4-11-2012

The Relationship Between Dialectical Self and Hedonic, Eudaimonic, and Social Well-Being

Ayaka Hisanaga
Eastern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: http://thekeep.eiu.edu/lib_awards_2012_docs

Part of the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hisanaga, Ayaka, "The Relationship Between Dialectical Self and Hedonic, Eudaimonic, and Social Well-Being" (2012). *2012 Awards for Excellence in Student Research & Creative Activity - Documents*. 5.
http://thekeep.eiu.edu/lib_awards_2012_docs/5

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the 2012 Awards for Excellence in Student Research and Creativity at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2012 Awards for Excellence in Student Research & Creative Activity - Documents by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

Running head: Dialectical Self and Well-Being

The Relationship Between Dialectical Self
and Hedonic, Eudaimonic, and Social Well-Being

Ayaka Hisanaga

Eastern Illinois University

Table of Contents

Title Page	1
Table of Contents	2
Introduction	5
Dialectical Self	5
The Sense of Self	5
Contrasting Naïve Dialecticism with Aristotelian Logic	7
Three Principles of Naïve Dialecticism Applied to the Dialectical Self	9
Theory of Change	9
Theory of Contradiction	9
Holism	10
Dialectical Self and Emotional Complexity	11
Dialectical Self and Well-Being	14
Well-Being	22
Hedonic Well-Being	23
Three Principles of Subjective Well-Being	27
Life Satisfaction	27
Positive Affect	27
Absence of Negative Affect	27
Eudaimonic Well-Being	27
Six Principles of Eudaimonic Well-Being	29
Self-Acceptance	29
Positive Relation with Others	29

Autonomy	29
Environmental Mastery	30
Purpose in Life	30
Personal Growth	30
Social Well-Being	31
Five Principles of Social Well-Being	31
Social Integration	31
Social Contribution	32
Social Coherence	32
Social Actualization	32
Social Acceptance	32
The Present Study	33
Dialectical Self and Hedonic Well-Being	33
Hypothesis H1 (Dialectical Self and Life Satisfaction)	33
Hypothesis H2 (Dialectical Self and Positive Affect)	34
Hypothesis H3 (Dialectical Self and Negative Affect)	34
Dialectical Self and Eudaimonic Well-Being	34
Hypothesis E1 (Dialectical Self and Self-Acceptance)	34
Hypothesis E2 (Dialectical Self and Positive Relation with Others)	35
Hypothesis E3 (Dialectical Self and Autonomy)	35
Hypothesis E4 (Dialectical Self and Environmental Mastery)	35
Hypothesis E5 (Dialectical Self and Purpose in Life)	36
Hypothesis E6 (Dialectical Self and Personal Growth)	36

Dialectical Self and Social Well-Being	36
Hypothesis S1 (Dialectical Self and Social Integration)	36
Hypothesis S2 (Dialectical Self and Social Contribution)	37
Hypothesis S3 (Dialectical Self and Social Coherence)	37
Hypothesis S4 (Dialectical Self and Social Actualization)	37
Hypothesis S5 (Dialectical Self and Social Acceptance)	38
Method	38
Participants	38
Measures	39
Dialectical Self	39
Hedonic Well-Being	39
Eudaimonic Well-Being	40
Social Well-Being	40
Procedure	41
Analysis	41
References	42
Appendix A	46
Appendix B	47
Appendix C	49
Appendix D	50
Appendix E	51
Appendix F	54

Introduction

Many researchers in psychology have sought to identify and examine various factors that foster mental health and psychological well-being. The way one perceives and experiences one's self (also called 'sense of self') has been one of these factors. The concept of a dialectical self refers to a specific way we sense or view ourselves. An individual with a dialectical sense of self recognizes not only positive attributes of the self but also negative qualities. It represents an ability to accept and tolerate contradictions and fluidity in the self. Although previous studies have shown that a dialectical self is associated with lower levels of self-esteem and well-being (Spencer-Rodgers, Peng, Wang, & Hou, 2004), these studies have only addressed the relationship of a dialectical self with hedonic forms of well-being (i.e., basic global judgments of life satisfaction and experiencing more positive emotions over negative ones). The purpose of this study is to examine if such a negative relationship holds true with other notions of well-being, specifically eudaimonic and social well-being. The latter types of well-being go beyond hedonic well-being and tap into other elements of well-being such as meaning in life, self-actualization, personal growth, social integration, and coherence. It is anticipated that a more dialectical self will be generally associated with lower levels of hedonic well-being, but with higher levels of eudaimonic and social well-being.

Dialectical Self

The Sense of Self

What is *self*? A dictionary defines the "self" as (a) a person's essential being that distinguishes them from others, and (b) a person's particular nature or personality (Little Oxford English Dictionary, 2002). What is the *sense of self*? Flury and Ickes (2007) state that individuals with a weak sense of self would feel "as if they do not know who they are, what they think, what

their own opinions are, or what religion they should adopt" (p. 283); individuals with a strong sense of self would have an insight of who they are, what they think, and what their opinions are. Dizén and Berenbaum (2011) refer to the sense of self as the difference between self-perception and perception of others. In other words, the sense of self is the uniqueness that one recognizes in himself/herself. Moreover, Dizén and Berenbaum (2011) suggest that the sense of self includes one's perception of what a specific event or situation means to him/her. Integrating these different definitions and concepts, the sense of self is one's understanding of the self that is unique from others which, in turn, would affect one's thoughts and feelings.

There are different aspects of the sense of self that have been conceptualized and examined in research. One of the most studied aspects of the sense of self is 'self-esteem.' Self-esteem refers to "how favorable or unfavorable one perceives oneself to be" (Dizén & Berenbaum, 2011, p. 116). It indicates how much one likes himself/herself, and how positively one sees himself/herself. Related to self-esteem are 'self-enhancement' and 'self-satisfaction.' Self-enhancement refers to how much people are motivated to view themselves positively (Heine & Hamamura, 2011). The concept emerged from people's tendencies to recall information about successes better than failures, to think of oneself as better than the average, and to have stronger implicit association between oneself and positive words than between oneself and negative words. Self-satisfaction focuses on how close the current view of the self is to the ideal (Heine & Lehman, 1999). 'Self-acceptance,' or 'unconditional self-acceptance,' refers to how much the person is able to fully and unconditionally accept himself/herself whether or not he/she behaves correctly (Macianes, 2006). Research on 'self-instability' focuses on the magnitude of short-term fluctuations in individuals' levels of self-esteem (Dizén & Berenbaum, 2011). Current research on these self-related concepts examine how these various ways we experience the self have

effects on well-being and other related outcomes such as depression, anxiety, life satisfaction, aggression, and prejudice.

This thesis focuses on the concept of a 'dialectical self,' one of the different ways that we understand and experience our selves (the sense of self). The roots of the notion of a dialectical self are found in the concept of *naïve dialecticism*. Naïve dialecticism is a theory about the ways we perceive and respond to reality. Naïve dialecticism, which originated from China, recognizes reality as changeable and contradictory in nature. Dialectical self in particular refers to how people perceive and deal with the various contradictions and changes that they experience in themselves. A person with a high level of dialectical self would recognize both positive and negative aspects of himself/herself, recognizing good and bad in the self at the same time.

Contrasting Naïve Dialecticism with Aristotelian Logic

People experience contradictions in their daily lives. According to Peng and Nixbett (1999), there are four ways to respond to such apparent contradictions. Consider the following example from their study:

Statement A: Two mathematicians have discovered that the activities of a butterfly in Beijing, China, noticeably affect the temperature in the San Francisco Bay Area.

Statement B: Two meteorologists have found that the activities of a local butterfly in the San Francisco Bay Area have nothing to do with temperature changes in the same San Francisco Bay Area. (p. 741)

The four possible responses to this apparent contradiction are: denial, discounting, differentiation, and dialecticism.

A person who takes on a *denial* position would notice that there is a contradiction in these statements, and decide not to deal with it at all, or pretend that there is no contradiction. On the

other hand, if the person responds by *discounting*, she would state that both statements are wrong because there is a contradiction. A person who takes on a *differentiation* position would compare both pieces of information and decide that one is right and the other is wrong. A *dialectical* person would retain basic elements of the two opposing perspectives and believe that both perspectives might contain some truth, even at the risk of tolerating a contradiction. The dialectical position does not view the association between the activities of a butterfly and temperature changes as a contradiction, but rather attempt reconciliation by accepting both statements.

In contrast with naïve dialecticism, Aristotelian logic emphasizes three different principles: the law of identity, the law of noncontradiction, and the law of the excluded middle (Peng & Nisbett, 1999). *The law of identity* holds that if anything is true, then it has to be true. From this perspective, everything is what it is. For example, "a teacher is a teacher" is a logical statement because "teacher" and "teacher" are identical. *The law of noncontradiction* asserts that no statement can be both true and false; "a teacher cannot be non-teacher." Other expressions of this law are that "Contradictory statements (A is B, and A is not B) cannot both be true," and that it is impossible for the same thing to be both true and false at the same time." *The law of excluded middle* refers to the rule that any statement is either true or false; "a person must be a teacher or a non-teacher" because "teacher" and "non-teacher" are contradictory and complementary so anyone must belong to one of these two categories.

When naïve dialecticism is applied to the sense of self, how would one understand himself/herself? A person who possesses a dialectical sense of self would consider his/her qualities from different dimensions and accept all dimensions regardless of contradictions. Thus, having a dialectical self allows one to recognize and accept the duality of attributes in the self.

For example, a dialectical individual might recognize good and bad, strengths and weaknesses, masculinity and femininity, and so forth in the same self (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2004).

A person who takes on Aristotelian logic, on the other hand, would view the self along these lines: "Strength and weakness cannot coexist" (the law of noncontradiction), "I must be either strong or weak, and if I am strong, then I cannot be weak" (the law of the excluded middle), and "If I am strong, then I am always strong" (the law of identity).

Three Principles of Naïve Dialecticism Applied to the Dialectical Self

Naïve dialecticism has three principles: theory of change, theory of contradiction, and holism (Peng & Nisbett, 1999; Spencer-Rodgers, Baucher, Mori, Wang, & Peng, 2009; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2004; Spencer-Rodgers, Williams, & Peng, 2010). They indicate higher tolerance of change and contradiction in life, and more ambivalent judgment of the world, including the self (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2004).

Theory of change. This principle indicates that the universe and reality are unpredictable, dynamic, flexible, and changeable. Reality is seen as a process that is in constant flux (Peng & Nisbett, 1999). According to Peng and Nisbett (1999), because life is a constant passing from one stage to another, to be is not to be, and not to be is to be. Applying this principle to the self, a dialectical person would view his/her own personality as changeable (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2010): "I am sometimes reserved and sometimes outspoken." For a dialectical person, all attributes of his/her self are considered active and changeable rather than objective, fixed, and identifiable entities.

Theory of contradiction. The principle of contradiction entertains the possibility of two contradictory propositions can be both true. The universe and reality are seen as full of contradictions. Peng and Nisbett (1999) explains this principle using the main idea from Chinese

mandatory book; "When the people of the world all know beauty as beauty, there arises the recognition of ugliness" (p. 743). Contradictions coexist in harmony, mutually controlling each other. A dialectical person, from a perspective of the theory of contradiction, would view himself/herself as comprising contradictory elements (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2010): "I am reserved and outspoken at the same time."

Holism. Holism views and understands objects in relation to the whole. This principle is the essence of dialecticism, and a consequence of the theories of change and contradiction (Peng & Nisbett, 1999). The examples for both the principle of change and the principle of contradiction can be integrated into one; "I am sometimes reserved and sometimes outspoken, therefore I am reserved and outspoken at the same time." Holistic thinkers emphasize the "big picture" rather than a focal object (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2010). The theory of holism states that nothing is independent, and everything is connected; if one really wants to know something fully, she has to know all of its relations (Peng & Nisbett, 1999). A dialectical person would be able to recognize and accept coexisting attributes that do not necessarily agree with each other in his/her self; "This *part of me* is reserved, but this *part of me* is outspoken."

Summing the three principles of dialectical self, a dialectical person acknowledges change ("I am sometimes good and sometimes bad"), can tolerate contradiction in himself/herself ("I am good and bad at the same time"), and can see the self as a whole ("A part of me is good, and another part of me is bad"). How does a more dialectical sense of self affect well-being? Would recognition of change, tolerance of contradiction, and a holistic view of the self make one psychologically healthier? There are only a few studies that examine this relationship between a dialectical self and mental health related issues. Specifically, there are

two studies on the relationship between dialecticism and emotional complexity, and four studies that have examined the relationship between dialectical self and well-being.

Dialectical Self and Emotional Complexity

How do more dialectical individuals experience emotions? There have been a number of debates on whether people can feel positive and negative feelings at the same time. Some scholars consider positive and negative emotions to be at opposite ends of a bipolar continuum (Green, Goldman, & Salovey, 1993; Russell, 1980; Russell & Carroll, 1999 as cited in Miyamoto, Uchida, & Ellsworth, 2010); because positive and negative emotions are two opposite things, there must not be a co-occurrence of both. On the other hand, other scholars see positive and negative feelings to be independent (Cacioppo & Berntson, 1994; Diener & Iran-Nejad, 1986; Larsen, McGraw, & Cacioppo, 2001 as cited in Miyamoto et al., 2010); despite the contradiction in characteristics between positive and negative emotions, because they are independent from each other, both can co-occur. This phenomenon of co-occurrence of positive and negative emotions is often called *emotional complexity*. Emotional complexity has been examined by testing the relationship between positive and negative emotions. Past research showed that the correlation between positive and negative emotions tend to be inverse for Westerners, but it is weaker, nonexistent, or positive for Asians (Bagozzi, Wong, & Yi, 1999; Kitayama, Markus, & Kurosawa, 2000; Schirumack, Oishi, & Diener, 2002), which indicates that Asians are more likely to experience emotional complexity than Westerners.

Spencer-Rodgers et al. (2010) conducted a cross-cultural study on the relationship between dialecticism and emotional complexity. Fifty-three Chinese students from Peking University and 54 students from University of California, Santa Barbara who self-identified as Euro-Americans participated in the study. Participants were divided into two groups. In one

group, participants read a paragraph that encouraged them to think about contradictory situations and experiences and opposing outcomes, and to write about all of the facts and possible perspectives associated with the experiences on a blank paper. They also rated the valence of their experiences (e.g., "Just think about the positive aspects of these experiences, how positive were they for you?"). All participants also filled out the Dialectical Self Scale (DSS; Spencer-Rodgers and her colleagues, 2008), which assesses the extent to which one has a dialectical sense of self, and Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), which asked to rate "the extent to which you have felt this way during the past few weeks" on 10 positive emotions (confident, content, calm, proud, bold, satisfied, pleased, energetic, happy, and interested) and 10 negative emotions (sad, tired, bored, upset, disappointed, nervous, insecure, ashamed, angry, and embarrassed).

The results indicated that the more dialectical the person is, the greater emotional complexity the person experiences. Emotional complexity was assessed by looking at the relationship between agreement with positive affect and agreement with negative affect. A person who rated high on both positive and negative emotions would, because of the inconsistency in his/her emotions, be more emotionally complex than a person who rated high on positive emotions yet low on negative emotions. Chinese students exhibited greater levels of both dialectical self and emotional complexity than Euro-American students. When the cultural difference between Chinese and Euro-American populations was experimentally manipulated, research showed that increased dialecticism led to the greater emotional complexity; a test of mediation also revealed that dialecticism mediated the relationship between cultural differences and emotional complexity. In other words, it was dialecticism as a single factor that was directly creating the emotional complexity rather than the cultural differences. Authors discuss the

possibility that co-occurrence of positive and negative emotions or mixed emotions may be more acceptable and comfortable among individuals with a dialectical sense of self because of the nature of tolerating change and contradiction in life.

In another research, Miyamoto, Uchida, and Ellsworth (2010) examined situational and cultural differences in emotional complexity. In the first study, 28 Euro-American students from the University of Michigan and 22 Japanese students from Kyoto University participated in the study. Researchers assumed Japanese participants to be more dialectical than Euro-American participants based on previous research that had shown cultural difference in dialecticism. Participants were asked to rate positive and negative affect experienced in different situation scenarios (self-success, self-failure, transition, and a loss). Overall, Japanese students reported more mixed emotions than Euro-American students; however there was no cultural difference in self-failure, transition, and a loss situations. In self-success situations, happiness was reported clearly high among Euro-American students, whereas there was co-occurrence of happiness and fear of troubling someone else among Japanese students.

The second study aimed to further confirm the situational difference in emotions between the two cultures by having participants freely describe different situations (self-success, self-failure, and transition) and what they felt in the situation. Twenty-eight Euro-American students and 27 Japanese students from the same universities as the first study volunteered in this study. The results were consistent with the first study; Japanese students reported more mixed emotions in self-success situation, but there was no cultural difference in self-failure or transition situations. From the two studies, they found that Japanese express mixed emotions in all situations whereas Euro-Americans express mixed emotions only in negative situations.

Dialectical Self and Well-Being

Spencer-Rodgers and her colleagues (2004) conducted four cross-cultural studies to examine dialecticism in self-esteem and its influence on well-being. They compared dialectical cultures versus synthesis-oriented (non-dialectical) cultures. Study 1 predicted two hypotheses. First, based on previous research that had shown lower self-esteem among Asians, they predicted that Asians would rate themselves more equally on positive and negative traits. Second, they predicted that dialectical cultures would show more ambivalent responses on self-esteem scales than synthesis-oriented cultures. One-hundred and fifty-three Chinese students from Peking University and Beijing Normal University represented the dialectical culture. American participants were students at University of California (UC), Berkeley, and UC Santa Barbara. One-hundred and ninety-five Asian American students represented the moderately dialectical culture and 166 Euro-American students represented synthesis-oriented culture. The study also included 142 Latino students and 47 African-American students that also represented synthesis-oriented cultures.

Each participant evaluated his/her self-esteem using the Rosenberg (1965) Self-Esteem Scale (RSES). Using the scores from the RSES, the study compared the five cultural groups on the following: positive self-esteem, negative self-esteem, global self-esteem, and self-evaluative ambivalence. Positive self-esteem focused only on the positive items (e.g., "I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others") of the RSES, while negative self-esteem focused on negative items (e.g., "I feel that I can't do anything right"). Global self-esteem was overall average on both positive and negative items. Self-evaluative ambivalence referred to inconsistent responses on RSES. For example, a participant who rated himself/herself highly on

“good” and also highly on “bad” would hold the most ambivalent attitude, whereas a participant who rated himself/herself as highly on “good” yet low on “bad” would be the least ambivalent.

The results revealed significant cultural effects on all variables (positive, negative, and global self-esteem, and ambivalence). More dialectical cultures showed more contradictory sense of self than did synthesis-oriented cultures at both the group and individual levels. Positive and negative self-esteem were more polarized among synthesis-oriented cultures. Chinese and Asian American students exhibited greater self-evaluative ambivalence than other populations. Between Chinese and Asian American students, Chinese students showed more ambivalent self-esteem than Asian American students. Researchers argued possibilities which Asians tended to rate both positive and negative items toward the middle, or Asians tended to agree with negative items than participants from synthesis-oriented cultures. To further confirm the findings, considering the possible biases they argued, Study 2 examined the same relationship using open-ended questions rather than rating scales.

Study 2 used the Twenty Statements Test (TST; Kuhn & McPartland, 1954) instead of the RSES. The TST assesses the relative frequency of use of positive and negative statements when describing the self. The researchers hypothesized that dialectical cultures would show a smaller portion of positive self-description, a greater portion of negative self-description, and a smaller ratio of positive and negative self-description on the TST than synthesis-oriented cultures. Ninety-five Chinese students from Peking University represented the dialectical culture. A moderately dialectical culture was represented by 100 Asian-American students, and a synthesis-oriented culture was represented by 110 Caucasian students, both from UC Santa Barbara and US Berkeley. All participants completed the TST. Responses to the TST were coded into positive (1), neutral (0), and negative (-1) self-statements by two bilingual coders. The coders

worked independently, and they were blind to the hypotheses of the study. The proportions of three types of responses were computed on the basis of the participants' total number of responses.

The proportions of three types of responses were compared both between cultures and within cultures. Between-culture analyses revealed that the participants from the dialectical culture reported a smaller proportion of positive self-statements and a greater proportion of negative self-statements than those from a synthesis-oriented culture. Asian American students showed moderate scores on each response. Within-culture analyses suggested that all cultures showed a greater ratio of positive to negative self-statements. Although previous research had indicated the tendency among Asians and/or Asian Americans to report lower self-esteem, the result from this study revealed that dialectical cultures are not more negative than positive in their self-evaluation. Dialectical cultures showed more ambivalence than synthesis-oriented cultures, but ambivalence and low self-esteem or negativity are not equivalent constructs. Study 3 and Study 4 focused on the influence of dialectical self on self-esteem and ambivalence.

In Study 3, the researchers examined the relationship between dialectical self and well-being. Well-being was assessed using the RSES, the Stability of Self Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) which assessed self-concept stability, the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983) which assessed anxiety and depression, the Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS), the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS), and the TST, and dialectical self was assessed using the Dialectical Self Scale (DSS). One-hundred and twenty-nine Asian American students and 115 Caucasian students from UC Berkeley and UC Santa Barbara participated in the study. One-hundred and fifty-three Chinese students from Study 1 also participated in this study. They

hypothesized that Chinese and Asian American students would report higher scores on dialecticism, as well as lower self-esteem and well-being than Caucasian students.

The study confirmed cultural differences in dialectical self, Chinese students reported the greatest levels of dialectical self, Asian American students scored moderately, and Euro-American students scored lower. Participants from the more dialectical cultures reported lower global self-esteem, self-stability, and life satisfaction than did synthesis-oriented culture. They also reported more negative self-esteem, greater self-evaluative ambivalence, and greater anxiety and depression. At the within-culture level of analysis, they found that among Chinese students, dialecticism tended to be more highly related to negative self-esteem, anxiety, and depression, whereas among Caucasian students, dialecticism tended to correlate with a decreased emphasis on positive self-esteem, positive affect, and life satisfaction.

In Study 4, the researchers manipulated naïve dialecticism and examined its effect on well-being. Fifty-three Chinese students from Peking University and 54 Euro-American students from UC Santa Barbara participated in the study. Dialecticism was manipulated by asking half of the participants of each cultural group to think about and to describe experiences that contained both positive and negative consequences for the self and for the people they care about. Participants were first asked to think about contradictory experiences and describe the experiences in writing. They were then asked to rate the perceived positivity and negativity of the experiences (e.g., 0-6 scale on "Just thinking about the positive aspects of these experiences, how positive were they for you?"). Participants also completed the RSFS, the OSS, and the SWLS.

Chinese students in the manipulated dialecticism condition reported lower self-esteem, greater self-evaluative ambivalence, and less life satisfaction than did Chinese students in the

control group. The effect of manipulation of dialecticism was in the same direction, but was not significant among Euro-American students. The study also showed that both cultures tended to view experiences positively than negatively, especially Chinese students, which the researchers argued that their high tolerance of contradiction led to higher acceptance of negative experiences. In addition to the previous findings about the tendency of Asians to report lower self-esteem and life satisfaction, this study by Spencer-Rodgers and her colleagues revealed that dialectical cultures encourage acceptance of opposing judgments of satisfaction with the self and life and greater tolerance of positive and negative emotional experiences.

Kim, Peng, and Chiu (2008) examined cultural differences in dialecticism and its effect on self-esteem based on the study by Spencer-Rodgers and her colleagues (2004), but using different methods than the previous study. They predicted that the reason why Asians tend to report lower self-esteem is because of the Asians' stronger agreement with the negatively worded items. Two-hundred and fifteen students from a public university in Beijing, China and 218 Euro-American students from a public university in Illinois participated in the study. Chinese participants were assumed to have more dialectical sense of self, based on the previous study by Spencer-Rodgers and her colleagues (2004). Participants completed the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES). Participants also responded to four self-promotion-oriented measures: persistence ("You just took an important test and failed. Now you have one more chance to take the test. How likely would you take it, even if you may fail it again?"), challenge seeking ("You are given the option of taking a very challenging task that only a few people will succeed. How likely would you take it?"), perceived invulnerability of the self ("You just read a scientific article that describes the risks of getting involved in a life-threatening accident. According to the article, one out of two adults would have a life-threatening accident before age 40. How likely

would you have such an accident before age 40?”), and goal setting (“You have taken a performance task and you have a score below the average. You have one more chance to take the test. This time, you will set your own standard, which must be not lower than your performance in the previous task. You will be rewarded based on your performance. If you set your standard at the same level as your performance in the first task and succeed, you will get a small reward. The higher the standard you set compared to your initial performance, the greater the reward you will get if you succeed. If you fail to achieve the standard you set for yourself, you will get nothing. How will you set the standard?”).

Consistent with the previous research by Spencer-Rodgers and her colleagues (2004), the results showed that Euro-Americans tended to agree with positively worded items and disagree with negatively worded ones, and Chinese tended to agree with both. Euro-American students scored higher on overall self-esteem than Chinese students, both when the items were positively worded and when it was negatively worded. However, the difference was more pronounced when the items were negatively worded. In other words, the Chinese students were less consistent on their rating across positively and negatively worded items on RSES compared to Euro-American students. Moreover, for both populations, only agreement with positively worded items predicted persistence, challenge seeking, perceived vulnerability of the self, and goal setting.

Sanchez, Shih, and Garcia (2009) examined the relationship between malleable racial identification and well-being using the **Dialectical Self Scale (DSS)**. Malleable racial identification refers to “the tendency to identify with different racial identities depending on the social context” (p. 243). The study consisted of three parts. The first two parts had shown that stronger malleable racial identification among multiracial participants led to lower well-being

(greater depressive symptoms). In the third part of the study, they tested whether the presence of dialectical self changes the negative relationship between malleable racial identification and well-being. This idea was developed based on the fact, when they ran the initial study to prove the negative correlation between malleability and well-being, that participants with partial Asian identity showed less depressive symptoms compared to other multiracial participants. One-hundred and four participants from multiracial background were recruited from the Rutgers University community. Participants filled out scales for malleable racial identification that was developed by the authors, Rosenberg Self-Concept Stability Scale (Rosenberg, 1979), Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression scale (CES-D; Radloff, 1977), the Well-Being Scale (Bradley & Lewis, 1990), and the DSS.

The results indicated that malleable racial identification would predict poorer well-being for those who have a less sense of dialectical self. Those who scored high on malleable racial identification and low on the DSS showed greater unstable multiracial regard, lower well-being, and greater depressive symptoms than those who scored high on malleable racial identification and also on the DSS. In other words, even if you showed high malleable racial identification, if you are dialectical, you would have fewer tendencies to present poorer well-being and greater depressive symptoms than non-dialectical people who have high malleable racial identification.

English and Chen (2007) examined cross-cultural differences on well-being by observing stability of sense of self. The study consisted of two parts. The first half had shown that Asian Americans were less consistent of their sense of self than were Euro-Americans; however, Asian American's sense of self showed high consistency over time. The second half of the study further investigated the cultural difference in consistency of sense of self by also examining its influence on self-view importance and self-enhancement, and dialectical self. They predicted that Asian

Americans would show less consistency in their perception of self-view importance and self-enhancement than Euro-Americans, and the cultural difference would be related to a dialectical tendency in the sense of self. Participants were 141 undergraduate students, and 48% of them were Asian Americans. Participants first rated their standing on 15 attributes (e.g., anxious, creative, lazy) relative to other college students. They were asked to rate the importance of each attribute in defining how they see themselves, then were asked to rate how desirable it was to possess each attribute. Consistency of self-view importance was assessed by measuring the importance of the attributes in other people and the self. Consistency of self-enhancement was assessed by measuring the degree to which they perceived themselves as better than the average. Participants also completed the Dialectical Self Scale (DSS).

Results indicated that Asian Americans showed less consistency in their perception of self-view importance and self-enhancement than Euro-Americans. They also found that Asian Americans scored higher on the DSS than Euro-Americans. In other words, the cultural difference is related to dialectical self, and dialectical self is related to consistency in self-view importance and self-enhancement. Although past research had shown inconsistency in Asians' sense of self, this study denied the statement of Asians lacking a meaningful sense of self by revealing that Asians were consistent with their perception of selves over time. In other words, Asians' inconsistency in sense of self could be defined as situational flexibility, considering their high consistency over time and its relationship with dialectical self, and this tendency might not be a factor of poorer well-being if the focus of concept of well-being was on flexibility in different situations.

The recent four studies on dialectical self and well-being and two studies on dialectical self and emotional complexity have found that Asian populations generally report higher levels

of dialectical self than other populations, and more dialectical populations exhibited more emotional complexity and more contradictory and inconsistent sense of self. Contradiction and inconsistency in the sense of self were correlated with poorer self-esteem and subjective well-being. On the other hand, the greater ability to recognize and accept negativity among dialectical individuals has also been revealed. Moreover, a dialectical self prevents poorer well-being and depressive symptoms among people with multiple racial identities. Finally, a strong consistency in sense of self over time among dialectical population has been revealed, which indicates a situational flexibility in sense of self among people from dialectical cultures rather than lack of consistency. This suggests a possibility that dialectical self might not necessarily lead to poorer well-being if the concept of well-being was observed differently, focusing on flexibility in different situations and in society rather than simply subjective judgments of happiness.

Well-Being

Throughout human history, a number of researchers have attempted to understand and define well-being. Many people aspire to be happier, and there are hundreds of self-help books and other opportunities to achieve the desire. Ryan and Deci (2001) stated that the concept of well-being refers to optimal psychological functioning and experience, and that well-being is more complex and controversial than the simple question of "How are you?" In recent years, the scientific study of well-being and the positive aspects of mental health have had a dramatic expansion (Gallagher, Lopez, & Preacher, 2009). There are different understandings and definitions of well-being across cultures and across individuals. Critiques have pointed out that standards or norms in the field of mental health (Sue & Sue, 2008) and concepts of well-being studied in the United States (Christopher, 1999) are monocultural of Western or Euro-American

culture. Diener (2009) discusses the well-being science needed today, and suggests the need for consideration of diversity and inclusion of different measures of well-being.

Two qualities of what constitutes a good life have stood in the past debate: happiness and meaning in life (Bauer, McAdams, & Sakaeda, 2005). There are also three major theories of well-being developed to date: hedonic well-being which focuses on happiness and pleasure (Diener, 1984), eudaimonic well-being which focuses on meaning in life and self-actualization (Ryff, 1989), and social well-being which focuses on meaning in social lives (Keyes, 1998). Much of previous research has compared hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being (Gallagher et al., 2009). Although hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being are viewed as opposing ways of pursuing well-being (Josjanloo & Ghaedi, 2009), research suggests that well-being is multidimensional (Ryan & Deci, 2001). Gallagher et al. (2009) studied the possibility of integrating the three existing models of well-being.

Hedonic Well-Being

The theory of hedonic well-being, which views well-being as simply pleasure or happiness (Josjanloo & Ghaedi, 2009; Ryan & Deci, 2001) has been the most extensively studied models of well-being. The term *hedonism* refers to the pursuit of pleasure and the doctrine that pleasure or happiness is the highest (Little Oxford English Dictionary, 2002). Theoretical progress in understanding happiness and pleasure has been made since the time of the ancient Greeks. Ryan and Deci (2001) mention historical development of the theories of hedonic well-being. In the fourth century B.C., a Greek philosopher Aristippus taught that the goal of life is to experience the maximum amount of pleasure, and people's happiness is the totality of one's hedonic moments. Many followed his early hedonism, and hedonism as a way of well-being has been expressed in many forms. While early philosophers focused mainly on physical hedonism

such as appetites and self-interests, psychologists who adopted the hedonic view widened the conception of hedonism by including pleasures of the mind as well as the body.

Diener and Lucas (1999) suggest that most recent research on hedonic well-being has used assessment of *subjective well-being*, although there are many other ways to evaluate the pleasure/pain continuum (as cited in Ryan & Deci, 2001, p. 144). The literature on subjective well-being is concerned with how and why people experience their lives in positive ways (Diener, 1984). The literature covers studies that used diverse terms such as happiness, satisfaction, morale, and positive affect. A number of researchers have examined subjective well-being from different perspectives. Diener (1984) reviewed the literature on subjective well-being in measurement, causal factors, and theories. More recent studies on subjective well-being follow Diener's integrative theory of subjective well-being. Many ancient philosophers asked whether happiness is gained by satisfying one's desires or by suppressing them. Hedonic philosophers have recommended fulfillment of desires whereas ascetics have recommended the suppression of desires. In need theories, there are certain inborn or learned needs that the person seeks to fulfill, and their fulfillment creates happiness. In goal theories, on the other hand, people are aware of specific desires and happiness results when they are reached. Both need theories and goal theories are related, and can be integrated into one idea; the fulfillment of needs, goals, and desires is somehow related to happiness.

Pleasure and pain are intimately related. One cannot experience pleasure without knowing how pain feels. A person only has goals or needs to the extent that something is missing in the person's life. One assumption from this concept is that the greater the pain, the greater the pleasure upon achieving the goal or need. There is another theory that suggests pleasure and pain are intimately connected; the loss of something good leads to unhappiness and the loss of

something bad leads to happiness. Critiques of this theory suggest the possibility of habituation to a good or a bad object which would lessen the effect after repeated exposure. However, it is also suggested that opposing affect when the object is lost will be greater after habituation; for example, if an individual was habituated to an automobile and it brought little pleasure, and if the automobile was stolen, the person would experience more pain than s/he would if the automobile was new.

Activity theories indicate that happiness is brought through human activities. For example, the activity of climbing a mountain might bring greater happiness than reaching the summit. The theory of flow suggests that activities are seen as pleasurable when the challenge is matched to the person's skill level. If an activity is too easy, the person may feel bored; if it is too difficult, anxiety may develop. When a person is involved in an activity which the person's skills and the challenge of the task are roughly equal, a pleasurable flow experience naturally comes. Unlike need theories or goal theories, activity theories indicate that happiness arises from human behaviors rather than from achieving endpoints. However, the two ideas might be able to be integrated.

Another dimension to examine theories of happiness is distinction between bottom-up and top-down approaches. Bottom-up approaches consider happiness as the sum of many small pleasures, whereas top-down approaches consider that there is a global propensity to experience things in a positive way, and this propensity influences the momentary interactions an individual has with the world. In other words, a person experiences pleasures because s/he is happy, and not vice versa. There are a number of models that seek to explain why some individuals are happier than others. One approach rests on the attributions people make about the events happening to them. In other words, good events bring more happiness if they are attributed to internal factors.

Another possibility is that events that are perceived as good bring happiness regardless of the attributions made. Some other theories focus on memory and conditioning; conscious attempt to reduce negative thoughts or to recite positive thoughts lead to a happier day. Those approaches on subjective emotions and thoughts can integrate external events and internal personality as a factor of well-being and happiness.

Judgment theories state that happiness results from a comparison between some standard and actual conditions. The definition and value of the standard would be the question in these theories. One may use other people as a standard (if a person is better off than others, s/he will be happy), one may use his/her own past as a standard (if his/her current life is better than the past, s/he will be happy), or one may carry a certain level of attainment based on what the person is told by his/her parents. The domains that people compare could vary. One may compare the size and weight, one may compare income, and one may compare education or career. Standard itself is also moveable. For example, if one's income increases, the person will be happy; however his/her standard will eventually rise. Judgment theories also suggest that happiness will depend on how the person judges the fulfillment of his/her desire.

After reviewing a variety of theories related to subjective well-being, Diener stated that happiness comes when a person has a preponderance of positive affect over negative affect. There are three hallmarks in theories and measurements of subjective well-being. First, it is subjective, and it resides within the experience of the individual. Second, the measurement of subjective well-being includes positive measures, whereas most measures of mental health assess well-being by examining the absence of negative indices such as symptoms of depression and anxiety. Third, the subjective well-being measures integrated judgment of the person's life.

Again, the measurement is not symptom-specific or focused on particular aspects of life, but has more global assessment of life.

Three principles of subjective well-being. How would we structure subjective judgment of satisfaction and happiness in our lives? Subjective well-being consists of three principles: life satisfaction, the presence of positive affect, and absence of negative affect (Christopher, 1999; Diener, 1984; Ryan & Deci, 2001).

Life satisfaction. The concept of life satisfaction is based on subjective judgmental evaluation on one's life (Christopher, 1999; Diener, 1984). Life satisfaction may be directly influenced by emotions, but is not itself a direct measure of emotions (Diener, 1984). The focus of this principle is on global life satisfaction rather than domain-specific satisfaction (e.g., income). The measure of life satisfaction for the subjective well-being used today assesses more broad evaluation on one's life.

Positive effect. The concept of positive affect is based on presence of subjective feelings of positive emotions. This concept can be tracked back several millennia. For example, Marcus Aurelius wrote that "no man is happy who does not think himself so" (Diener, 1984).

Absence of negative effect. Happiness from the perspective of subjective well-being is led by a preponderance of positive effect over negative effect (Diener, 1984). In other words, we are happy when we experience more positive than negative feelings in our life (Christopher, 1999).

Eudaimonic Well-Being

Despite the evaluation and popularity of hedonic view of well-being, eudaimonic view has denigrated hedonic happiness as a principal criterion of well-being (Ryan & Deci, 2001).

Eudaimonia is a Greek word, translated as *happiness*. However, Waterman (1984) argued that this translation suggests an equivalence between eudaimonism and hedonism, which would have been contrary to the important distinction that the Greeks had made between the gratification of right desires and wrong desires (cited in Ryff, 1989, p. 1070). From Waterman's perspective, eudaimonia is defined as "the feelings accompanying behavior in the direction of, and consistent with, one's true potential" (Ryff, 1989, p. 1070). Aristotle rejected hedonic view of happiness, and stated that hedonic happiness is a vulgar idea, which makes people slaves to their pleasures (Ryan & Deci, 2001; Waterman, 1993). Against the hedonic happiness, Aristotle offers the proposition that eudaimonia is found in actively expressing virtue (Bauer et al., 2005; Huta, 2007; Ryan & Deci, 2001; Ryff & Singer, 2006; Waterman, 1993), and such happiness is not easily attained because it required significant amount of leisure and luck (Bauer et al., 2005). While hedonic well-being focuses on pleasure and pain avoidance, eudaimonic well-being focuses on meaning in life and self-actualization.

Waterman (1993) stated that, whereas the hedonic well-being refers to subjective judgment of happiness, the eudaimonic well-being calls upon people to live in accordance with their *daimon*, or true self. The *daimon* refers to "those potentialities of each person, the realization of which represents the greatest fulfillment in living of which each is capable" (p. 678). The *daimon* is a perfection toward which one strives, and therefore it can give meaning and direction to one's life. Eudaimonia is a condition of making efforts to live in accordance with the *daimon* and realizing those potentials (self-actualization). Eudaimonia occurs when people's life activities are most congruent and are fully engaged. Under such circumstances, people would experience *personal expressiveness*. Personal expressiveness refers to feelings of intensely alive and authentic, existing as who they really are. Empirically, he found strong correlation between

personal expressiveness and hedonic pleasure, but they were indicative of distinct types of activity. While hedonic pleasure was correlated with higher levels of positive affect than personal expressiveness, eudaimonic activity was correlated with higher levels of personal expressiveness than positive affect.

Six principles of eudaimonic well-being. In his review of developmental, humanistic, and clinical psychology, Ryff (1989) presented a model of eudaimonic well-being with six principles: self-acceptance, positive relation with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth.

Self-acceptance. Self-acceptance is defined as "positive evaluations of oneself and one's past" (Ryff & Keyes, 1995, p. 720). Ryff (1989) indicates that the principle of self-acceptance is a central feature of mental health, hence, "holding positive attitudes toward oneself emerges as a central characteristic of positive psychological functioning" (p. 1071).

Positive relation with others. Positive relation with others involves "developing and maintaining warm and trusting relations with others, demonstrating a capacity for affection, empathy, and intimacy, and showing concern for others' welfare" (Grant, Langan-Fox, & Anglim, 2009, p. 205). Ryff (1989) suggests that the ability to love is a central component of mental health, and those who have stronger self-actualization show stronger feelings of empathy and affection for human beings and capability of greater love, deeper friendship, and more complete identification with others.

Autonomy. Autonomy refers to sense of authority, self-determination, independence, internal locus of evaluation, individuation, and internal regulation of

behavior (Grant et al., 2009; Ryff 1989), and it involves “evaluating oneself according to self-imposed criteria rather than looking for social approval” (Grant et al., 2009, p. 207).

Environmental mastery. Environmental mastery refers to one’s ability to manage effectively one’s life and surrounding world (Ryff & Keyes, 1995). The concept of environmental mastery came from studies on aging and maturity. Maturity requires participation in a significant sphere of activity outside of self, and successful aging involves taking advantages of environmental opportunities (Ryff, 1989). This perspective suggest that “active participation in and mastery of the environment are important ingredients of an integrated framework of positive psychological functioning” (Ryff, 1989, p. 1071).

Purpose in life. Purpose in life refers to “the belief that one’s life is purposeful and meaningful” (Ryff & Keyes, 1995, p. 720). This belief involves one’s past and present life, its purpose, a sense of directedness, and intentionality (Grant et al., 2009; Ryff, 1989). Ryff (1989) stated that one who shows positive psychological functioning would have goals, intentions, and a sense of direction in his/her life, all of which contribute to the feeling that life is meaningful.

Personal growth. Finally, personal growth is defined as “a sense of continued growth and development as a person” (Ryff & Keyes, 1995, p.720). Ryff (1989) suggests that positive psychological functioning requires that one continues to develop his/her potential, make the most of one’s skills, and try to reach his/her full potential. Therefore, continued personal growth and self-realization is a prominent component of psychological well-being.

Social Well-Being

Whereas eudaimonic well-being is conceptualized as a primarily private phenomenon that is focused on individual lives, social well-being represents primarily public phenomena that is focused on social lives (Gallagher et al., 2009). Social well-being is often considered to be a part of eudaimonic aspects of well-being (Joshani & Ghaderi, 2009). However, study by Gallagher, Lopez, and Preacher (2009) suggested that the distinction between eudaimonic well-being (Ryff, 1989) and social-well being (Keyes, 1998) is meaningful.

Keyes (1998) developed the concept of social well-being. He states that the self is both a public process and a private product, and it characterizes people as "either attentive to situational or internal exigencies and information" (p. 121). Role theories focus on the ways in which people manage strains and incongruities between personal and social expectations. The private and the public sides of self and life are both potential sources of life. Although hedonic and eudaimonic theories of well-being emphasize private features of well-being, individuals remain embedded in social communities and structures. Keyes suggested that, to understand mental health, investigation of adults' social well-being is necessary.

Five principles of social well-being. Keyes (1998) proposed five dimensions of social well-being: social integration, social contribution, social coherence, social actualization, and social acceptance. Social well-being is "the appraisal of one's circumstance and functioning in society" (p. 122). The following five principles represent social challenges that constitute possible dimensions of social wellness.

Social integration. Social integration is "the evaluation of the quality of one's relationship to society and community" (p. 122). This concept is built on assumption that healthy individuals feel connected to the society and community. Social integration

therefore examines the degree of which individuals see things in common in the society and which they feel that they belong to the community.

Social contribution. Social contribution is defined as the evaluation of one's social value including the belief that s/he is a vital member of society giving something of value to the world. Social contribution resembles self-efficacy and social responsibility. Self-efficacy is the belief that one can perform certain behavior to accomplish specific objectives. Social responsibility is "the designation of personal obligations that ostensibly contribute to society" (p. 122).

Social coherence. Social coherence is care and understanding of the society. In other words, social coherence is the ability and desire to make sense of life. Individuals with greater social coherence would care about the kind of world in which they live, and also feel that they can understand what is happening around them. Social coherence examines how much the individual view the meaning in his/her life.

Social actualization. Social actualization refers to the ability to recognize society's potential and trajectory. This is based on the concept that healthy people are hopeful about the condition and future of society in which they live.

Social acceptance. Finally, social acceptance is "the construal of society through the character and qualities of other people as a generalized category" (p. 122). This indicates the ability of trusting others. Individuals with greater social acceptance would be able to trust others, would hold favorable views of human nature, and would feel comfortable with others. Social acceptance also includes the concept of accepting both the good and the bad in self and in society.

The Present Study

The present study will examine the relationship of a dialectical self with hedonic, eudaimonic, and social well-being. It will build upon previous research on the dialectical self by examining its relationship with all of the three types of well-being. Although previous studies have shown that the dialectical self is associated with lower levels of well-being (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2004), such studies have only tapped into the hedonic or subjective elements of well-being. Considering other previous findings including a strong consistency in sense of self over time among individuals with a greater dialectical sense of self (English & Chen, 2007), it is possible that the relationship between dialectical self and well-being varies across different perspectives on well-being. All previous research have also examined cross-cultural differences in dialecticism indicating that Easterners tended to have a more dialectical self than Westerners; however Spencer-Rodgers et al. (2010) have shown that the dialectical self mediated the effect of cultural differences on emotional complexity. Thus, the concept itself can be examined independently of cultural differences. In the present study, the dialectical self will be treated as an individual difference variable. The followings are the predictions about the relationship between dialectical self and each element of well-being.

Dialectical Self and Hedonic Well-being

Hypothesis 111 (dialectical self and life satisfaction). Individuals with a greater sense of dialectical self are predicted to report lower levels of life satisfaction. In the present study, the Dialectical Self Scale (DSS; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2008) will be used to measure the degree of dialecticism in each participant's sense of self and life satisfaction measured using the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) will be used. Previous

research showed a negative correlation between dialectal cultures and life satisfaction (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2004), using the same scales for both dialectical self and life satisfaction.

Hypothesis H2 (dialectical self and positive affect). Individuals with greater levels of dialectical self will report experiencing less positive emotions. The Positive and Negative Affectivity Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) will be used to measure the degree of both positive effect and negative effect. Previous research have revealed that individuals from dialectical cultures show less agreement with positive statements and use positive statements less often when describing the self (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2004). Considering the acceptance of contradiction and change in life in naïve dialecticism, individuals that follow this philosophy may present emotions that are less extreme. Thus, dialectical individuals would report less positive effect.

Hypothesis H3 (dialectical self and negative affect). Individuals with a greater sense of dialectical self will report experiencing more negative emotions. Previous research showed that individuals with a greater dialectical sense of self are more emotionally complex; they present both positive and negative emotions at the same time (Miyamoto et al., 2010; Spencer-Rodgers et al., (2010). In other words, dialectical individuals are more likely to feel some degree of negative emotions regardless of degree of positive affect present. Thus, dialectical individuals would more likely to report more negative effect.

Dialectical Self and Eudaimonic Well-Being

Hypothesis E1 (dialectical self and self-acceptance). Individuals with a greater sense of dialectical self will report more self-acceptance. In the present study, all six principles of eudaimonic well-being will be measured using the Scale of Psychological Well-being (Ryff, 1989). The emphasis of self-acceptance is on positive evaluation on the self. Considering that

dialectical self is associated with emotional complexity (Miyamoto et al., 2010; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2010), dialectical individuals may evaluate themselves in a more complex way, including negative aspects. However, English and Chen (2007) have shown that dialectical individuals have a strong stability in the sense of self over time. This suggests that dialectical individuals would hold some positive evaluation of themselves regardless of situations.

Hypothesis E2 (dialectical self and positive relation with others). Individuals with a greater dialectical sense of self will score higher on positive relation with others. The principle of positive relation refers to ability to love (Ryff, 1989); its emphasis is on ability to develop and maintain warm and trusting relationships. Dialectical self is associated with acceptance and tolerance of change and contradiction. One of the challenges in human relationships is that people keep changing. Dialectical individuals would be able to perceive the change in others and in selves more positively. The ability to accept and tolerate contradiction would also help maintain relationships.

Hypothesis E3 (dialectical self and autonomy). More dialectical individuals will show lower levels of autonomy. Christopher (1999) criticizes that the principle of autonomy is strictly based on a synthesis-oriented perspective in that its focus is on individualism. Holism, one of the three principles of naïve dialecticism, views and understands interconnectiveness which is opposite to individualism. The theory of holism also states that nothing is independent (Peng & Nisbett, 1999). Thus, dialectical individuals would have a lower sense of autonomy.

Hypothesis E4 (dialectical self and environmental mastery). Individuals with higher sense of dialectical self will show greater environmental mastery. Environmental mastery concerns one's ability to manage external factors in life. Its focus is on maturity, participation in activity outside of the self, and ability to take advantage of environmental opportunities. High

recognition, acceptance, and tolerance of change and contradiction in naïve dialecticism would help one accept and work with the environment and society.

Hypothesis E5 (dialectical self and purpose in life). Individuals with a greater sense of dialectical self will present higher levels of purpose in life. The principle of purpose in life requires having a concrete view of meaning in life and a sense of directedness. Considering that dialectical individuals would have a more realistic view of self, society, and life, they may also have more concrete, obtainable goals in life. By having more realistic goals, more dialectical individuals may have concrete plans to reach each goal, and therefore their lives would be more purposeful and meaningful.

Hypothesis E6 (dialectical self and personal growth). Individuals with a greater dialectical self will present greater personal growth. Human growth involves positive changes in life. In order for one to make a positive change, s/he has to first recognize and accept problems. The theory of change and theory of contradiction emphasizes that dialectical individuals have greater ability to accept and tolerate changes and contradictions in life and in self. This ability would be very helpful in the course of positive change. Thus, more dialectical individuals would show greater personal growth.

Dialectical Self and Social Well-Being

Hypothesis S1 (dialectical self and social integration). Individuals with a greater sense of dialectical self will present higher levels of social integration. The concept of social integration is built on the belief that healthy individuals feel connected to the society and community. The theory of holism emphasizes interconnectedness. Holistic persons may have ability to recognize and accept coexisting attributes in society and life even when they are not

agreeing with each other, as such dialectical self would be associated with connection between self and society.

Hypothesis S2 (dialectical self and social contribution). Individuals with a greater dialectical sense of self will report a greater sense of social contribution. Social contribution focuses on the responsibility that one takes in society. Dialectical individuals can recognize and accept both the positive and the negative in life regardless of situations. This ability would increase one's sense of responsibility in daily lives. Previous study has shown that dialectical individuals showed emotional complexity in both positive and negative situations whereas other populations showed emotional complexity only in negative situations (Miyamoto et al., 2010), which suggests the ability of dialectical individuals to recognize not only strengths but also deficits in self and in life, and to take societal responsibility in both positive and negative situations.

Hypothesis S3 (dialectical self and social coherence). More dialectical individuals will present higher levels of social coherence. Social coherence examines the ability to make sense of life. English and Chen (2007) have shown that dialectical self is associated with high over-time consistency of the sense of self. This suggests that dialectical individuals would have ability to accept and understand the reality regardless of the situation.

Hypothesis S4 (dialectical self and social actualization). Individuals with a greater dialectical self will report more complex sense of social actualization, indicating less optimism about society. The concept of social actualization concerns hope for the conditions and future of society. Considering the nature of naïve dialecticism which accepts both positive and negative in reality, non-dialectical individuals may lean more toward positive-only view of the conditions

and future of society whereas dialectical individuals may recognize and accept both positive and negative conditions and future of society.

Hypothesis S5 (dialectical self and social acceptance). Individuals with a greater sense of dialectical self will present greater social acceptance. Social acceptance focuses on acceptance of the external. Dialectical individuals would have greater acceptance of reality regardless of the situation because of their ability to accept and tolerate both positive and negative attributes in life. Thus, individuals with a greater dialectical self would report more social acceptance.

Overall, the predictions above indicate that dialectical self may have different relationships with various types of well-being. Although previous research has shown that a dialectical self is associated with lower levels of self-esteem and life satisfaction (Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2004), many of the elements of eudaimonic and social well-being may be positively correlated with dialectical self.

Method

Participants

Participants will be students at Eastern Illinois University and University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana. At an alpha level of .05, a desired power of .80, and anticipated medium effect size, at least 53 participants is required (Green, 1991); however, at least 150 participants will be recruited to increase power and allow for a more stringent alpha if necessary. Students may or may not receive extra credit for their participation. The selection of participants will be neither gender specific nor race specific. Ideally, the population of the participants will diverse in age, gender, race, and field of study.

Measures

Dialectical self. Dialectical self will be measured using the Dialectical Self Scale (DSS; Spencer-Rodgers et al., 2007). The DSS consists of 14 items on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale assessing the degree of dialecticism in one's sense of self. The 14 items are divided into three categories: contradiction (e.g., "When I hear two sides of an argument, I often agree with both"), cognitive change (e.g., "I often find that my beliefs and attitudes will change under different contexts"), and behavioral change (e.g., "I often change the way I am, depending on who I am with"). The category of contradiction looks at the degree of tolerance and acceptance of contradiction in self. Cognitive change looks at the individual's tendency and tolerance of cognitive change depending on different situations. Behavioral change looks at the individual's tolerance and tendency of behavioral change depending on different situations. The overall score for dialectical self will be obtained by averaging across items. Thus, the possible score range will be 1 to 7, and the higher the score, the more dialectical the person.

Hedonic well-being. Life satisfaction will be assessed using the five-item the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985) on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale. This scale measures how much the individual is satisfied with his/her life at the current moment. An example of an item is: "In most ways my life is closer to my ideal." The overall score for life satisfaction will be obtained by averaging across items. Thus, the possible score range will be 1 to 7, and the higher the score, the more satisfied the individual is with his/her life.

Positive and negative affect will be measured using the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Participants will rate the extent to which they generally feel 10 positive emotions (confident, content, calm, proud, bold, satisfied, pleased,

energetic, happy, and interested) and 10 negative emotions (sad, tired, bored, upset, disappointed, nervous, insecure, ashamed, angry, and embarrassed). The PANAS uses the following scale: 1: Very slightly or not at all, 2: A little, 3: Moderately, 4: Quite a bit, and 5: Extremely. Subscale scores for each, positive and negative affect, will be obtained by averaging the item scores. Thus, the possible range of scores for each subscale is 1 to 5, and the higher the score, the more positive/negative the individual's emotions are.

Eudaimonic well-being. All six principles of eudaimonic well-being will be measured using the 42-item version of the Scale of Psychological Well-being (Ryff, 1989), with seven items per principle. Participants will rate their agreement with a series of statements using a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale. Examples of items include: "I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most other people" (autonomy) and "Most people see me as loving and affectionate" (positive relations with others). Negatively worded items will be reverse coded prior to all analysis. The overall score for each principle of eudaimonic well-being will be obtained by averaging the ratings on each subscale. Thus, the possible score range will be 1 to 7 for each principle, and the higher the score, the higher the principle applies to the individual.

Social well-being. All five principles of social well-being will be measured using the 32-item version of Keyes's (1998) measure of social well-being. Each principle will be measured with five to seven items on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) scale. Examples of items include: "You feel like you're an important part of your community" (social integration) and "You think you have something valuable to give to the world" (social contribution). Negatively worded items will be reverse coded prior to all analysis. The subscale score for each principle of social well-being will be obtained by averaging across items. Thus, the possible score range will

be 1 to 7, and the higher the score, the higher sense of the principle (e.g., an individual who scored 7 on social coherence would have greater care and understanding of society).

Procedure

All participants will be provided with a brief description of the research project and then will complete a packet of questionnaires. Participants will be seated in a classroom when taking the survey. They will then be handed our informed consent and will be asked to sign it before they will receive a packet of questionnaires. Participants will have an opportunity to ask questions and/or withdraw from the research during the process. A packet consists of demographic information, the Satisfaction with Life Scale, the PANAS, the Scale of Psychological Well-Being, Keyes's (1989) measure of social well-being, and the DSS. The order of the questionnaires will be counter-balanced. After each participant completes the packet, as s/he turns it in, s/he will receive a debriefing.

Analysis

A Pearson's r test will be conducted for each element of well-being to measure the correlation between dialectical self and the principle (e.g., correlation between the DSS and the Satisfaction with Life Scale). Thus, 14 sets of Pearson's r tests (three principles for hedonic well-being, six principles for eudaimonic well-being, and five principles for social well-being) will be conducted.

References

The following resources were used to define the sense of self:

- Dizen, M. & Berenbaum, H. (2011). Cognitive correlates of emotional traits: Perceptions of self and others. *Emotion, 11*(1), 115-126.
- Flory, J. M. & Ickes, W. (2007). Having a weak versus strong sense of self: The sense of self scale (SOSS). *Self and Identity, 6*, 281-303.
- Heine, S. J., & Hamamura, T. (2007). In search of East Asian self-enhancement. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 11*(1), 4-27.
- Heine, S. J., & Lehman, D. R. (1999). Culture, self-discrepancies, and self-satisfaction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(8), 915-925.
- MacInnes, D. L. (2006). Self-esteem and self-acceptance: An examination into their relationship and their effect on psychological health. *Journal of Psychiatric and Mental Health Nursing, 13*, 483-489.
- Stevenson, A., Elliott, J. & Jones, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Little Oxford English Dictionary* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

The following resources were used to explain a dialectical self:

- Peng, K., & Nisbett, R. E. (1999). Culture, dialectics, and reasoning about contradiction. *American Psychologist, 54*(9), 741-754.
- Spencer-Rodgers, J., Boucher, H. C., Mori, S. C., Wang, F., & Peng, K. (2009). The dialectical self-concept: Contradiction, change, and holism in East Asian cultures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(1), 29-44.

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Peng, K., Wang, L., & Hou, Y. (2004). Dialectical self-esteem and East-West differences in psychological well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(11), 1416-1432.

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Williams, M. J., & Peng, K. (2010). Cultural differences in expectations of change and tolerance for contradiction: A decade of empirical research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 14(3), 296-312.

The following resources were used to examine the relationship between dialectical self and emotional complexity:

Bagozzi, R., Wong, N., & Yi, Y. (1999). The role of culture and the relationship between positive and negative affect. *Cognition and Emotion*, 13(6), 641-672.

Cacioppo, J. T. & Bersohn, G. G. (1994). Relationship between attitudes and evaluative space: A critical review, with emphasis on the separability of positive and negative substrates. *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(3), 401-423.

Dicner, E. & Iran-Nejad, A. (1986). The relationship in experience between various types of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 1031-1038.

Green, D. P., Goldman, S. L., & Salovey, P. (1993). Measurement errors masks bipolarity in affect ratings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(6), 1029-1041.

Kitayama, S., Markus, H. R., Kurosawa, M. (2000). Culture, emotion, and well-being: Good feelings in Japan and the United States. *Cognition and Emotion*, 14(1), 93-124.

Larsen, J. T., McGraw, A. P., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2001). Can people feel happy and sad at the same time? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 684-696.

Miyamoto, Y., Uchida, Y., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2010). Culture and mixed emotions: Co-occurrence of positive and negative emotions in Japan and the United States. *Emotion, 10*(3), 404-415.

Russell, J. A. (1980). A circumplex model of affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 1161-1178.

Schirmack, U., Oishi, S., & Diener, E. (2002). Cultural influences on the relation between pleasant emotions and unpleasant emotions: Asian dialectic philosophies or individualism-collectivism? *Cognition and Emotion, 16*(6), 705-719.

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Williams, M. J., & Peng, K. (2010). Cultural differences in expectations of change and tolerance for contradiction: A decade of empirical research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*(3), 296-312.

The following resources were used to examine the relationship between a dialectical self and well-being:

English, T. & Chen, S. (2007). Culture and self-concept stability: Consistency across and within contexts among Asian Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93*(3), 478-490.

Kini, Y., Peng, S., & Chiu, C. (2008). Explaining self-esteem differences between Chinese and North Americans: Dialectical self (vs. self-consistency) or lack of positive self-regard. *Self and Identity, 7*, 113-128.

Sanchez, D. T., Shih, M., & Garcia, J. A. (2009). Juggling multiple racial identities: Malleable racial identification and psychological well-being. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15*(3), 243-254.

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Peng, K., Wang, L., & Hou, Y. (2004). Dialectical self-esteem and East-West differences in psychological well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(11), 1416-1432.

The following resources were used to explain well-being:

Bauer, J. J., McAdams, D. P., & Samuels, A. R. (2005). Interpreting the good life: Growth memories in the lives of mature, happy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 203-217.

Christopher, J. C. (1999). Situating psychological well-being: Exploring the cultural roots of its theory and research. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 77, 141-152.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542-575.

Diener, E. (2009). Conclusion: The well-being science needed now. In Diener, E. (Ed.) *The science of well-being: The collected works of Ed Diener* (pp. 267-271). New York, NY: Springer Science + Business Media.

Gallagher, M. W., Lopez, S. J., & Preacher, K. J. (2009). The hierarchical structure of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 77(4), 1025-1049.

Josh, ando, M. & Ghaddi, G. (2009). Value priorities as predictors of hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 294-298.

Keyes C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(2), 121-140.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1009-1081.

Sue, D. W. & Sue, D. (2008). *Counseling the culturally diverse: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

The following resources were used to define hedonic well-being:

Christopher, J. C. (1999). Situating psychological well-being: Exploring the cultural roots of its theory and research. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 77, 141-152.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin*, 95(3), 542-575.

Joshanloo, M. & Ghaedi, G. (2009). Value priorities as predictors of hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 294-298.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.

Stevenson, A., Elliou, J. & Jones, R. (Eds.). (2002). *Little Oxford English Dictionary* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press, Inc.

The following resources were used to define eudaimonic well-being:

Bauer, J. J., McAdams, D. P., & Sarnaeda, A. R. (2005). Interpreting the good life: Growth memories in the lives of mature, happy people. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88(1), 203-217.

Grant, S., Langan-Fox, J. & Anglim, J. (2009). The big five traits as predictors of subjective and psychological well-being. *Psychological Reports*, 105, 205-231.

- Huta, V. (2007). Pursuing pleasure versus growth and excellence: Links with different aspects of well-being. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68(1), 649B. (UMI No. AA0621656).
- Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141-166.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.
- Ryff, C. D. & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being, revised. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.
- Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B. H. (2006). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 13-39.
- Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64(4), 678-691.

The following resources were used to define social well-being:

- Gallagher, M. W., Lopez, S. J., & Preacher, K. J. (2009). The hierarchical structure of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 77(4), 1025-1049.
- Joshanloo, M. & Ghaedi, G. (2009). Value priorities as predictors of hedonic and eudaimonic aspects of well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47, 294-298.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(2), 121-140.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.

The following resources were used to explain the method of this study:

Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71-75.

Green, S. B. (1991). How many subjects does it take to do a regression analysis? *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 26(3), 499-510.

Keyes C. L. M. (1998). Social well-being. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 61(2), 121-140.

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.

Spencer-Rodgers, J., Srivastava, S., Boucher, H. C., English, T., Palciz, S. B., & Peng, K. (2007). [The dialectical self scale.] Unpublished data.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measurement of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(6), 1063-1070.

Appendix A

Demographic Information

Age: _____

Gender: male or female

Year in school: 1) Freshman 2) Sophomore 3) Junior 4) Senior 5) Graduate

Ethnicity: 1) White/Caucasian 2) Black/African-American 3) Hispanic/Latino(a)

4) Native American 5) Asian 6) Multi-ethnic 7) Other: _____

Culture you grew up in: 1) White/Caucasian 2) Black/African-American 3) Hispanic/Latino(a)

4) Native American 5) Asian 6) Multi-ethnic 7) Other: _____

Academic major: _____

Religious affiliation: _____

Hometown: _____

Appendix B

The Dialectical Self Scale

Instructions

Listed below are a number of statements about your thoughts, feelings, and behaviors. Select the number that best matches your agreement or disagreement with each statement. Use the following scale, which ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). There are no right or wrong answers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree			Strongly agree

- _____ 1. I am the same around my family as I am around my friends.
- _____ 2. When I hear two sides of an argument, I often agree with both.
- _____ 3. I believe my habits are hard to change.
- _____ 4. I believe my personality will stay the same all of my life.
- _____ 5. I often change the way I am, depending on who I am with.
- _____ 6. I often find that things will contradict with each other.
- _____ 7. If I've made up my mind about something, I stick to it.
- _____ 8. I have a definite set of beliefs, which guide my behavior at all times.
- _____ 9. I have a strong sense of who I am and don't change my views when others disagree with me.
- _____ 10. The way I behave usually has more to do with immediate circumstances than with my personal preferences.
- _____ 11. My outward behaviors reflect my true thoughts and feelings.
- _____ 12. I sometimes believe two things that contradict each other.
- _____ 13. I often find that my belief and attitudes will change under different contexts.
- _____ 14. I find that my values and beliefs will change depending on who I am with.

- _____ 15. My world is full of contradictions that cannot be resolved.
- _____ 16. I am constantly changing and am different from one time to the next.
- _____ 17. I usually behave according to my principles.
- _____ 18. I prefer to compromise than to hold on to a set of beliefs.
- _____ 19. I can never know for certain that any one thing is true.
- _____ 20. If there are two opposing sides to an argument, they cannot be both true.
- _____ 21. My core beliefs don't change much over time.
- _____ 22. Believing two things that contradict each other is illogical.
- _____ 23. I sometimes find that I am a different person by the evening than I was in the morning.
- _____ 24. I find that if I look hard enough, I can figure out which side of a controversial issue is right.
- _____ 25. For most important issues, there is one right answer.
- _____ 26. I find that my world is relatively stable and consistent.
- _____ 27. When two sides disagree, the truth is always somewhere in the middle.
- _____ 28. When I am solving a problem, I focus on finding the truth.
- _____ 29. If I think I am right, I am willing to fight to the end.
- _____ 30. I have a hard time making up my mind about controversial issues.
- _____ 31. When two of my friends disagree, I usually have a hard time deciding which of them is right.
- _____ 32. There are always two sides to everything, depending on how you look at it.

Appendix C

The Satisfaction with Life Scale

DIRECTIONS: Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1-7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by placing the appropriate number in the line preceding that item. Please be open and honest in your responding.

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Slightly Disagree
- 4 = Neither Agree or Disagree
- 5 = Slightly Agree
- 6 = Agree
- 7 = Strongly Agree

- _____ 1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.
- _____ 2. The conditions of my life are excellent.
- _____ 3. I am satisfied with life.
- _____ 4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.
- _____ 5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.

Appendix D

The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you generally feel this way, that is, how you feel on average. Use the following scale to record your answers:

1	2	3	4	5
very slightly or not at all	a little	moderately	quite a bit	extremely
☐ interested				☐ irritable
☐ distressed				☐ alert
☐ excited				☐ ashamed
☐ upset				☐ inspired
☐ strong				☐ nervous
☐ guilty				☐ determined
☐ scared				☐ attentive
☐ hostile				☐ jittery
☐ enthusiastic				☐ active
☐ proud				☐ afraid

Appendix E

The Scale of Psychological Well-being

The following set of questions deals with how you feel about yourself and your life. Please remember that there are no right or wrong answers.

Circle the number that best describes your present agreement or disagreement with each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree
1. Most people see me as loving and affectionate.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. In general, I feel I am in charge of the situation in which I live.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I am not interested in activities that will expand my horizons.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. When I look at the story of my life, I am pleased with how things have turned out.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Maintaining close relationships has been difficult and frustrating for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I am not afraid to voice my opinions, even when they are in opposition to the opinions of most people.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The demands of everyday life often get me down.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I live life one day at a time and don't really think about the future.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. In general, I feel confident and positive about myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I often feel lonely because I have few close friends with whom to share my concerns.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. My decisions are not usually influenced by what everyone else is doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. I do not fit very well with the people and the community around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. I tend to focus on the present, because the future nearly always brings me problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. I feel like many of the people I know have gotten more out of life than I have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I enjoy personal and mutual conversations with family members or friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Circle the number that best describes your personal agreement or disagreement with each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree
16. I tend to worry about what other people think of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I am quite good at managing the many responsibilities of my daily life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I don't want to try new ways of doing things - my life is fine the way it is.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Being happy with myself is more important to me than having other people approve of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. I often feel overwhelmed by my responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I think it is important to have new experiences that challenge how you think about yourself and the world.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. My daily activities often seem trivial and unimportant to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23. I like most aspects of my personality.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24. I don't have many people who want to listen when I need to talk.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25. I tend to be influenced by people with strong opinions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26. When I think about it, I haven't really improved much as a person over the years.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27. I don't have a good sense of what it is I'm trying to accomplish in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28. I made some mistakes in the past, but I feel that all in all everything has worked out for the best.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29. I generally do a good job of taking care of my personal finances and affairs.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30. I used to set goals for myself, but that now seems like a waste of time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31. In many ways, I feel disappointed about my achievements in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. It seems to me that most other people have more friends than I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Circle the number that best describes your present agreement or disagreement with each statement.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree
33. I enjoy making plans for the future and working to make them a reality.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. People would describe me as a giving person, willing to share my time with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. I have confidence in my opinions, even if they are contrary to the general consensus.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. I am good at juggling my time so that I can fit everything in that needs to be done.	1	2	3	4	5	6
37. I have a sense that I have developed a lot as a person over time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. I am an active person in carrying out the plans I set for myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. I have not experienced many warm and trusting relationships with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. It's difficult for me to voice my own opinions on controversial matters.	1	2	3	4	5	6
41. I do not enjoy being in new situations that require me to change my old familiar ways of doing things.	1	2	3	4	5	6
42. Some people wander aimlessly through life, but I am not one of them.	1	2	3	4	5	6
43. My attitude about myself is probably not as positive as most people feel about themselves.	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. I often change my mind about decisions if my friends or family disagree.	1	2	3	4	5	6
45. For me, life has been a continuous process of learning, changing, and growth.	1	2	3	4	5	6
46. I sometimes feel as if I've done all there is to do in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
47. I know that I can trust my friends, and they know they can trust me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix F

Measure of Social Well-Being

Below are statements of your feelings about yourself and your life. Select the number that best matches your agreement or disagreement with each statement. Use the following scale, which ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). There are no right or wrong answers.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree			Neither agree nor disagree			Strongly agree

- _____ 1. You don't feel I belong to anything you'd call a community.
- _____ 2. The world is too complex for you.
- _____ 3. Your behavior has some impact on other people in your community.
- _____ 4. You think you have something valuable to give to the world.
- _____ 5. You believe that society has stopped making progress.
- _____ 6. You think that other people are unreliable.
- _____ 7. Society isn't improving for people like you.
- _____ 8. You believe that people are kind.
- _____ 9. Scientists are the only people who can understand how the world works.
- _____ 10. You cannot make sense of what's going on in the world.
- _____ 11. You feel like you're an important part of your community.
- _____ 12. Most cultures are so strange that you cannot understand them.
- _____ 13. If you had something to say, you believe people in your community would listen to you.
- _____ 14. You believe that people are self-centered.
- _____ 15. You don't think social institutions like law and government make your life better.
- _____ 16. You think it's worthwhile to understand the world you live in.

- _____17. You see society as continually evolving.
- _____18. You think our society is a productive place for people to live in.
- _____19. You feel that people are not trustworthy.
- _____20. You feel close to other people in your community.
- _____21. You see your community as a source of comfort.
- _____22. You think that people live only for themselves.
- _____23. Your daily activities do not produce anything worthwhile for your community.
- _____24. For you there's no such thing as social progress.
- _____25. You don't have the time or energy to give anything to your community.
- _____26. You believe that people are more and more dishonest these days.
- _____27. You think that your work provides an important product for society.
- _____28. If you had something to say, you don't think your community would take you seriously.
- _____29. You think the world is becoming a better place for everyone.
- _____30. You think that people care about other people's problems.
- _____31. You feel you have nothing important to contribute to society.
- _____32. You believe other people in society value you as a person.