Do pastel painting of native kids
Decorate x-mas tree

Appendix G

Sample Comments From Participant Evaluations

Comments

It was fun

It made me think about my life

It was very interesting

It's interesting answering questions about things you don't usually think about

Overall, fun and make me think I'm on the right track with priorities.

You can really get to know yourself

Enjoyable project

I liked the format of the questions as I found them easy to understand

Some questions really made me think of how important some things really are.

I found the study to be interesting, as I realize that I don't completely know or understand myself

I liked the ten topics we could choose - showed me how I evaluate them

I liked the chance to put my projects in perspective

A great way to make you think about your chores/ responsibilities/ projects.

I liked that the experiment was not complicated physically and mentally

It made me really think about who I really am!

Thanks! I enjoyed the questionnaire overall and found it quite interesting.

Overall enjoyable experience

I liked that it was anonymous, very well organized and clear on what we are expected to do

You learn about yourself

It made me think of relative importance of goals in my life.

It made me think about myself

I liked that the questions revolved around me and my environment. I liked the confidentiality - learn something about yourself - good organization

I enjoyed taking part in your study.

It gave me a chance to review what I am doing in my life.

It made me really think and consider what my priorities and goals are. The experiment was interesting and inspired much thought

It was interesting. It really makes you evaluate yourself and how you act.

I liked that the questions made you think about your goals, etc.

It helps to let me know myself deeper

I liked the self-examination

I liked that I . . . learned a few things about myself - wasn't time pressured

Learned things about myself that I really haven't thought of before

This seemed to be a "self-awareness" class. It was really interesting! A real eye-opener about my true self!!!

It revealed some things about myself and the individual person that I am.

Personal projects analysis helped me see my faults

It was interesting

Gave me a good opportunity to break away from the stress of exam time to look at myself clearly.

Quite interesting. Looking forward to getting the results

The session was really fun.

It was interesting to have to think about life

It was good.

It actually made me think about my life and my goals in my life

Very interesting. allowed me to see who I really am. Self evaluation

It lets me analyze certain personal things that I won't necessarily analyze about myself day to day.

The questions were interesting - Very interesting experiment.!

I liked it because it made me think about my life - very interesting

Interesting topic. Has helped me reorganized my priorities in terms of "projects" by writing them on paper.

Interesting study and made you think about your interests and values

It was very thought provoking

Good questions - actually made me analyze my goals

I liked that it reminded me of some of my forgotten projects. Goals to work toward. Was kind of fun!

Interesting, makes me think deeply about self-worth and projects currently appearing in my life

It is very interesting answering all these questions (somewhat fun) It let you know about yourself

It helped to emphasize some of my personal characteristic and point out what I sometimes neglect

The questionnaires were interesting and very useful for self-evaluation

It mad me realize quite a bit about my inner self that I had never really taken a good look at - these questions brought about many more questions about myself, my thoughts etc... that never occurred to me.

I feel this is an excellent exercise to stimulate personal feelings.

I like taking inside looks at myself. It shows me ways to improve and I learn valuable qualities.

I enjoyed it. I liked the topic, it was fun.

It mad me realize that I should concentrate more on accomplishing some of my projects and that maybe I should plan them out

Caused me to look into my self and come up with some interesting questions and answers

It was fun. Questions were well phrased, clear and understandable

It had a variety of interesting questions . . . it gave me a feeling of what I feel is most important to me

I liked that it made me think about myself, my goals etc

First of all there was a lot questions which many of us had asked ourselves throughout our daily routines of life. It was great to think about them and put down the opinions I felt I needed to explore.

I feel that this was a good version of the truth between myself and the paper.

END

1 | 5 - 1 1 - 9 5

FIN