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Abstract

Am I committed or conflicted? Examining implications of self-concept structure for self-regulation, well-being, and performance

Author: Nicholas Aaron Moon
Advisor: Patrick D. Converse, Ph.D.

Although research on self-concept is extensive, few studies have examined the relationship between specific aspects of self-concept structure (e.g., self-concept clarity) and self-regulation constructs (e.g., goal commitment). In addition, research has linked aspects of self-concept structure with well-being outcomes, but less is known about the mechanisms involved in these relationships. This research addresses these two issues by examining self-concept structure (self-concept clarity and self-concept differentiation) as antecedents of key self-regulatory mechanisms (goal commitment and goal conflict) and how these linkages may help explain connections between self-concept structure and well-being and performance. More specifically, two studies examined these relationships, with Study 1 investigating these variables in individuals’ lives in general and Study 2 focusing on these variables in the work context. Regarding self-regulatory mechanisms, SCC was related to goal commitment and SCD was related to both goal commitment and goal conflict. For psychological well-being, SCC was related to eudaimonic, hedonic, and work engagement, whereas SCD was related to eudaimonic and hedonic well-being. In addition, goal commitment was related to work engagement
and goal conflict was related to eudaimonic well-being and positive affect. Finally, for performance-related outcomes, SCC was positively related to in-role job performance. In addition, goal commitment was related to goal progress and in-role job performance. However, results for the indirect effects were mixed. Taken together, these results suggest that aspects of self-concept structure may have notable implications for self-regulatory mechanisms, psychological well-being, and performance outcomes.
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Introduction

The self-concept is one of the most studied issues in psychology, spanning across multiple sub-disciplines. The self-concept has been conceptualized in several ways but typically involves answers to questions such as “Who am I?” and “How do I feel about myself?” (Campbell et al., 2003). A variety of perspectives are taken when examining the self-concept, including social identity theory (e.g., Ashforth & Mael, 1989), individual differences (e.g., core self-evaluations; Judge et al., 1998), cognitive schemas (Campbell et al., 1996; Campbell et al., 2000), and organizational identification (e.g., Cooper & Thatcher, 2010). The substantial and sustained theoretical and empirical attention the self-concept has received likely stems in part from the notion that it plays an important role in several aspects of life. Indeed, research has linked aspects of the self-concept with job performance (e.g., Kacmar et al., 2009), negative affect and positive affect (e.g., Tsaousis et al., 2007), grit (Wong & Vallacher, 2017), and psychological adjustment (Bigler et al., 2001).

The self-concept is conceptualized as dynamic and multifaceted (Campbell et al., 2003). One way to organize the major components of the self-concept is in terms of self-concept content and self-concept structure (Campbell et al., 2003). Campbell et al. (1996) outline two aspects of the contents of self-concept: knowledge components and evaluative components. Knowledge components involve defining “Who/what am I?” and evaluative components involve “How do I feel about myself?”. Self-concept structure then involves how self-concept content is organized. For example, researchers have proposed constructs such as self-complexity involving multiple cognitive categories or “self-aspects” (Linville, 1985), self-concept clarity (SCC) involving the self being “clearly and confidently defined, internally consistent, and temporally stable” (Campbell et al., 1996, p. 141), and self-concept differentiation (SCD) involving the degree to
which individuals see themselves having different personality characteristics in diverse social roles (Donahue et al., 1993).

A majority of research has focused on self-concept contents, such as self-perception, self-esteem, and core-self evaluations (Keith & Bracken, 1996; Judge et al., 2003). Although growing, less research has been conducted on the structural components of the self-concept and how these components impact outcomes, especially in organizational literature (Brown & Zeigler-Hill, 2018; Spain & Kim, 2017). There are, however, conceptual and empirical reasons to propose that aspects of self-concept structure may have meaningful implications for achievement and well-being. In particular, two lines of theory and research point to a potential role for aspects of self-concept structure in these contexts. However, these lines of work have yet to be integrated to fully explore these potential implications.

First, several theoretical models have linked the self-concept in general with self-regulation. For instance, in Control Theory (Carver & Scheier, 2002), the highest level of the goal hierarchy contains the global sense of idealized self, where self-regulation occurs with values that direct goals at lower levels. Additionally, Self-Discrepancy Theory (Higgins, 1989) considers how personal standards (i.e., goals) that individuals set are in reference to their desired selves. However, little research has examined specific aspects of self-concept structure in particular in the area of self-regulation. Second, previous research has linked aspects of self-concept structure with well-being outcomes. For example, both SCC and SCD have been linked with positive and negative affect (Bigler et al., 2001). However, less is known about the mechanisms involved in these relationships. Given this, the proposed research integrates and extends these two areas by examining (a) how self-concept structure may relate to self-regulatory processes and (b) how these connections may help explain why self-concept structure relates to
well-being and performance. Specifically, this research focuses on SCC (Campbell et al., 1996) and SCD (Donahue et al., 1993) as components of self-concept structure; goal commitment and goal conflict as self-regulatory mechanisms (see Austin & Vancouver, 1996); and goal progress, well-being, job performance, and job engagement as outcomes. In exploring these issues, the proposed research aims to contribute to our understanding of self-concept, self-regulation, achievement, and well-being in four ways.

First, theoretical work has suggested relationships between self-concept and goals (e.g., Light 2017). For instance, Light (2017) states three ways that self-concept can impact self-regulation: (1) serving as a measure of the current state, (2) serving as the basis for conceptions of goals, and (3) initiating motivational processes. However, limited empirical research has examined the effects of self-concept on self-regulation in general and there appear to be very limited studies on self-concept structure and self-regulation in particular. Recent research has examined the influence of SCC on motivational orientations (Pomerance et al., 2020), but there are very few more-detailed examinations of self-regulatory mechanisms. Thus, the proposed research examines these connections, focusing on SCC, SCD, goal commitment, goal conflict, and goal achievement.

Second, the well-being implications of certain aspects of self-concept structure have been examined. Most of this research has focused on psychological well-being outcomes, such as positive affect, general health, self-esteem, and negative affect (Bigler et al., 2001; Diehl & Hay, 2011; Fukushima & Hosoe, 2011). However, less is known about the explanatory mechanisms involved in these relationships. The proposed research expands on existing studies by examining potential underlying mechanisms in these relationships, focusing on goal-related mechanisms (see Burkley et al., 2015; Pomerance et al., 2020; Wong & Vallacher, 2018)
Third, prior research on self-concept structure and well-being has typically examined positive affect and negative affect (Bigler et al., 2001). This provides an important foundation for understanding the implications of self-concept structure but entails a somewhat limited view of the well-being domain. In particular, researchers have proposed at least three perspectives on well-being: hedonic (e.g., Diener et al., 2018), eudaimonic (e.g., Ryan & Deci, 2001), and most recently psychological richness (Oishi & Westgate, 2021). Hedonic involves feelings of positive affect, life satisfaction, and general happiness (Diener et al., 2018); eudaimonic involves feelings of maximizing potential and optimally functioning (Vittersø, 2016); and psychological richness involves a life that has “variety, interestingness, and perspective change” (Oishi & Westgate, 2021, p. 4). Examining aspects of these three perspectives may provide a broader and more detailed understanding of linkages to well-being. In addition to well-being, there is very limited work examining relationships between aspects of self-concept structure and achievement-related outcomes. However, given potential connections to self-regulatory processes, it seems plausible that aspects of structure will have implications for goal achievement as well. Therefore, the proposed research also examines achievement outcomes.

Finally, very little research has examined these issues in organizational settings. Although similar relationships may hold across domains, this has yet to be explored and there are reasons to think direct examination of this is necessary. For example, moving from a general examination of the focal variables to a domain-specific (work) examination means that the constructs involved will be more domain-specific. SCC, for instance, would involve clarity in terms of work-related self-concept and SCD would involve differentiation across work-related roles (e.g., self as supervisor, peer, subordinate). Previous research does not appear to have examined these more domain-specific constructs and thus the extent to which similar processes
are involved is unclear. The proposed research examines this as well, focusing on work-specific versions of the focal relationships in Study 2.

In summary, the proposed research seeks to contribute to both research and practice related to self-concept, self-regulation, achievement, and well-being. For example, the relationships between self-concept structure and well-being have been established in several studies (e.g., Bigler et al., 2001). However, why self-concept structure relates to well-being has been less developed. Additionally, the relationships between self-regulation and self-concept structure are less understood (Light, 2017); therefore, the purpose of this research is to address these issues in more detail. The following sections discuss these topics. First, self-concept content is discussed, both knowledge and evaluative components. Second, self-concept structure is discussed, focusing on SCC and SCD. Third, goal constructs are discussed, including goal commitment and goal conflict. Fourth, relationships between self-concept structure and goal constructs are discussed. Finally, outcomes related to well-being and achievement are discussed along with how self-concept structure and goal constructs may relate to these outcomes.

**Self-Concept**

Self-concept refers to the “cognitive structures that include content, attitudes, or evaluative judgments and are used to make sense of the world, focus attention on one’s goals, and protect one’s sense of basic worth” (Oyserman et al., 2012, p. 72). The aim behind the self-concept is to provide answers to questions such as “Who am I?” (Oyserman et al., 2012). Researchers have conceptualized self-concept in several ways including in terms of cognition, structure, social aspects, and sociocultural aspects (Oyserman et al., 2012); multiple, context-dependent selves (McConnell, 2011); and within a unified theory of social cognition (Greenwald et al., 2002). These conceptualizations tend to include a few key elements including knowledge about the self and evaluations of the self (i.e., self-concept content), the organization of these
aspects (i.e., self-concept structure), and the notion that self-concept is dynamic and malleable across contexts. The self-concept covers both personal and social identities (e.g., Tajfel, 1981) and essentially forms our own theory of personality and who we are (Markus & Cross, 1990). The self-concept allows for evaluating the current state of knowledge about the self while also organizing experiences, guiding social interactions and motivation, and regulating emotions (Oyserman et al., 2012). The following sections discuss these aspects of self-concept in further detail.

**Self-Concept Contents**

Campbell et al. (1996) outline two aspects of the contents of self-concept: knowledge components and evaluative components. Knowledge components refer to “Who/What am I?”, such as beliefs about specific attributes, roles, values, and personal goals (Campbell et al., 1996, p. 141). Evaluative components include “positivity of specific self-beliefs and self-esteem” (Campbell et al., 1996, p. 141).

**Knowledge Components**

The knowledge components of the self-concept tend to refer to personality traits, characteristics, attributes, values, roles, identity, and membership. The identities that an individual takes from situation to situation play a role in how they think, behave, and feel. Identities refer to “the traits and characteristics, social relations, roles, and social group memberships that define who one is” (Oyserman et al., 2012, p. 69). Together, these identities make up the knowledge components of one’s self-concept. Thus, the knowledge components of self-concept contain these perceived personality and other characteristics, as well as group memberships.
One aspect of these identities is personality, which may include the characteristics in the Five Factor Model (McCrae & Costa, 1999) or the HEXACO (honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience) model (Ashton & Lee, 2008). These two models dominate personality psychology, and they both contain characteristics or traits of individuals, which are labeled extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness to experience under the Five Factor Model (Costa & McCrae, 1992), or honesty-humility, emotionality, extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience under the HEXACO model (Lee & Ashton, 2004). Thus, these represent one set of characteristics that may be contained in an individual’s self-concept (e.g., perceiving oneself as high on conscientiousness and low on openness to experience). Further, researchers have studied the self-concept in other ways, such as self-construal (Cross et al., 2011) and self-schema (Scott et al., 2022). Self-construal refers to the distinctions made between the inner and outer selves, such that independent self-construal focuses on internal traits and characteristics, whereas interdependent self-construal focuses on relationships and group memberships (Cross et al., 2011; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). This captures another component of the self-concept knowledge: roles and social relations. Further, self-schemata are defined as the mental representations of “cognitive generalizations about the self, derived from past experience, that organize and guide the processing of the self-related information contained in the individual’s social experiences” (Markus, 1977, p. 64). Taken together, these aspects of self-concept describe the knowledge components of the self.

**Evaluative Components**

The evaluative component of self-concept usually revolves around two core concepts: self-efficacy and self-esteem. Self-efficacy refers to individuals’ “beliefs about their capabilities
to exercise control over their own level of functioning and over events that affect their lives” (Bandura, 1993, p. 118). Self-efficacy has been very influential in motivation research due to its central role in social-cognitive theory (Bandura, 2001; Bandura, 2015) and control theory (Carver & Scheier, 2002; Vancouver & Day, 2005). Self-esteem refers to “the individual’s positive or negative attitude toward the self as a totality” (Rosenberg et al., 1995, p. 141). Self-esteem has also been studied extensively, with research showing self-esteem is linked with happiness (Diener & Diener, 1995), positive affect (Orth et al., 2012), task persistence (Baumeister et al., 2003), and lower levels of depression (Orth et al., 2009) and negative affect (Orth et al., 2012).

Additionally, recent work by Judge has combined these, along with other characteristics, to propose an overall evaluation, known as core self-evaluations (CSE). CSE are described as traits that meet three criteria: self-evaluative, fundamentality (i.e., core), and scope (i.e., global, broad aspects of the self; Judge et al., 1998). Judge et al. (1998) identified the following traits that met the criteria: self-esteem, self-efficacy, locus of control, and neuroticism. Self-esteem refers to the “basic appraisal people make of themselves” (Judge et al., 1998, p. 18). Self-efficacy, specifically generalized self-efficacy, refers to the estimates of one’s capabilities related to motivation, resources, and action needed for life (Judge et al., 1998). Locus of control refers to the degree to which individuals believe they are in control of the events in their life (Rotter, 1966). Finally, neuroticism refers to the tendency to feel insecure, guilty, or anxious (Costa & McCrae, 1988). Taken together, these traits in combination represent the evaluations that individuals make about themselves. CSE has been positively linked to various outcomes, such as job and life satisfaction (Judge et al., 1998), job performance (Judge & Bono, 2001), and intrinsic work motivation (i.e., experienced meaningfulness and autonomy; Bipp, 2010).
Self-concept contents have been studied in multiple areas within psychology, including social psychology, industrial/organizational psychology, clinical psychology, and personality psychology. The knowledge component of one’s self-concept (e.g., in the form of self-reported personality) has wide-spread implications for subjective well-being (DeNeve & Cooper, 1998), job performance (Barrick & Mount, 1991), coping (Connor-Smith et al., 2007), and job satisfaction (Judge et al., 2001). Further, the evaluative component of one’s self-concept content has implications for life outcomes such as life satisfaction (Lemelle & Scielzo, 2012), work outcomes such as performance (Chang et al., 2012), and overall psychological well-being (Judge et al., 1998).

**Structural Components**

Structural components of self-concept refer to “how the contents are organized” and are “theoretically independent of the contents” (Campbell et al., 2000, p. 68). These structural components are represented by self-concept pluralism (self-complexity and self-compartmentalization) and self-concept unity (SCD, SCC, self-discrepancies, and correlation between self-aspects; Campbell et al., 2003). The current research focuses on SCC and SCD.

**Self-Concept Clarity**

SCC refers to the “extent to which the contents of an individual’s self-concept (e.g., perceived personal attributes) are clearly and confidently defined, internally consistent, and temporally stable.” (Campbell et al., 1996, p. 141). In essence, those who are high in SCC are considered to have a self-concept that is unambiguous, such that they will not have difficulty in identifying the contents of who they are (e.g., personality, value, or opinion). Further, those with high SCC do not fluctuate in these contents over time (i.e., temporally stable and internally consistent). In contrast, those with low SCC may have difficulty with their own identity and may
struggle to clearly articulate their own values and opinions. Additionally, they may shift their identity over time based on their current state.

As previously mentioned, the primary outcomes examined with SCC are well-being and adjustment. For example, SCC is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to negative affect (Campbell et al., 2003). In addition, those who are lower on SCC have increased levels of depression, anxiety (Bigler et al., 2001), perceived stress, and suicidal behavior (Wong et al., 2019). In addition, SCC has been linked to several other psychological well-being outcomes, such as self-acceptance, positive relationships, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (Hanley & Garland, 2017). These relationships expand beyond just the self by also impacting relationship satisfaction and commitment (Lewandowski et al., 2010).

**Self-Concept Differentiation**

SCD refers to the “degree to which an individual’s self is variable or consistent across personally important roles” (Donahue et al., 1993, p. 834). For instance, personally important roles might include employee, husband, and son. Someone high in SCD may differ in terms of personality trait activation across the roles of employee, husband, and son. For example, while an individual is acting in the employee role, he may be extremely extraverted and sociable; however, when at home with his family, he may be quiet and reserved. In contrast, someone low in SCD may be more similar across these roles. It should be noted that some researchers have used the term self-complexity for a very similar construct (Linville, 1985; Linville, 1987; Schleicher & McConnell, 2005). However, SCD is distinct from self-complexity in two ways: (a) self-complexity represents the number of distinct self-aspects that an individual construes within
themselves and (b) SCD represents lack of interrelatedness, fragmentation, and lack of coherence in the self-concept (Donahue et al., 1993).

McConnell (2011) expanded on the extent to which an individual is variable or consistent by establishing a framework for how the self is represented in memory, the multiple self-aspects framework (MSF). There are five principles of the MSF: 1) The self is a collection of multiple context-dependent self-aspects, 2) Self-aspects are related to personal attributes, which become activated when the self-aspect is activated, 3) Affect reflects the evaluation of one’s self-aspects, 4) Feedback about one self-aspect will influence evaluations of another self-aspect, and 5) Information received about a specific attribute will influence affect as the number of self-aspects associated with that attribute increases (McConnell, 2011). One relevant component of this framework is the organization of the self-aspects as capturing these contextual aspects of life, which can also include goals. However, support for self-aspect activation through attributes, such as goals, has been relatively limited (McConnell, 2011).

Recently, Scott et al. (2022) developed an additional measure of self-schema content that also has some connections to SCD, where the researchers had respondents record self-schema content when interacting with several targets (e.g., person, role). Participants identified three to five adjectives that represented how they perceived themselves during that interaction with the targets (similar to SCD); however, the adjectives were coded to be “positive, negative, and neutral” for each self-schema. The other self-report items focused primarily on self-efficacy (i.e., self-schema goal efficacy), valence (i.e., good or bad feeling), and connection (i.e., how close they were to the individual).

SCD has implications for several psychological outcomes. For example, SCD is negatively related to overall psychological adjustment (Bigler et al., 2001). In particular, SCD is
negatively related to purpose in life, sense of coherence, and self-esteem (Bigler et al., 2001). Additionally, research has indicated that self-complexity relates to affect (Linville, 1985), stress (Linville, 1987), and variability in affect over time (e.g., McConnell et al., 2005). Further, SCD has been linked to aspects of psychological well-being across the lifespan, such as negative affect, depressive symptoms, and state anxiety (Diehl et al., 2001). However, less is known specifically about the impact of SCD on goal processes.

**Integrative Model: Social Knowledge Structure (SKS) Model**

In order to integrate these aspects of self-concept into one framework, the current research extends a model presented by Pomerance et al. (2020) that in turn is based on a unified theory of social knowledge developed by Greenwald et al. (2002). The Greenwald et al. framework includes four social-cognitive constructs: attitude, stereotype, self-esteem, and self-concept. In this unified model, attitude refers to the “association of a social object or social group concept with a valence attribute concept” (Greenwald et al., 2002, p. 5). Stereotype refers to the “association of a social group concept with one or more (nonvalence) attribute concepts” (Greenwald et al., 2002, p. 5). Self-esteem refers to the “association of the concept of self with a valence attribute” (Greenwald et al., 2002, p. 5). Finally, self-concept refers to the “association of the concept of self with one or more (nonvalence) attribute concepts” (Greenwald et al., 2002, p. 5). Taken together, each of these aspects of the unified theory of social knowledge plays a role in how individuals think, feel, and act in situations.

For the current research, we will be focusing on these concepts as they directly relate to the self-concept. Using this approach, the self-concept can be represented using a social knowledge structure (SKS) model consisting of nodes (ovals) and links (lines). In the SKS, a node represents specific concepts, such as roles, traits, and attributes. Links represent the
associations between these concepts. Within the SKS model, self-concept is then represented as the links between a central “self” node and other nodes representing various characteristics. For example, an individual who views themselves as introverted, disciplined, and as a student would have nodes for these characteristics linked to the central “self” node (see Figure 1).

The primary properties of the SKS model are: (a) self-concept elements (e.g., perceived personality characteristic, group membership) are represented as nodes (i.e., ovals); (b) there are connections among these nodes that vary in strength; (c) these nodes become activated either internally (e.g., thinking about a particular part of oneself) or externally (e.g., being placed in a particular context); (d) greater node activation is associated with that node influencing affect, cognition, and behavior; (e) activation is spread from one node to other nodes that are connected (e.g., Anderson, 1983); and (f) the strength of the spreading activation depends on the strength of the connections amongst the nodes involved.

For example, when an individual is in a given situation (e.g., university class), they will activate parts of their self-concept related to being at the university (e.g., student role). By being in that particular situation, the activation of nodes will spread from one node to the next (e.g., spreading from student node to disciplined node), where the activation of these nodes will influence their thoughts, feelings, and behaviors in the situation.

**Figure 1: Social Knowledge Structure (SKS) Model**
Pomerance et al. (2020) extended this by incorporating the notion of SCC. Specifically, clarity was represented as the association strength of links (thickness of lines) connecting characteristic nodes to the “self” node (see Figure 2). For example, if an individual has a clear sense of themselves as a son, student, introverted, disciplined, and imaginative (i.e., they have high SCC; Figure 2a), then they would have thick lines represented in their SKS model. However, if the individual has a less developed self-concept (i.e., they have low SCC; Figure 2b), they will have “weaker” associations or thinner lines.

Figure 2: Social Knowledge Structure (SKS) Model with (a) strong SCC and (b) weak SCC

The current research further extended this by incorporating the notion of SCD. In particular, SCD is represented in terms of roles and the extent to which different roles are linked to different characteristics. Someone high in SCD would have different characteristics associated with different salient roles, whereas someone low in SCD would have the same characteristics associated with different salient roles (see Figure 3). Essentially, an individual who is strongly differentiated will have multiple connections or associations between self-concept nodes tied to specific roles. For example, an individual may have imaginative and disciplined tied to the role of “son,” whereas they have introverted tied directly to “student” with no tie to son. Therefore, this individual is differentiated in that they have different traits tied to each role.
Figure 3: Social Knowledge Structure (SKS) Model with (a) high SCD and (b) low SCD

Goal Constructs

Goals are defined as “internal representations of desired states, where states are broadly construed as outcomes, events, or processes” (Austin & Vancouver, 1996, p. 338). Austin and Vancouver (1996) developed an organizing framework for goal constructs involving three major components: structure, process, and content. Austin and Vancouver (1996) define these elements as follows: goal structure involves “properties, organization, and dimensions of multiple goals within and between persons” (p. 340); goal process involves “temporal cycles of establishing, striving toward, and revising goals” (p. 340); and content involves “classifications of outcomes or states that individuals approach or avoid” (p. 340).

Based on potential connections with self-concept structure (as discussed in more detail later), this research incorporates goal content and goal structure (specifically, the structural elements of goal commitment and goal conflict).

Goal Content

Establishment of goal content theories has mostly involved an idiographic and self-report approach where individuals self-report their goals, and then researchers establish broad themes associated with those goals, while also establishing a goal hierarchy (e.g., DeShon & Gillespie, 2005; Wicker et al., 1984). Austin and Vancouver (1996) present a taxonomy of goals that
represent (a) within a person and (b) person-environment interaction with positive (i.e., approach) and negative (i.e., avoid) poles associated with each goal. For example, they establish broad categories of: affective, cognitive, subjective organization, self-assertive social relationship, integrative social relationship, and task. Most of the goals that are included in their taxonomy are represented by values (e.g., Schwartz, 1992), personal strivings (e.g., Emmons, 1986; Emmons, 1991), and principles (e.g., Carver & Scheier, 1982). Below these goals are further subgoals, such as personal projects (Little, 1983) and life tasks (Cantor et al., 1991). These goals are likely the goals that activate when an individual considers their “current concerns” (Klinger & Cox, 2004), where individuals choose the goals that they wish to pursue.

Recently, goal content theories have been expanded through a systematic development of goals, following a similar approach to the development of the Big Five model of personality. Specifically, Wilkowski et al. (2020) developed a taxonomy of goal-content, labeled PINT (i.e., prominence, inclusiveness, negative prevention, tradition). The goal content of this taxonomy represents higher-order goal-content due to its ability to organize and categorize lower-order goals, which are idiographic and unique to each individual. While lower-order goals may be different in content (e.g., becoming a doctor or becoming a lawyer), they serve a higher-order goal (e.g., achieving a high-status position; Wilkowski et al., 2020). Wilkowski et al. note that past goal taxonomies have restricted scope in various ways by focusing on needs (e.g., Self-Determination Theory; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Deci et al., 2017), social goals (e.g., Locke, 2015), or values (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2012). In their attempt to organize past goal taxonomies, Wilkowski et al. identified the categories of: pain and pleasure, positive social relationships, high social standing, and change versus conservation. This organization served as the basis for their creation of the PINT goal taxonomy. Through a series of pre-registered studies, Wilkowski et al.
supported four major dimensions of higher-order goals: prominence, inclusiveness, negative prevention, and tradition. Wilkowski et al. (2020) defined prominence as “a goal to earn the respect, admiration, and voluntary deference of others through one’s achievements” (p. 1177); inclusiveness as “a goal to open-mindedly accept people of all types” (p. 1175); negativity prevention as “a broad goal to prevent or avoid negative outcomes” (p. 1172); and tradition as “a goal to adhere to long-standing institutions of one’s cultural in-group (e.g., church, nation, and family)” (p. 1179).

**Goal Commitment**

Goal commitment refers to an individual’s determination to strive towards accomplishing a goal (Hollenbeck et al., 1989; Locke & Latham, 1990). Another way to define goal commitment, in order to minimize confounds, is as a volitional psychological bond that reflects dedication and responsibility for a specific target (i.e., goal; Klein et al., 2013). Therefore, an individual who is committed to a goal would be more likely to spend time or exert effort toward achieving that goal. For example, an individual who is committed to losing 10 pounds over the next 3 months would exert effort (i.e., exercise and eat healthy) to achieve their goal. Depending on their level of commitment, they may have trouble achieving that goal. Additionally, researchers have suggested that goal commitment can change over time, such that individuals will have differing levels of commitment towards specific goals based on their current situation (Vancouver, 1996). In the weight loss example, an individual may wax and wane on their goal commitment over time. For example, if there is a birthday or holiday party, the individual may temporarily lower their commitment to losing weight in order to enjoy the food at the party.

Research has demonstrated several antecedents and outcomes associated with goal commitment. For instance, Wofford et al. (1992) found several predictors of goal commitment,
such as self-efficacy, expectancy, and task difficulty. Prior research has also shown evidence of the saying “the end justifies the means” through understanding goal commitment. Köpetz et al. (2011), for example, found that goal commitment increased the number of means that are considered to attain the goal. In fact, the source of goal commitment (e.g., assigned, self-set) does not particularly influence its importance for goals (Klein et al., 2020). In addition, goal commitment is particularly relevant for performance, where difficult goals (vs. specific) moderates the relationship (Klein et al., 1999). Additionally, if an individual makes their goals known to others, especially those who have higher perceived status, performance is positively affected through goal commitment (Klein et al., 2020).

**Goal Conflict**

Intergoal interference (i.e., goal conflict) refers to “when the pursuit of one goal impedes the likelihood of success in reaching another goal” (Riediger & Freund, 2004, p. 1511). In goal-systems theory, Kruglanski et al. (2002) outline the facilitative and inhibitory links between goals within the hierarchy. Specifically, goals at different levels (i.e., vertically connected goals) offer facilitative links, where means lead to goals. In contrast, goals at the same level (i.e., laterally connected goals) often have inhibitory links, where they compete with one another. One of the ways that a goal can inhibit another goal is due to resource limitations when two goals require the same limited resource (e.g., balancing time between studying for two mid-term exams). Another way that a goal can inhibit another goal is when the two goals themselves conflict with each other (e.g., pulling an all-nighter to study on the exam versus staying healthy). Additionally, goal conflict can manifest at multiple levels, such that (a) at the lower level, goal conflict corresponds directly to the conflict between two goals (i.e., behavioral), (b) at the middle level, ambivalence corresponds to an approach/avoidance conflict where the individual wants to
pursue and achieve a goal at the same time of not wanting to achieve a goal (i.e., they would be unhappy after achieving the goal), and (c) at the higher level, self-discrepancy corresponds to when an individual’s ideal self (i.e., representation of attributes that one would ideally have), actual self (i.e., representation of attributes that one believes they possess), and ought self (i.e., representation of attributes that one ought to possess) are different from one another (Higgins, 1987; Kelly et al., 2015).

Goal conflict has important implications for psychological well-being, such that interference is positively related to habitually negative affect and negatively related to positive psychological functioning, habitually positive affect, and life satisfaction (Riediger & Freund, 2004). Recent research has examined possible boundary conditions in the negative impact of goal conflict. Moberly and Dickson (2018) suggest that at higher levels of goal-conflict ambivalence can help buffer the impact that goal-conflict has on anxiety, such that lower goal ambivalence weakens the relationship.

**Self-Concept and Goals**

The idea that self-concept and goals are related has been incorporated into a number of theoretical models. For instance, Carver and Scheier (1998) mentioned the role of self in their work on control theory and the goal hierarchy with their focus on the ideal self. Further, motivated action theory (DeShon & Gillespie, 2005) also outlines the importance of self-concept with the self-goals of agency, affiliation, and esteem. Additionally, goal-systems theory (Kruglanski et al., 2002) also suggests the potential relevance of aspects of the self-concept by describing the malleability and dynamism of motivation, such that interests and desires fluctuate from one moment to the next. Additionally, self-concept organizes the self into the current state of knowledge and focuses motivation and regulates emotion (Epstein, 1973).
Based on this, there is support for a connection between self-concept and goals. In fact, a number of researchers have suggested that goals are a part of the self-concept (e.g., Campbell et al., 1996; Markus & Wurf, 1987; Oyserman & James, 2009). The current research takes a complementary view based on four considerations relevant to the relationship between goals and other elements of the self-concept: (a) goals and self-concept are interrelated but unique in definition, (b) goals and self-concept serve distinct purposes, (c) goals and self-concept appear to involve different regions of the brain, and (d) the level of the goal may have implications for the association with self-concept.

First, goals are distinct from self-concept elements, such that goals represent desired states, whereas self-concept elements are stored self-relevant knowledge. For example, an individual may set a goal to “do well in school” which represents their desired state, but it is not equal to knowledge about themselves, such as “student.” The former is a desired state, whereas the latter is more descriptive in nature about their role. Second, goals and self-concept serve different purposes, such that goals have feedback loops surrounding them, whereas self-concept elements do not. For example, an individual may set a goal (e.g., do well in a course), and they receive feedback (e.g., grades and teacher comments) and adjust effort based on that feedback. Self-concept elements do not typically function in that way. In addition, self-concept element activation may automatically decay over time, whereas the activation of goals may not automatically decay (e.g., DeShon & Gillespie, 2005). Third, processes related to goals and other self-concept elements appear to involve different brain regions. Heatherton (2011) noted: “From a neuroscience perspective, it is likely that the brain has evolved distinct mechanisms for knowing ourselves, knowing how others respond to us, detecting threats from within the social group, and regulating actions in order to avoid being excluded from those groups” (p. 366). For
example, goal activation (i.e., approach and inhibition systems) primarily involves the cortical midline network (Strauman et al., 2013). Further, goal pursuit behavior has been linked with activation in the left and right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex; however, there are a number of other brain areas also activated (e.g., anterior cingulate cortex and amygdala; Spielberg et al., 2012). In addition, whereas self-relevant information and knowledge has been linked with activation in the medial prefrontal cortex (mPFC), another self-concept element, self-esteem, was linked to the posterior mid-cingulate and right superior parietal cortex (Frewen et al., 2013). Finally, the level of the goal may determine how closely connected it is to the self-concept, such that higher-level goals (e.g., values and/or ideal self) are more closely connected to self-concept than mid-level or lower-level behavioral goals (e.g., getting an “A” on the exam). In a goal hierarchy perspective, the goals that individuals set on a day-to-day basis may relate to the self-concept, but they are not equivalent to self-concept.

In combination, these considerations suggest that self-concept elements and goals are related but they may be somewhat distinct constructs, particularly below the highest levels of the goal hierarchy. Therefore, this research includes goals in the SKS model discussed previously as separate but connected nodes (see Figure 4). This conceptualization is then used to help lay the foundation for proposing relationships between self-concept structure (i.e., SCC and SCD) and goal-related variables (i.e., commitment and conflict).
As shown in Figure 4, goals are represented in the SKS model; however, they are representative of the motivational aspects of higher-order desired states (rectangular nodes) and lower-order desired states (triangle nodes), rather than only concepts (oval nodes). Therefore, relationships between goals and self-concept elements are represented in this SKS, where goals that are cognitively associated with self-concept elements are linked (represented by connecting lines).

These additions introduce several new connections within the SKS model. Specifically, there are at least five types of connections between nodes within the SKS model. First, there are connections between Me and traditional self-concept elements (e.g., roles and traits). These connections were discussed earlier and are based on Greenwald et al. (2002) and Pomerance et al. (2020). Second, there are connections between Me and goal elements (e.g., higher-order goals that are directly tied to the self). Third, there are connections between roles and specific traits (e.g., specific roles activate specific traits). Fourth, there are connections between roles and specific goals (e.g., specific roles activate goals for that role). Finally, there are connections between traits and specific goals (e.g., a given trait may be associated with a particular goal).
This last type of connection (trait and goal) is consistent with Cybernetic Big Five Theory (CB5T; DeYoung, 2014) and Trait Activation Theory (TAT; Tett et al., 2021). According to CB5T, traits have implications for cybernetic functions and ultimately goals. For example, extraversion is tied to engagement with specific rewards and exploration, which can be linked to approach-related goals. Additionally, agreeableness is tied to altruism and cooperation, which can be linked to communal-related goals or team-oriented goals, such as coordination. Further, TAT indicates that certain situational features, such as demands (Tett et al., 2021), may affect trait expression. Therefore, when in a specific situation, a certain goal will be activated based on the situation (Carver & Scheier, 1990). When a specific situation activates a personality trait (i.e., TAT), it is likely to activate certain behaviors (Tett et al., 2021) based on those traits, which suggests that individuals pursue goals related to those behaviors.

For example, first, in the figure, “Me” has connections with Student and Introverted, indicating that the individual considers both the role as a student and characteristic of introverted as central to their self-concept. Second, there are connections between Me and goal elements, such as Tradition, a higher-order goal that focuses on obligation, tradition, and pureness. Therefore, the individual considers this goal as central to their self-concept. Third, the individual has connections between their roles and specific traits, such as Student and Disciplined; therefore, when the individual is in the student role, they see themselves as disciplined. Further, the individual would not see themselves as disciplined in other roles, such as Son. Fourth, there are goals that are associated with specific roles, such as comradery tied to the Student role. In this case, when the individual thinks of their Student role, they activate their comradery goal, such that they are more likely to engage in teamwork and team-building behaviors. Finally, there are goals that are connected to specific traits central to the self-concept. For example, in the SKS
model, there are goals of obedience and obligation tied to an individual’s trait of politeness. Therefore, when the individual activates their trait of politeness, they further activate their goals associated with obedience and obligation.

**Self-Concept Structure and Goal-Related Constructs**

Given the integrative nature of the SKS model and the prior related work theorizing connections between self-concept and goals, it is expected that self-concept structure will be related to goals. A limited number of studies have reported results that are generally consistent with this notion. For example, recent research has examined SCC and motivational orientations (i.e., approach and avoidance motivational orientation; Pomerance et al., 2020), finding that SCC and CSE interact to predict motivational orientations (i.e., approach and avoidance motivation) and subsequently organizational citizenship behaviors. Further, SCC has been associated with grit, which is connected to goal pursuit, at a daily level (Wong & Vallacher, 2018). As expected, those who have higher levels of grit also report having a higher level of SCC. Therefore, goals may be influenced by an individual’s SCC. The current research extends this work by examining whether SCC may play a role in goal commitment and goal conflict.

SCD may also have implications for goal-related constructs. For example, according to the multiple self-aspects framework (MSF), self-concept contains multiple context-dependent selves (McConnell, 2011). As an individual goes from situation to situation or role to role, they are likely to activate each context-dependent self. Therefore, as individuals move across these contexts, it is expected that they would activate different roles. Further, as individuals shift roles, they are likely to activate differing goals. Some previous research has examined the impact that SCD has on goal-related constructs. For example, Dunlop et al. (2013) envisioned SCD taking place at multiple levels of personality, examining the effects of SCD at the trait, goal, and
narrative level. Interestingly, the goal SCD was related positively to adjustment. Therefore, those who indicated higher levels of goal SCD tended to report higher levels of adjustment. Additionally, prior research has suggested that individuals appraise goals differently depending on the role (Sheldon & Elliott, 2000). Although not explicitly SCD, this research has implications for SCD. Specifically, because individuals are committed more strongly to the goals that are relevant to their role, SCD will likely influence their goal commitment and conflict. Therefore, the current research extends this work by examining whether SCD, at the trait level, may play a role in both goal commitment and goal conflict across contexts (see Figure 5).

**Figure 5: Study 1 Theoretical Model of Hypotheses**
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*Note.* Dotted lines indicate Research Questions. Level 1 relationships are exploratory with hypothesized relationships being assessed with Level 2 relationships (above the horizontal dashed line).

**Goal Commitment**

Taking the definition of SCC, it represents the extent to which one’s self-concept is “clearly and confidently defined” (Campbell et al., 1996, p. 141). Goal commitment represents the determination an individual has towards achieving a goal (Hollenbeck et al., 1989).
Underlying both of these definitions is the confidence and/or determination that an individual has. In the SKS model, higher SCC is represented by “thick” lines connecting nodes in the self-concept, including higher-order goals. In particular, as outlined previously, higher-order goals may be directly connected to Me or connected to other self-concept nodes (e.g., roles and traits) and thus indirectly connected to Me. Both of these connections may be stronger in those higher in SCC. For example, an individual with high SCC may have a strong connection between Me and the prominence goal from the PINT taxonomy; thus, when the concept of Me (or self) is activated, the prominence goal may be strongly activated as well through the spreading of activation process. In addition, this individual may also have a strong connection between certain traits and/or roles and the tradition goal; thus, when those traits or roles are activated, the traditional goal may be strongly activated as well. In contrast, an individual with low SCC may have weak connections between Me and higher-level goals and between traits and/or roles and higher-level goals. Thus, when these nodes (Me, traits, roles) are activated, higher-order goals are only weakly activated.

These differences related to higher-order goals may then have implications for lower-order goals. Specifically, the goal hierarchy notion indicates that lower-order goals (means) are pursued in order to achieve higher-order goals (ends). Thus, these goals are connected such that activation of higher-order goals leads to the activation of associated lower-order goals. Given this, SCC should have implications for lower-order goal pursuit. Specifically, an individual with high SCC would likely have stronger activation of these lower-order goals due to the stronger activation of associated higher-order goals. For example, an individual may have the higher-order goal of Prominence and an associated lower-order goal of completing a school assignment. If this individual is high in SCC, then the Prominence goal may tend to be strongly activated, as
activation of associated nodes (e.g., Me, traits, roles) leads to a strong spreading of activation to Prominence. This strong activation of Prominence in turn may then lead to strong activation of the associated lower-order goal of completing the school assignment. In contrast, if this individual is low in SCC, then the Prominence goal may tend to be weakly activated, as activation of associated nodes (e.g., Me, traits, roles) leads to only a weak spreading of activation to Prominence. This weak activation of Prominence in turn may then lead to weak activation of the associated lower-order goal of completing the school assignment.

This difference in activation strength may then manifest as differences in goal commitment. As described previously, greater node activation is associated with greater likelihood that the node will influence affect, cognition, and behavior. Thus, stronger goal activation means that the individual is more likely to think about and pursue that goal. This is consistent with greater goal commitment. For instance, when asked about their goals, those high in SCC should be clear, confident, and consistent in thinking about their strongly connected goals, manifesting as higher commitment. In contrast, those low in SCC should be less clear, confident, and consistent given their weakly connected goals and instead may find that the goals that come to mind are more influenced by their current or recent circumstances (e.g., goals that others brought up in a recent conversation). Related research has produced findings that appear to be consistent with this notion. Specifically, Light et al. (2018) found that those who are higher in self-certainty will maintain their commitment toward focal goals when presented with alternatives. Further, Jiang et al. (2022) found that those who had been manipulated to have lower SCC were less willing to adhere to their original exercise plan. This may also play out in day-to-day life, where those higher in SCC experience clear and consistent activation of the same goals over time, as contexts activate Me, roles, and traits that lead to strong activation of
associated goals. In contrast, those lower in SCC do not experience clear and consistent activation of goals, and thus the goals that come to mind and may be pursued are more influenced by external, situational factors.

Given these arguments, it is expected that those high in SCC would have more clearly defined goals manifesting as higher levels of commitment towards their goals, compared to those low in SCC. In the current study, this is examined by first measuring trait SCC and then assessing commitment to goals each day for multiple days. It was expected that those high in SCC would have higher average levels of goal commitment across days as well as lower variability (i.e., stability) of goal commitment across days (i.e., these goals would be resistant to revision or abandonment). Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed.

**Hypothesis 1**: SCC will be (a) positively related to average goal commitment and (b) negatively related to variability of goal commitment across days.

SCD might also have implications for goal commitment, but the nature of this potential relationship is less clear. For example, drawing from TAT (Tett et al., 2021) and CB5T (DeYoung, 2014), an individual with high SCD is more likely to have higher-order goals that are tied directly to a specific role and only that role. Therefore, when they are in a context that activates that role, it would likely activate the trait and then activate commitment towards that higher-order goal. However, if put into a different situation that activates a different role, it would activate a different trait and then activate commitment towards a different higher-order goal; therefore, the commitment to the first higher-order goal may be lower. Thus, depending on the situation and the role, they may have higher or lower goal commitment. This suggests that the level and variability of goal commitment may depend on situational factors and the extent to which those change. Therefore, the following research question is proposed.
**Research Question 1:** What is the relationship between SCD and (a) average goal commitment and (b) goal commitment variability across days?

**Goal Conflict**

SCC may influence the amount of goal conflict an individual experiences. However, the direction of this relationship is not entirely clear. While an individual high in SCC may have clear and defined goals, this does not mean that the goals are always in service of each other. In fact, these goals may be in conflict with each other at the lower levels. For example, an individual may have two higher-level elements of self-concept that are clearly and confidently defined: politeness and disciplined. However, goal conflict may manifest at lower levels of the goal hierarchy, such as conflict between goals, plans, or projects (Kelly et al., 2015). By activating both politeness and disciplined, an individual high in SCC may experience goal conflict by having to choose between being disciplined and studying for an exam versus being polite and spending time with their brothers. Both goals are serving aspects of the previously mentioned self-concept-related goals, but they may be in conflict with each other, because time is a limited resource.

On the other hand, those high in SCC may have goals that are so clearly defined throughout the hierarchy that they would be unlikely to set goals that are in conflict with each other. For example, an individual high in SCC may set reasonable and clearly defined goals that achieve both ideal selves (e.g., “studying 1 hour per day for 2 weeks” and “spending 1 hour per day with family”). Therefore, those high in SCC may experience little to no goal conflict. In the SKS model, this may manifest as an individual with low goal conflict having thick lines to a select few higher-level goals that are connected to their self-concept nodes. These thick lines would represent strong associations between how they see their self-concept and these goals. In
contrast, those high in SCC may experience goal conflict where they have thick lines to each higher-order goal, but by pursuing each of these goals, they have to trouble choosing which of the lower-order goals to be committed to, especially when being committed to one goal would take away commitment to another.

**Research Question 2**: What is the relationship between SCC and goal conflict?

SCD is likely to introduce goal conflict as individuals shift between roles which may be problematic for goal pursuit. Specifically, individuals have multiple roles that they enact (e.g., student and son) that are activated based on their surroundings. These roles then activate related self-concept elements including goals. For those high in SCD, the self-concept elements differ across roles and thus the goals activated and pursued would differ across roles. In contrast, for those low in SCD, the self-concept elements are similar across roles and thus the goals activated and pursued would be similar across roles. This suggests that there may be an increased likelihood of goal conflict for those higher in SCD.

Expanding on this, CB5T (DeYoung, 2014) provides an explanation on why the Big Five traits are corresponding to functional categories in the human cybernetic system (i.e., goal activation, action, selection, action, outcome interpretation, and goal comparison). Specifically, the CB5T provides the cybernetic function that each of the Big Five traits, and their aspects, serve. Extraversion’s cybernetic function corresponds to the “Behavioral exploration and engagement with specific rewards (i.e., goals to approach)” (DeYoung, 2014, p. 10). Neuroticism’s cybernetic function corresponds to the “Defensive responses to uncertainty, threat, and punishment” (DeYoung, 2014, p. 10). Openness/Intellect’s cybernetic function corresponds to the “Cognitive exploration and engagement with information” (DeYoung, 2014, p. 10). Conscientiousness’s cybernetic function corresponds to the “Protection of non-immediate or
abstract goals and strategies from disruption” (DeYoung, 2014, p. 10). Finally, agreeableness’s cybernetic function corresponds to the “Altruism and cooperation; coordination of goals, interpretations, and strategies with those of others” (DeYoung, 2014, p. 10). Taken together, each of the Big Five traits do correspond to specific functions in the cybernetic system; however, DeYoung (2014) also points out that the “one-to-one mapping of each of the Big Five to one step of the cybernetic cycle will not work because most of the mechanisms that carry out the cycle operate in parallel and influence multiple steps of the cycle” (p. 9). However, the Big Five not only corresponds to specific cybernetic functions, but it is likely that the activation of specific Big Five traits may lead to the activation of certain goals.

In their studies, Wilkowski et al. (2020) also identified Big Five predictors of higher-order goals (Study 6). Specifically, they found that Extraversion was positively related to prominence, inclusiveness, and tradition goals, with the strongest relationship for prominence goals. For Openness/Intellect, it was positively related to prominence, inclusiveness, negativity prevention, and tradition goals, with the highest relationship for inclusiveness goals. For Agreeableness, it was positively related to inclusiveness, negativity prevention, and traditional goals, with the strongest relationship for tradition goals. For Conscientiousness, it was positively related to prominence, inclusiveness, negativity prevention, and tradition goals, with the strongest relationship for tradition goals. Finally, for Neuroticism, it was not significantly related to any of the goals, but the strongest relationship was negativity prevention ($r = -.11$, $ns$). Taken together, there is a relationship between the Big Five and the PINT taxonomy of goals, suggesting that certain Big Five traits are going to predict which goals an individual sets.

Given this, those high in SCD will likely experience more goal conflict as different roles entail different self-aspects (i.e., traits) activating different goals. In contrast, an individual who
is low in SCD may not activate multiple goals because these self-aspects are similar across roles, leading them to have less conflict amongst their goals. In other words, high SCD entails each role involving different attributes for the individual. Given the connections between self-concept attributes and goals, this also suggests different goals across different roles. This increases the potential for goal conflict. For instance, if a high SCD person sees themselves as extraverted in the role of a friend but anxious in the role of a student, they may correspondingly pursue a goal to make friends and a goal to avoid speaking up during class, and these two goals may conflict. In contrast, if a low SCD person sees themselves as extraverted in the role of a friend and the role of a student, they may correspondingly consistently pursue those same goals (e.g., speaking up during class), reducing the potential for conflict.

**Hypothesis 2:** SCD will be positively related to average goal conflict.

**Psychological Well-Being**

Despite the research that has been conducted on the relationship between self-concept structure components and psychological well-being, there is still more research to be done in the area. Well-being refers to “optimal psychological functioning and experience” (Ryan & Deci, 2001 p. 142). Although this sounds simplistic, there are several competing and complex theories regarding psychological well-being. In fact, there are two traditional views of psychological well-being: hedonism and eudaimonism. For measuring hedonism, researchers have relied on one or more of the following: satisfaction with life, happiness, and depression. Researchers have focused on measuring eudaimonism through six factors: self-acceptance, positive relations with others, autonomy, environmental mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (Ryff, 1989; Ryff & Singer, 2006). Recently, Oishi and Westgate (2021) expanded on these views by adding an additional component: psychological richness. These dimensions of psychological well-being define what the authors call a *meaningful life* or the “subjective self-appraisal that one’s life and
experiences have meaning” (Oishi & Westgate, 2021, p. 3). Further, through a series of factor analyses, Oishi and Westgate (2021) show the distinctiveness of their third factor (i.e., psychological richness).

**Hedonic**

The hedonic well-being point of view “consists of subjective happiness and concerns the experience of pleasure versus displeasure broadly construed to include all judgments about the good/bad elements of life” (Ryan & Deci, 2001 p. 144). Hedonic well-being tends to be an approach and avoidance type of paradigm where one approaches the pleasurable aspects of life while avoiding the unpleasant aspects of life. To examine hedonic well-being, most researchers rely on the subjective well-being scale, which consists of three dimensions: life satisfaction, positive mood, and negative mood (Diener & Lucas, 1999).

Some predictors of hedonic well-being include extraversion, conscientiousness, and low neuroticism (Steel et al., 2008; Oishi et al., 2019). Additionally, higher socioeconomic status (SES) is associated with hedonic (i.e., happy life) well-being (Oishi & Westgate, 2020). Further, income-level has been associated with greater happiness and life satisfaction (Kahneman & Deaton, 2010). Essentially, the best way to characterize a happy life is through stable interpersonal, financial, and political environments (Diener et al., 2018). Additionally, the individual’s mindset can help with this as well, such as expressing optimism and gratitude.

**Eudaimonic**

The eudaimonic well-being point of view represents “human flourishing and living to one’s full potential” (i.e., self-actualization; Disabato et al., 2016, p. 471). This view of well-being starts from Aristotle’s distinction between pleasure and a good life. The idea behind Aristotle’s conceptualization is to extend beyond just pleasure-drive and focus on personal
growth and being true to oneself (Cooper, 1985). Although there are different operationalizations of eudaimonic well-being, such as self-realization (Vittersø, 2016), personal expressiveness (Waterman, 1993), or purpose in life (Garcia-Alandete, 2015), they all highly correlate with each other with rs ranging between .50 and .75 (Waterman et al., 2010). Specifically, key features of a meaningful life include significance and purpose; facilitators of a meaningful life include consistency and relationships; and finally, the outcome of a meaningful life is measured through meaning in life and subjective meaning (Oishi & Westgate, 2020). Predictors of eudaimonic well-being include autonomy, competence, and relatedness (e.g., Martela et al., 2018), intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2001), self-acceptance, pursuit of positive relationships, and personal growth (Ryff, 1989).

**Psychological Richness**

Finally, psychological richness is defined as a life “best characterized by a variety of interesting and perspective-changing experiences” (Oishi & Westgate, 2020, p. 3). A psychologically rich life differs in several ways from a happy life (hedonic) and meaningful life (eudaimonic). Specifically, key features of a psychologically rich life include variety, interest, and perspective change; facilitators of a psychologically rich life include curiosity, time, energy, and spontaneity; and finally, the outcome of a psychologically rich life is wisdom (Oishi & Westgate, 2020). Taken together, a psychologically rich life ultimately entails that the individual experiences variety that changes their perspective. Predictors of psychological richness include openness to experience and extraversion (Oishi et al., 2019; Oishi et al., 2020). Additionally, those who engaged in a study abroad program reported higher psychological richness than those who were on-campus (Oishi et al., 2020).
Goal-Related Constructs and Psychological Well-Being

As previously mentioned, goal commitment refers to the willful psychological bond that reflects dedication and responsibility for a specific target (i.e., goal; Klein et al., 2013). Traditionally, research has examined the antecedents of goal commitment, such as goal level, prior performance, task complexity, self-efficacy, self-esteem, need for achievement, and many more (Wofford et al., 1992). Less research has examined outcomes of goal commitment but there have been a few studies. For example, goal commitment has been linked to primarily performance-based outcomes, such as performance (Locke et al., 1988; Wofford et al., 1992), feedback (Vance & Colella, 1990), goal progress (Brunstein, 1993), and goal achievement (Wofford et al., 1992). Additionally, team-level goal commitment has been related to team effectiveness (Aube et al., 2005).

For well-being, one study found that goal commitment at the beginning of the semester was positively related to well-being at subsequent time points throughout the semester (Brunstein, 1993). In this case, well-being was conceptualized as whether the participant felt an elated mood or a depressed mood. Additionally, goal commitment has been positively linked to hedonic, social, and psychological well-being (Joshanloo et al., 2017). Therefore, average goal commitment is likely related to all aspects of psychological well-being. As for stability of goal commitment, one critical aspect of having fluctuating commitment to goals over time is the shifting of resources between goals. Shifting these resources frequently (e.g., multitasking) can lead to lower levels of well-being indicators (e.g., Xu et al., 2016). Multitasking involves switching between tasks or goals within a certain time period (Kirchberg et al., 2015; König & Waller, 2010). When individuals multitask (i.e., balance multiple tasks and shift resources and attention from one task to the next), they experience higher levels of stress (Robinson &
Smallman, 2006). Further, multitasking throughout the workday is associated with lower levels of positive affect at the end of the day (Kirchberg et al., 2015). Given that multitasking and fluctuating goal commitment may involve similar mechanisms (e.g., resource allocation and goal attainment), this phenomenon may manifest across days as well, such that an individual who shifts around in their goal commitment across the week may have lower levels of psychological well-being.

However, less is known about the relationship between goal commitment and psychological richness. Specifically, goal commitment could hinder an individual’s ability to seek a variety of interests because they are tied directly to the goal that they are pursuing. However, goal commitment may also direct an individual towards certain aspects of psychological richness, such as energy and time put towards goals. Therefore, the relationship between goal commitment and psychological richness is unclear.

**Hypothesis 3:** Goal commitment (average and stability) will be positively related to all aspects of (a) eudaimonic psychological well-being (i.e., autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) and (b) hedonic psychological well-being (i.e., positive affect, life satisfaction).

**Research Question 3:** What is the relationship between goal commitment (average and stability) and psychological richness?

Goal conflict is likely to have implications for psychological well-being. In fact, high goal conflict has been linked with negative subjective well-being (i.e., negative affect and lower life satisfaction; Emmons, 1986). Further, goal ambivalence (i.e., a type of goal conflict) has been positively associated with anxiety and depression symptoms (Kelly et al., 2011). In
addition, based on a recent meta-analysis, the relationship between goal conflict and psychological distress was moderate ($r = .34$; Gray et al., 2017). However, in a longitudinal study, the relationship between goal conflict and depressive symptoms was null (Moberly & Dickson, 2018). After taking into consideration goal ambivalence (i.e., higher-level goal conflict; Kelly et al., 2015), high levels of goal conflict paired with low levels of ambivalence led to reductions in anxious symptoms. Again, however, relationships with psychological richness are less clear given that less is known about this construct. Therefore, the following relationships are expected between goal conflict and psychological well-being.

**Hypothesis 4:** Goal conflict will be negatively related to all aspects of (a) eudaimonic psychological well-being (i.e., autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) and (b) hedonic psychological well-being (i.e., positive affect, life satisfaction).

**Research Question 4:** What is the relationship between goal conflict and psychological richness?

**Self-Concept Structure and Psychological Well-Being**

Previous research has explored the relationships between self-concept structure and psychological well-being in depth. Specifically, relationships between SCC and psychological well-being have been examined cross-sectionally, through experience sampling methodology, and longitudinally. As previously discussed, SCC is positively related to self-esteem and negatively related to negative affect (Campbell et al., 2003). Further, those lower in SCC have increased levels of depression, anxiety (Bigler et al., 2001), perceived stress, and suicidal behavior (Wong et al., 2019). In addition, SCC has been linked to several other psychological well-being outcomes, such as self-acceptance, positive relationships, autonomy, environmental
mastery, purpose in life, and personal growth (Hanley & Garland, 2017). These relationships expand beyond just the self by also impacting relationship satisfaction and commitment (Lewandowski et al., 2010). Taken together, SCC has been linked to positive aspects of psychological well-being, both hedonic (e.g., positive relationships; Hanley & Garland, 2017; lack of depression; Campbell et al., 2003) and eudaimonic (e.g., purpose in life; Hanley & Garland, 2017).

**Hypothesis 5:** SCC will be positively related to all aspects of (a) eudaimonic psychological well-being (i.e., autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) and (b) hedonic psychological well-being (i.e., positive affect, life satisfaction).

However, self-concept structure has yet to be examined in regard to psychological richness. Based on the conceptualization of SCC and the current framework, the nature of the relationship between SCC and psychological richness is unclear. For example, given that SCC focuses on the clear and confidently defined aspects of the self-concept, individuals high on SCC may have difficulty with seeking variety or expressing curiosity, some of the key features of psychological richness. This suggests that the relationship could be negative. However, individuals who are higher in SCC may have greater self-confidence or self-esteem (Campbell et al., 1996; Kawamoto, 2020), making them more willing to seek out new experiences. This suggests that the relationship could be positive. Given there is a possibility of the relationship being positive or negative, the following research question is proposed rather than a hypothesis.

**Research Question 5:** What is the relationship between SCC and psychological richness?
For SCD, the majority of findings demonstrate the negative impact that it has on psychological well-being. Overall, SCD has implications for psychological adjustment as a whole (Bigler et al., 2001). In particular, SCD is negatively related to purpose in life, sense of coherence, and self-esteem (Bigler et al., 2001). Further, SCD has been linked to negative aspects of psychological well-being across the lifespan, such as negative affect, depressive symptoms, and state anxiety (Diehl et al., 2001). Taken together, SCD has been linked to negative aspects of psychological well-being. Additionally, when considering SCD, the focus is on the individual being variable across roles.

**Hypothesis 6:** SCD will be negatively related to all aspects of (a) eudaimonic psychological well-being (i.e., autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) and (b) hedonic psychological well-being (i.e., positive affect, life satisfaction).

Based on the conceptualization of SCD and the current framework, the nature of the relationship between SCD and psychological richness is unclear. For example, the relationship between SCD and psychological richness may be positive, such that individuals high on SCD may be spontaneous, have a variety of interests, and be open to new perspectives, some of the key features of psychological richness. However, individuals high in SCD may also not spend the time and energy in order to have these life experiences because they are switching their priorities and who they define themselves as across roles. For example, if someone with high SCD is inconsistently extraverted across roles (e.g., they are extremely extraverted at school but not extraverted at home), they may engage and have a variety of interests when it comes to school but then have fewer interests at home; therefore, they may have moderate or even low levels of psychological richness when looking at their life as a whole. Given there is a possibility
of the relationship being positive or negative, the following research question is proposed rather than a hypothesis.

**Research Question 6:** What is the relationship between SCD and psychological richness?

Given the proposed relationships between self-concept structure and goal-related constructs and the proposed relationships between the goal-related constructs and psychological well-being, it is expected that the relationships between self-concept structure and psychological well-being will be mediated through goal-related processes. For example, an individual who is high in SCC would have more clearly defined goals, demonstrating higher levels of commitment towards those goals, which would lead to higher levels of eudaimonic and hedonic well-being. Further, for individuals high in SCD, they may experience more goal conflict when self-concept elements, and thus goals, differ across roles, which would then lead to lower levels of eudaimonic and hedonic well-being.

**Hypothesis 7:** Goal commitment (average and variability) will mediate the relationship between SCC and (a) eudaimonic psychological well-being (i.e., autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) and (b) hedonic psychological well-being (i.e., positive affect, life satisfaction).

**Research Question 7:** Does goal commitment mediate the relationship between SCC and psychological richness?

**Hypothesis 8:** Goal conflict will mediate the relationship between SCD and (a) eudaimonic psychological well-being (i.e., autonomy, environmental mastery, personal
growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance) and (b) hedonic psychological well-being (i.e., positive affect, life satisfaction).

**Research Question 8:** Does goal conflict mediate the relationship between SCD and psychological richness?

**Goal Progress**

Goal progress refers to the comparison between an individual’s current performance and desired performance related to a goal (Carver & Scheier, 1998). Goal progress has been demonstrated to have influences on affect and self-efficacy (Bandura & Locke, 2003). For example, when an individual experiences a lack of progress, they often experience negative affect (e.g., frustration); when they make good progress, they often experience positive affect (e.g., pride). Consistent with this notion, findings have indicated that when individuals are provided feedback indicating lack of progress, they experienced increased levels of negative affect (Ilies & Judge, 2005). Additionally, goal progress may influence an individual’s belief in their ability to attain a goal, or self-efficacy, such that when individuals feel that they are not making progress, they may not feel that they have the ability to meet their goal (e.g., Bandura, 2001).

Relatedly, goal achievement refers to the process of completing or reaching a desired end-state. Several predictors of goal achievement have been examined in past research. For example, several individual difference variables are related to goal achievement. Self-control, for instance, has been linked to task completion (Moon et al., 2020). Further, conscientiousness has also been linked to task goal achievement, even when experiencing temptations or interruptions (Russell et al., 2017). Taken together, there are certain aspects of self-regulatory mechanisms (i.e., self-control and conscientiousness) that are linked to achievement of goals.
Goal-Related Constructs and Progress

Prior research has demonstrated that goal commitment is positively related to goal achievement and performance (e.g., Klein & Kim, 1998; Klein et al., 1999). For example, an individual who is committed to a goal will likely spend more effort towards achieving that goal. Therefore, as the individual expends effort, they will likely achieve the goal. Based on this, the following relationship is expected.

**Hypothesis 9:** Goal commitment (average) will be positively related to goal progress.

Goal conflict has also been linked to lower levels of performance and achievement (Locke et al., 1994), where individuals who set multiple conflicting goals are less likely to achieve each of these goals. Additionally, goal conflict has been linked to several aspects of distress (Moberly & Dickson, 2018). For example, an individual might set two goals that conflict with one another: (a) get an A on the exam and (b) spend time with friends. These goals do not inherently conflict with each other, but they do have one common resource: time. Therefore, in order for the individual to pursue both, they must balance that resource. By balancing this resource, it is likely that the individual will struggle to complete both of the goals. For example, by prioritizing one goal instead of the other the non-prioritized goals are inhibited (i.e., goal shielding; e.g., Shah et al., 2002). Given this, it is expected that goals that conflict with each other (i.e., hindrance rather than facilitative; Kruglanski et al., 2002) would lend themselves to lower levels of goal progress and achievement.

**Hypothesis 10:** Goal conflict will be negatively related to goal progress.

Self-Concept Structure and Progress

Aspects of the self-concept (e.g., self-efficacy) have been linked to performance (e.g., Bandura & Wood, 1989) and achievement-related outcomes (Phillips & Gully, 1997). However,
less is known about how aspects of self-concept structure (i.e., SCC and SCD) are related to goal achievement and task performance.

Limited prior research has examined SCC and some aspects of performance, namely counterproductive work behaviors and organizational citizenship behaviors (Pomerance et al., 2020). Although conceptualized as a moderator in the research, daily SCC was negatively related to daily counterproductive work behaviors. However, it was unrelated to organizational citizenship behavior at the within- and between-level. Given the impacts of SCC and goal pursuit (e.g., Fite et al., 2017), it is expected that higher SCC lends itself to goal progress and achievement. For example, researchers have found a positive relationship between SCC and an aspect of grit, consistency of interest, where those higher in SCC had higher levels of consistency of interest (Fite et al., 2017). Additionally, there was a positive relationship between SCC and perseverance of effort, another aspect of grit. Thus, an individual who is high on SCC is likely to have clearly defined goals based on their own beliefs and values; therefore, they will be able to monitor progress towards these goals more easily and ultimately achieve these goals. Additionally, individuals high in SCC will tend to understand their strengths, weaknesses, and preferences to pursue goals appropriately (Light, 2017).

**Hypothesis 11:** SCC will be positively related to goal progress.

Prior research has examined the effects that SCD has on self-esteem, well-being, anxiety, and physical symptoms (for a meta-analysis, see Bleidorn & Kodding, 2013). Overall, SCD is positively related to depression, anxiety, negative affect, and physical symptoms while being negatively related to well-being, self-esteem, positive affect, and satisfaction with life (Bleidorn & Kodding, 2013). However, the relationship between SCD and goal progress and achievement is less clear. SCD has been linked to lower levels of GPA in both high school and college
students (Donahue et al., 1993). However, researchers still debate whether those who are differentiated are more specialized or fragmented (e.g., Campbell et al., 2003; Diehl & Hay, 2011; Lutz & Ross, 2003). Further, past research has suggested that the self-concept does have important motivational implications for achievement (Möller et al., 2011). In this research, the focus was on domain-specific aspects of self-concept (i.e., the “belief of doing well or poorly in the corresponding domain” [Möller et al., 2011, p. 1326]). The researchers examined the relationships of the self-concept across the domain-specific academic self-concepts (i.e., combining both verbal and math), and found that when there is more consistency between the self-concepts (i.e., averaging the self-concepts together, rather than considering each separately), participants had higher levels of achievement. As one would expect, by pursuing multiple self-concepts at the same time, individuals would need to set multiple goals towards each of those self-concepts. For example, an individual who is differentiated would likely have multiple goals which would likely undermine progress and achievement for any one specific goal (Unsworth et al., 2014). Therefore, those who are highly differentiated may have more difficulty in progressing with goals and achievement than those who are lower in differentiation.

**Hypothesis 12:** SCD will be negatively related to goal progress.

Given the previously discussed relationships between self-concept structure and goal-related variables and the relationships between goal-related variables and achievement/progress, it is expected that these goal-related variables will mediate the relationship between self-concept structure and achievement-related variables.

**Hypothesis 13:** Goal commitment (average) will mediate the relationship between SCC and goal progress.
**Hypothesis 14:** Goal conflict will mediate the relationship between SCD and goal progress.

**Study 1 Method**

**Participants**

Participants were recruited using CloudResearch’s Connect platform (Connect). Connect is a crowdsourcing platform where participants are vetted prior to being allowed to access surveys to “fight fraud and inattention” (Connect for Researchers, 2023). Recently, Aguinis et al. (2021) provided best practice recommendations when conducting research using Amazon’s Mechanical Turk (MTurk). These best practices were followed, even though the present study used CloudResearch Connect, because they are useful guidelines for using crowdsourcing platforms in general. First, characteristics of the sample were matched to the population in that participants were limited to adults in the United States. Second, a “CAPTCHA” verification was used to impede bots. Third, participants were recruited above the required sample size in order to account for failure on attention checks and attrition. Fourth, three attention checks were used, participants were required to provide their ID, a pilot study was conducted with a small sample, and completions were processed within 24 hours. Taken together, these precautions are intended to ensure data quality.

Two hundred participants were recruited using Connect. Each participant passed the CAPTCHA verification. All but two participants passed the attention checks ($n = 198$). Therefore, 198 participants were invited to participate in the daily surveys. A total of 173 participants completed at least one of the daily surveys (mean age = 39.02 [SD = 10.95], 37.0% Female, 68.7% White, 87.3% working full or part time, 45.7% Bachelor’s degree). A total of 779 observations were obtained over the course of 5 working days (average observations per participant = 4.50).
Procedure

Participants completed a series of surveys over the course of one week. Specifically, participants completed a baseline survey with various individual difference measures, including measures of SCC, SCD, and exploratory variables. Then, participants were invited to participate in an experience sampling component of the study where they completed daily surveys measuring the focal goal-related constructs and outcomes for one week (see Appendix for full list of measures).

Baseline Measures

Self-concept Clarity (SCC)

SCC was measured using the SCC Scale (SCCS; Campbell et al., 1996). This scale consists of 12 items regarding self-beliefs. An example item is “Sometimes I feel that I am not really the person that I appear to be.” Each item was scored using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Each item was averaged across all 12 items with higher scores indicating a higher SCC.

Self-concept Differentiation (SCD)

SCD measurement involved two steps. First, roles were measured based on the Multiple Self-Aspects Framework (McConnell, 2011) where individuals selected the top 5 roles that they believe are most important to themselves out of a list possible 16 roles, with 3 options to fill in the blank for not available roles. Example roles included: student, employee, leader, coworker/colleague, community member, parent, job seeker, and romantic partner.

Second, SCD was measured by rating attributes for each of the roles identified above. Prior research has used an inconsistent number of attributes (e.g., talkative, open-minded, loyal) when measuring SCD (e.g., 60 attributes; Donahue et al., 1993; 7 personality traits; Pilarska,
In order to provide more structure to the overall measure of SCD, the Big Five from Goldberg’s (1992) 25-item Big Five markers adjective scale was used with a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Does not describe me) to 5 (Describes me extremely well). Participants were asked to rate themselves on these 25 markers (e.g., bashful, pleasant, nervous, organized, innovative) separately for each of five roles. For example, individuals rated whether being innovative is characteristic of themselves as a parent, son/daughter, romantic partner, etc.

For calculating SCD, there are three indices that can be used: the standard deviation approach (SCD_{SD}), the correlational approach (SCD_{R}), and the unshared variance approach (SCD_{VAR}; Pilarska & Suchańska, 2015). Donahue et al. (1993) used the SCD_{SD} calculation, while Campbell et al. (2003) used the SCD_{R} approach, and the SCD_{VAR} was used by Block (1961) and Donahue et al. (1993). However, the SCD_{R} approach and SCD_{VAR} approaches are sensitive to within-role variance and do not reflect the theoretically defined SCD construct (Donahue et al., 1993; Pilarska & Suchańska, 2015).

Based on this previous research, the SCD_{SD} index was calculated by computing a standard deviation (SD) for each of the participant’s personality trait ratings across each role (i.e., 25 SDs in all; Donahue et al., 1993; Pilarska & Suchańska, 2015) and then averaging these SDs. Therefore, the SCD score represents how much each individual’s personality trait ratings deviated when describing themselves in different roles with higher values reflecting more variation across roles (i.e., higher SCD).

**Personal Projects**

Personal projects (i.e., goals) were identified where participants reported 10 projects that they were presently working on and refined these projects to include the top 5 projects that are most important to them utilizing the Personal Project Analysis (PPA) tool (Little & Coulombe,
In the PPA tool, participants were asked to spend between 10-15 minutes typing in their current projects and then selected a subset of these projects. Participants then categorized each of their projects. Specifically, to update the PPA tool to current categorizations of goals (Wilkowski et al., 2020), participants categorized their projects into a specific category based on the PINT Goal-Contents Scale (Wilkowski et al., 2020). This approach thus includes four dimensions/categories (Prominence, Inclusiveness, Negativity Prevention, and Tradition). Previous research has categorized goals in a similar fashion to allow for comparisons across individual’s idiosyncratic goals (i.e., categorization framework with 8 category domains; Lawton et al., 2002; Little & Coulombe, 2015). One benefit to this approach is that individuals chose to classify these projects into the associated category, allowing for greater precision (Little & Coulombe, 2015). These projects/goals were rated on a series of matrices in the daily measures section (discussed below).

**Exploratory Baseline Measures**

**Goal Contents**

Goal Contents were measured using the PINT Goal Contents Scale (Wilkowski et al., 2020). There are four dimensions included in the measure (Prominence, Inclusiveness, Negativity Prevention, and Tradition). Each of these goals were measured from -4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to avoiding this) to 4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to this).

Further, participants categorized their identified goals from the PPA tool into the PINT framework of goals (Wilkowski et al., 2020) to compare goals across individuals (Little & Coulombe, 2015) in exploratory analyses outside of the present manuscript.

**Dispositional Goal Commitment**
Goal commitment was measured using the 5-item scale of commitment (Klein et al., 2001; modified from the 9-item scale from Hollenbeck et al., 1989b). This scale was adapted to focus on goals in general rather than a specific goal. An example item is “I am strongly committed to pursuing goals.” Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Prior research has demonstrated adequate reliability and validity for this scale (Klein et al., 2001). These items were included for exploratory analyses outside of the present manuscript. Core-Self Evaluations

Core-self evaluations (CSE) was measured using the 12-item scale developed by Judge et al. (2003). A sample item is “I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.” Each of the items was rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Prior research has demonstrated adequate reliability and validity for this scale for the broad measurement of CSE (Gardner & Pierce, 2010; Judge et al., 2003).

Daily Measures

Goal-Related Constructs

Daily goal-related constructs were measured using the PPA tool (Little & Coulombe, 2015) with a slight modification. Participants will rate the 5 projects identified in the baseline survey on a series of three matrices.

The first matrix covered the following: commitment, progress, control, responsibility, time adequacy, and conflict. The second matrix covered how the projects impact each other (i.e., participants will rate each project in terms of whether the project will have (or is having) a positive (‘+’), very positive (‘++’), negative (‘-‘), very negative (‘--’), or neutral impact (0) on the other projects). These ratings were converted to the following in order to assess goal conflict: 1
(very positive), 2 (positive), 3 (neutral), 4 (negative), and 5 (very negative), where a higher score indicates higher goal conflict.

For the purposes of this paper, the following ratings from the matrices were used: goal commitment (using commitment), goal conflict (using project impact on each other), and goal progress (using progress). Each of these were aggregated across goals to correspond to average commitment, conflict, and progress across the five projects. The other ratings in the matrices were retained for exploratory analyses beyond the scope of this manuscript.

**Eudaimonic Psychological Well-Being**

Eudaimonic psychological well-being (PWB) was measured using a 6-item PWB subscale (Keyes et al., 2010) that measures six dimensions of PWB (self-acceptance, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and autonomy). Previous research has used this scale to measure eudaimonic PWB (Yan et al., 2022). Participants rated this on a 7-point scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). An example item is, “Today, I had experiences that challenged me to grow and become a better person.” Prior research has demonstrated this to have adequate reliability at both the within-person level (α = .84) and between-person level (α = .98; Yan et al., 2022).

**Hedonic Psychological Well-Being**

Hedonic PWB was measured with three constructs: life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect. Life satisfaction was measured with two items from the Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al., 1985; Yan et al., 2022). Participants rated these statements on a 7-point scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). An example item is “In most ways, my life today was close to my ideal.” Prior research has demonstrated adequate reliability at both the within-person (α = .85) and between-person (α = .96) level (Yan et al., 2022). For positive
affect, the shortened version of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS) measure was used (Watson et al., 1988). The PANAS is a self-report measure of affect that contains a list of adjectives that are rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (Not at all) to 5 (Very much). The participants reported how they felt about each of these items today. Positive Affect was measured with the adjectives positive, good, pleasant, happy, joyful, and contented, and Negative Affect was measured with the adjectives negative, bad, unpleasant, sad, afraid, and angry. Prior research has demonstrated adequate reliability at both the within-person (α = .91) and between-person (α = .99) level for Positive Affect and within-person (α = .84) and between-person (α = .97) level for Negative Affect (Yan et al., 2022).

*Psychologically Rich Life*

Psychologically rich life was measured using a shortened version of the 17-item Psychologically Rich Life Questionnaire (PRLQ; Oishi et al., 2019; Oishi & Westgate, 2021). Participants rated these statements on a 7-point scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree). Scale shortening was accomplished by utilizing the OASIS tool (Cortina et al., 2020) and using Oishi et al.’s (2019) Study 1 data published on open-science framework (OSF; https://osf.io/sva2z/). The tool was used by entering all items and allowing the tool to determine the best 3 items that correspond to the highest omega, highest part-whole correlation with the total scale, and similar convergent validity with life satisfaction, positive affect, and negative affect to the whole scale (see Table 2 in Oishi et al., 2019). Three items were selected based on balancing these three indices. Prior research has indicated that selecting at least three items for each construct is necessary for daily/within-person measurement (Gabriel et al., 2019; Heggestad et al., 2019; Shrout & Lane, 2011). An example item is “Today, I have had a lot of interesting experiences.”
Exploratory Daily Measures

Daily Goal Contents

Daily Goal Contents was measured using a shortened version of the PINT Goal Contents Scale (Wilkowski et al., 2020) used in the baseline survey. There are four dimensions included in the measure (Prominence, Inclusiveness, Negativity Prevention, and Tradition). Each of these goals are measured from -4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to avoiding this) to 4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to this). Similar to the PRLQ, scale shortening was accomplished by utilizing the OASIS tool (Cortina et al., 2020) using the data (Study 6) from Wilkowski et al. (2020) published on open-science framework (OSF; https://osf.io/dzabg/). The tool was used by entering all items and allowing the tool to determine the best 3 items that correspond to the highest omega, highest part-whole correlation with each of the dimensions, and similar convergent validity with facets of the Big Five to the whole scale (Prominence: Assertiveness [Extraversion], Inclusiveness: Compassion [Agreeableness], Negativity Prevention: Politeness [Agreeableness], Tradition: Orderliness [Conscientiousness]). Three items were selected based on balancing these three indices. Prior research has indicated that selecting at least three items for each construct is necessary for daily/within-person measurement (Gabriel et al., 2019; Heggestad et al., 2019; Shrout & Lane, 2011). These items were included for exploratory analyses outside of the present manuscript.

Role Variability

Role variability was measured by asking participants to estimate the amount of time that they spent in each role for that day. Participants responded on a sliding scale from 0% of the Time to 100% of the time accumulating to 100% across roles.
Study 1 Results

Prior to conducting analyses, composites were created for each multi-item measure by averaging the items (e.g., SCC), and composites were created for the daily measures using a similar process but within each day (e.g., Monday eudaimonic psychological well-being). Additionally, intraclass correlations (ICCs) were examined for the daily measures to explore the extent of within-person versus between-person variation in these measures. The intraclass correlations are as follows: goal commitment (ICC1 = .81), goal conflict (ICC1 = .87), goal progress (ICC1 = .83), positive affect (ICC1 = .77), negative affect (ICC1 = .76), life satisfaction (ICC1 = .84), eudaimonic psychological well-being (ICC1 = .78), and psychological richness (ICC1 = .68). Taken together, these results suggest that multilevel modeling is appropriate.

Finally, descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities were examined for the focal variables (see Table 1). These findings indicated that the relationships were generally as expected, and the measures appeared to be reliable.

Multilevel Path Analysis

To begin examining the hypotheses and research questions, a multilevel path analysis was conducted in MPlus 6.2 utilizing the multilevel addon (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2010) that “treats the cluster-level component of Level-1 variables as latent” (Preacher et al., 2010, p. 212). Essentially, this approach is intended to result in unbiased estimates of effects at the between-person level. Given that this research uses a 2-1-1 design—where independent variables were measured at Level 2, mediator variables were measured at Level 1, and outcome variables were measured at Level 1—and the hypotheses focus on between-person relationships, this method was appropriate.
Table 1. Study 1 Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.47**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar</td>
<td>22.02</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCom</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConf</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalProg</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eudai</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PosAffect</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegAffect</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.50**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.54**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LifeSat</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>-.51**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsychRich</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SCC: Self-Concept Clarity, CSE: Core Self-Evaluations, SCD: Self-Concept Differentiation, GoalCommit: Goal Commitment, GoalConf: Goal Conflict, GoalProg: Goal Progress, Eudai: Eudaimonic Psychological Well-Being, PosAffect: Positive Affect, NegAffect: Negative Affect, LifeSat: Life Satisfaction, PsychRich: Psychological Richness. Within-person correlations are above the diagonal, between-person correlations are below the diagonal (obtained by averaging the daily scores for each variable and then calculating the correlations between these average scores), and between-person alphas are on the diagonal. RoleVar alpha cannot be calculated due to linear dependency where scores add up to 100. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. 


First, a model was constructed with (a) SCC, SCD, goal commitment, goal conflict, goal progress, eudaimonic well-being, PA, NA, life satisfaction, and psychological richness at the between level and (b) these same variables except SCC and SCD at the within level (see Figure 5). In addition, this model included covariances between the mediators of goal commitment and goal conflict, as well as the outcomes of psychological well-being and goal progress at the between level. Focusing on the between level (consistent with the hypotheses), results indicated that SCC positively predicted goal commitment ($b = 0.46, p = .003$), supporting Hypothesis 1a (see Table 2 for path analysis results). When examining Research Question 1, SCD was unrelated to goal commitment ($b = -1.01, p = .069$). When examining Research Question 2, SCC was unrelated to goal conflict ($b = 0.01, p = .913$). SCD was unrelated to goal conflict ($b = 0.20, p = .344$), failing to support Hypothesis 2. Goal commitment was unrelated to eudaimonic psychological well-being ($b = 0.06, p = .301$), positive affect ($b = 0.04, p = .513$), negative affect ($b = -0.01, p = .777$), or life satisfaction ($b = 0.06, p = .532$), failing to support Hypothesis 3a and 3b. When examining Research Question 3, goal commitment was unrelated to psychological richness ($b = 0.04, p = .626$). Goal conflict was negatively related to eudaimonic psychological well-being ($b = -0.29, p = .039$) and positive affect ($b = -0.36, p = .006$), but was unrelated to negative affect ($b = -0.04, p = .579$) and life satisfaction ($b = -0.28, p = .213$), providing support for Hypothesis 4a and partial support for Hypothesis 4b. When examining Research Question 4, goal conflict was unrelated to psychological richness ($b = -0.35, p = .105$). SCC was positively related to eudaimonic psychological well-being ($b = 0.37, p = .001$), supporting Hypothesis 5a. SCC was positively related to positive affect ($b = .17, p = .038$), negatively related to negative affect ($b = -0.30, p < .001$), and positively related to life satisfaction ($b = 0.43, p = .01$), supporting Hypothesis 5b. When examining Research Question 5, SCC was unrelated to
psychological richness ($b = -0.01, p = .96$). SCD was negatively related to eudaimonic psychological well-being ($b = -1.55, p < .001$), negatively related to positive affect ($b = -0.66, p = .027$), positively related to negative affect ($b = 0.82, p < .001$), and negatively related to life satisfaction ($b = -1.56, p = .007$), providing support for Hypothesis 6a and 6b. When examining Research Question 6, SCD was negatively related to psychological richness ($b = -1.15, p = .012$). Goal commitment was positively related to goal progress ($b = 0.63, p < .001$), supporting Hypothesis 9. However, goal conflict was unrelated to goal progress ($b = -0.11, p = .602$), failing to support Hypothesis 10. SCC was unrelated to goal progress ($b = -0.17, p = .364$), failing to support Hypothesis 11. SCD was unrelated to goal progress ($b = -0.69, p = .177$), failing to support Hypothesis 12. In order to examine Hypothesis 7, Research Question 7, Hypothesis 8, and Research Question 8, indirect effects were computed. The indirect effect from SCC to goal progress through goal commitment was significant (indirect effect = .29, $p = .005$), providing support for Hypothesis 13. The relationship between SCD and goal commitment (Research Question 1a) was non-significant; therefore, the indirect effect analyses were not conducted to explore whether the relationships for SCD and well-being and goal progress are mediated by goal commitment. The remaining indirect effects were non-significant (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within-Person Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Estimate/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PA</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→NA</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→GoalProg</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Eudai</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→PA</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→NA</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→LifeSat</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→PsychRich</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-2.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→GoalProg</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-4.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-Person Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Estimate/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalConflict</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PA</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→NA</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→GoalProg</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>7.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Eudai</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-2.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→PA</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-2.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→NA</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→LifeSat</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→PsychRich</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→GoalProg</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→Eudai</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→PA</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>2.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→NA</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-4.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→LifeSat</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→PsychRich</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalProg</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→Eudai</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-4.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→PA</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-2.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→NA</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>4.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→LifeSat</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-2.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→PsychRich</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>-2.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalProg</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Estimate/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→PA</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→NA</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→GoalProg</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→Eudai</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→PA</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→NA</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→LifeSat</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCD→GoalConflict→PsychRich -0.07 0.08 -0.83
SCD→GoalConflict→GoalProg -0.02 0.05 -0.43


Location-Scale Analysis

Two models were constructed to examine the goal commitment variance hypotheses (one with SCC and one with SCD as predictors\(^1\)). In order to examine these location-scale models, a Bayesian approach is used due to difficulties in frequentist estimation methods for the location-scale model (Hedeker et al., 2009; Rast et al., 2012). Another important note is that this within-individual variance is log transformed due to the fact that variances must be positive values (McNeish, 2020). Nonetheless, negative coefficients still mean that within-individual variance decreases when the predictor increases. Finally, with this approach, rather than reporting \(p\)-values, credible intervals are reported. When credible intervals contain zero, the result is considered non-significant.

SCC was negatively related to goal commitment variance (\(b = -0.48 [-0.78, -0.17]\)); thus, Hypothesis 1b was supported. As SCC increases, goal commitment variability decreases. Goal commitment variance was negatively related to eudaimonic well-being (\(b = -0.22 [-0.35, -0.11]\), positive affect (\(b = -0.16 [-0.26, -0.07]\)), life satisfaction (\(b = -0.20 [-0.39, -0.03]\)), and psychological richness (\(b = -0.22 [-0.38, -0.06]\)). Additionally, goal commitment variance was positively related to negative affect (\(b = 0.09 [0.01, 0.17]\)). Taken together, this provides support for Hypothesis 3a and Hypothesis 3b. The indirect effect from SCC to eudaimonic well-being

---

\(^1\) SCC and SCD were included in separate models due to convergence issues. When SCC and SCD were included in a single model, the model failed to converge.
through goal commitment variance (indirect effect = 0.10 [0.03, 0.22]), positive affect (indirect effect = 0.08 [0.02, 0.16]), negative affect (indirect effect = -0.04 [-0.10, -0.00]), life satisfaction (indirect effect = 0.09 [0.01, 0.24]), and psychological richness (indirect effect = 0.10 [0.02, 0.23]) were significant (see Table 3).

Table 3. Study 1 Self-Concept Clarity (SCC) Location-Scale Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-Person Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>[-0.78,-0.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[-0.35,-0.11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PA</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.26,-0.07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→NA</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[0.01,0.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[-0.39,-0.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>[-0.38,-0.06]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Effects</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[0.03,0.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→PA</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[0.02,0.16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→NA</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>[-0.10,-0.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[0.01,0.24]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[0.02,0.23]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. SCC: Self-Concept Clarity, GoalCommit: Goal Commitment, PA: Positive Affect, NA: Negative Affect, LifeSat: Life Satisfaction, PsychRich: Psychological Richness. CI = Credible Interval. CIs containing 0 are non-significant.

For Research Question 1b, SCD was positively related to goal commitment variance ($b = 1.80$ [0.67, 2.89]); thus, as SCD increases, goal commitment variability increases. Goal commitment variance was negatively related to eudaimonic well-being ($b = -0.21$ [-0.33, -0.09]), positive affect ($b = -0.15$ [-0.25, -0.06]), and psychological richness ($b = -0.20$ [-0.35, -0.05]). Additionally, goal commitment variance was positively related to negative affect ($b = 0.09$ [0.01, 0.17]). However, unlike the model with SCC, goal commitment variance was unrelated to life satisfaction ($b = -0.17$ [-0.342, 0.01]; see Table 4). Taken together, this provides support for Hypothesis 6a and partial support for Hypothesis 6b (see Table 5 for a summary of hypothesis support).
**Table 4. Study 1 Self-Concept Differentiation (SCD) Location-Scale Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-Person Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>[0.67, 2.89]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>[-0.33, -0.09]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PA</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.25, -0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→NA</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>[-0.34, 0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>[-0.35, -0.05]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit→PA</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit→NA</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* SCD: Self-Concept Differentiation, GoalCommit: Goal Commitment, PA: Positive Affect, NA: Negative Affect, LifeSat: Life Satisfaction, PsychRich: Psychological Richness. CI = Credible Interval. CIs containing 0 are non-significant.

**Table 5. Study 1 Hypotheses/Research Questions and Support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Level 2 DV</th>
<th>Level 2 IV</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1a</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Intercept</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1b</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Variance*</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1a</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Intercept</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1b</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Variance*</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td>Goal Conflict Intercept</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Goal Conflict Intercept</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3a</td>
<td>Eudaimonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Intercept, Goal Commitment Variance*</td>
<td>--✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3b</td>
<td>Hedonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Intercept, Goal Commitment Variance*</td>
<td>--✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 3</td>
<td>Psychological Richness Intercept</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Intercept, Goal Commitment Variance*</td>
<td>--✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4a</td>
<td>Eudaimonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>Goal Conflict Intercept</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4b</td>
<td>Hedonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>Goal Conflict Intercept</td>
<td>--✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 4</td>
<td>Psychological Richness Intercept</td>
<td>Goal Conflict Intercept</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5a</td>
<td>Eudaimonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5b</td>
<td>Hedonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 5</td>
<td>Psychological Richness Intercept</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6a</td>
<td>Eudaimonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6b</td>
<td>Hedonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 6</td>
<td>Psychological Richness Intercept</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7a</td>
<td>Eudaimonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept</td>
<td>SCC (X), Goal Commitment Intercept (M), Goal Commitment Variance* (M)</td>
<td>--✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 7b:  
Hedonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept  
SCC (X), Goal Commitment Intercept (M), Goal Commitment Variance* (M) ~✓

Research Question 7:  
Psychological Richness Intercept  
SCC (X), Goal Commitment Intercept (M), Goal Commitment Variance* (M) ~✓

Hypothesis 8a:  
Eudaimonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept  
SCD (X), Goal Conflict Intercept (M)

Hypothesis 8b:  
Hedonic Psychological Wellbeing Intercept  
SCD (X), Goal Conflict Intercept (M)

Research Question 8:  
Psychological Richness Intercept  
SCD (X), Goal Conflict Intercept (M)

Hypothesis 9:  
Goal Progress Intercept  
Goal Commitment Intercept ✓

Hypothesis 10:  
Goal Progress Intercept  
Goal Conflict Intercept ~

Hypothesis 11:  
Goal Progress Intercept  
SCC ~

Hypothesis 12:  
Goal Progress Intercept  
SCD ~

Hypothesis 13:  
Goal Progress Intercept  
SCC (X), Goal Commitment Intercept (M) ✓

Hypothesis 14:  
Goal Progress Intercept  
SCD (X), Goal Conflict Intercept (M) ~

Note: *For the variance hypotheses, the within-person variance of the outcome was regressed on the predictors using the approach outlined by McNeish (2020). X = predictor, M = mediator. ✓ = fully supported. ~✓ = partially supported.

Exploratory Analyses

Given that the hypotheses focused on the between level, the within-person relationships between the mediators and outcomes were examined as exploratory analyses. Goal commitment was positively related to goal progress ($\gamma = 0.39$, $p < .001$) and goal conflict was negatively related to goal progress ($\gamma = -0.68$, $p < .001$). Additionally, goal conflict was negatively related to psychological richness ($\gamma = -0.33$, $p = .036$). The remaining relationships were non-significant (see Table 2).

Finally, role variability and CSE were examined as control variables for the hypotheses related to SCC/SCD with goal commitment. When CSE and role variability were included in the model that incorporated goal commitment and conflict, the hypothesized relationships had the following differences (see Table 6). The relationship between SCC and goal commitment became non-significant ($b = 0.34$, $p = .082$). However, the relationship between CSE and goal commitment was also non-significant ($b = 0.28$, $p = .224$). Goal commitment was unrelated to eudaimonic psychological well-being ($b = 0.06$, $p = .30$), positive affect ($b = 0.03$, $p = .537$), negative affect ($b = -0.00$, $p = .907$), and life satisfaction ($b = 0.02$, $p = .748$). SCC was unrelated
to positive affect ($b = 0.14, p = 0.109$) and life satisfaction ($b = 0.13, p = 0.363$). Additionally, the indirect effect from SCC to goal progress through goal commitment was non-significant (indirect effect $= 0.21, p = 0.091$). Results were largely unchanged for the hypotheses containing SCD when these control variables were added. However, role variability was a significant predictor of eudaimonic well-being ($b = -0.02, p = 0.019$), positive affect ($b = -0.02, p = 0.002$), life satisfaction ($b = -0.02, p = 0.036$), and psychological richness ($b = -0.03, p = 0.006$; see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6. Study 1 Multilevel Path Model with CSE/Role Variability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within-Person Relationship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between-Person Relationship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalConflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→GoalCommit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→GoalConflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→GoalCommit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→GoalConflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→Eudai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→LifeSat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→PsychRich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→GoalProg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→Eudai</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→PA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→NA</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→LifeSat</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→PsychRich</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→GoalProg</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→Eudai</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCD→GoalConflict→PA -0.02 0.05 -0.39
SCD→GoalConflict→NA -0.00 0.01 -0.34
SCD→GoalConflict→LifeSat -0.01 0.02 -0.32
SCD→GoalConflict→PsychRich -0.01 0.04 -0.37
SCD→GoalConflict→GoalProg -0.00 0.02 -0.17


**Study 1 Discussion**

The goal of Study 1 was to examine (a) how self-concept structure relates to self-regulatory process and (b) how these connections may help explain why self-concept structure relates to well-being and goal progress. To address these issues, three sets of relationships are relevant: self-concept structure to well-being and goal progress, self-concept structure to self-regulatory processes, and self-regulatory processes to well-being and goal progress.

For the first set of relationships (self-concept structure to well-being and goal progress), previous research has suggested that SCC is positively related to both hedonic (Campbell et al., 2003) and eudaimonic psychological well-being (Hanley & Garland, 2017). Additionally, SCD has been related to hedonic (Diehl et al., 2001; Donahue et al., 1993) and eudaimonic psychological well-being (Bigler et al., 2001). In this study, these results were largely supported. SCC was positively related to eudaimonic psychological well-being and positive aspects of hedonic well-being (e.g., positive affect) and negatively related to negative aspects of hedonic well-being (i.e., negative affect). SCD was negatively related to eudaimonic psychological well-being and positive aspects of hedonic well-being (e.g., positive affect) and positively related to negative aspects of hedonic well-being (i.e., negative affect). This research also expanded on this prior work related to psychological well-being by including psychological richness. SCC was unrelated to psychological richness; however, SCD was negatively related to psychological...
richness, suggesting that these two self-concept structure components differentially related to aspects of well-being. Specifically, as SCD increased, psychological richness decreased. This finding suggests that those higher in SCD may have low levels of psychological richness when examining their life as a whole. It may be that those higher in SCD vary in their own values and interests, so they may tend to rate themselves lower when considering whether their experiences are unique, interesting, or novel on a day-to-day basis.

For the second set of relationships (self-concept structure to self-regulatory processes), prior work has been limited and mostly theoretical. For example, Light et al. (2018) found that those higher in self-certainty will stay committed to focal goals when presented with alternatives. Additionally, those manipulated to have lower levels of SCC were less willing to adhere to an original exercise plan (Jiang et al., 2022). Further, those with high SCD were expected to have higher levels of goal conflict based on CB5T (DeYoung, 2014). In the current study, SCC was positively related to goal commitment. However, SCD was unrelated to goal conflict. Although this may be in part a product of measurement issues, which are discussed further in the General Discussion section, it may also be that SCD is not related to goal conflict, suggesting that goal conflict could be a product of other factors (e.g., self-control), rather than SCD.

For the third set of relationships (self-regulatory processes to well-being and goal progress), prior research examining the effects of goal commitment and goal conflict on psychological well-being has indicated that goal commitment is positively related to well-being (e.g., Joshanloo et al., 2017) and goal conflict is negatively related to aspects of well-being (e.g., Emmons, 1986). The current results partially support these previous findings. Results for goal commitment, specifically variability, were similar to previous research findings; however, the relationships for goal conflict were mixed. Specifically, goal conflict was unrelated to aspects of
psychological well-being examined in previous literature (e.g., negative affect, life satisfaction; Emmons, 1986). Additionally, goal conflict was unrelated to psychological richness. However, goal conflict was negatively related to positive affect. As mentioned earlier, this may be in part a product of measurement, but it seems that goal conflict may be more related to enthusiasm and excitement (i.e., positive affect) than to nervousness or being upset (i.e., negative affect).

Further, prior research has demonstrated that goal commitment is positively related to progress (Klein et al., 1999) and goal conflict is negatively related to progress (Locke et al., 1994). The current research partially supports these findings as goal commitment was positively related to progress; however, goal conflict was unrelated to progress.

In combination, these three sets of proposed relationships suggest that the goal-related variables (i.e., goal commitment and goal conflict) may play a role in any relationships between self-concept structure and well-being and goal progress. Results for these indirect effect hypotheses were mixed. For example, there was an indirect effect from SCC to goal progress through average goal commitment, suggesting that SCC does in fact relate to self-regulatory constructs (specifically, goal commitment) which in turn predict goal-related progress. In addition, each indirect effect from SCC to well-being through goal commitment variability was significant. This suggests that goal commitment variability may have more relevance as a mechanism through which SCC is related to well-being than average goal commitment. Additionally, the indirect effects from SCD to well-being through goal commitment variability were significant, except when life satisfaction was the outcome. The remaining indirect effects were non-significant. Overall, this indicates that variability in goal commitment may be a mechanism through which self-concept structure components (i.e., SCC and SCD) are related to psychological well-being.
In exploratory analyses, role variability experienced throughout the week and CSE were examined as control variables. Role variability was significantly related to various aspects of well-being; however, this did not affect the SCD relationships. Conversely, the inclusion of CSE did impact several of the relationships. Specifically, when CSE was included in the model, many relationships involving SCC were rendered non-significant, although CSE was also non-significant. This suggests that SCC and CSE may be related such that when both are included in a single model, neither provides unique prediction. This is discussed further in the General Discussion.

This study provides preliminary support for several of the hypothesized relationships involving self-concept structure, goal-related variables (i.e., goal commitment and goal conflict), and psychological well-being and goal progress. However, this study examined an individual’s life in general rather than their experiences and behaviors in work settings. The following study examines these relationships when applied directly to the workplace.

**Study 2**

The purpose of Study 2 was to apply the concepts from Study 1 to the work context. Thus, Study 2 differed from Study 1 in three ways: 1) Study 2 explicitly targeted full-time employees, 2) goals specifically focused on work, and 3) the constructs and measures focused on the work context. More specifically, this study examined work engagement and job performance as outcomes. Further, SCC, SCD, and the goal-related constructs are contextualized to be work-related, rather than general (see Figure 6).

**Figure 6:** Study 2 Theoretical Model of Hypotheses
Research and theory on work engagement has suggested that there are three important aspects that come together to create the experience of engagement (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004): vigor, or the excitement or energy directed towards work; absorption, or the ability to be content when ‘lost’ in work; and dedication, or a sense of pride and accomplishment from one’s work. The most popular approach to studying the antecedents and consequences of engagement utilizes the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, discussed in more detail below and first proposed by Demerouti and colleagues (Demerouti et al., 2001) with later revisions focusing more directly on applications to work engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). In this model, the positive effects of work engagement on employee performance are highlighted – including increased performance, increased creativity, and reduction in turnover – but the real focus is the contributors to building an engaged employee.

Engagement has become such a hot commodity in the organizational psychology literature in part due to the realization that engagement benefits both the worker and the organization (see Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). Engaged employees are more committed, perform
better, experience better health, and cause less turnover in the organization (see Halbesleben, 2010).

**Goal-Related Constructs and Work Engagement**

According to job characteristics theory (Hackman, 1980), there are several aspects of work that facilitate employee motivation. For example, job characteristics such as autonomy, task significance, and feedback are positively related to employee engagement (Christian et al., 2011). Certain goal-related constructs such as goal commitment appear to be related to these characteristics. As individuals are working on their current goals on the job, they must be committed to those goals in order to be engaged in them. For example, goal commitment has been linked to goal achievement (Wofford et al., 1992), which would require individuals to be engaged in their goals. Additionally, two of the aspects of work engagement, vigor and absorption, tie directly to commitment. For example, an individual who is very committed to achieving their goal at work of selling 10 cars would exhibit energy and excitement in order to achieve that goal. Additionally, they may get lost in time while they are at work due to their focus on their goal.

**Hypothesis 15:** Goal commitment (average) will be positively related to work engagement.

Goal pursuit requires attentional resources (Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989). When multiple goals are present in goal pursuit, this splits up the attentional resources that can be allocated to each goal. Therefore, when employees are presented with conflicting demands, they may shift between these goals too often. This shifting of attention may then have implications for engagement. Specifically, a strong focus on the task at hand (i.e., goal) is necessary to feel vigorous at work (Niessen et al., 2012). Additionally, in order to feel absorbed in work, one
needs to direct attention and focus on the task (Rothbard, 2001). Through splitting attentional resources and task focus, individuals experiencing goal conflict are likely to be less engaged in their work overall as they are constantly shifting priorities.

**Hypothesis 16:** Goal conflict will be negatively related to work engagement.

**Self-Concept Structure and Work Engagement**

Little research has examined the relationship between SCC and work engagement. SCC has been shown to positively relate to two aspects of work engagement: dedication and absorption (Balunde & Paradnike, 2016). Specifically, those high on SCC tend to find themselves in work that leads them to become absorbed and dedicated, due to their knowledge about themselves. Additionally, SCC was positively related to a related construct, perceived work meaningfulness (Oh & Roh, 2019). This relationship was even stronger when the leader of those individuals had low levels of transformational leadership. This indicates that employees who do not have strong inspiration coming from leaders and have low levels of clarity are even more at-risk to not be engaged at work or find meaning in their work. Additionally, individuals who have higher levels of SCC are more active and more cooperative during problem-solving tasks than those low in SCC, suggesting that they are more engaged in the task at hand (Bechtoldt et al., 2010). Taken together, it is expected that those high on SCC will tend to be more engaged in their work, such that given they have high clarity, they are able to identify work that is more meaningful to them which leads to them being more engaged.

**Hypothesis 17:** SCC will be positively related to work engagement.

Little research has examined the relationships between SCD and work engagement. One study (Garczynski et al., 2013) examining this relationship was a cross-cultural study that examined the relationship between SCD (between work and non-work self-aspects) and
engagement. They found that SCD is negatively related to work engagement, such that individuals who were lower on SCD tended to not be engaged with their work; however, this was more present for Americans than their Indian counterparts (Garczynski et al., 2013). It may be, for example, that those high in SCD may struggle with their current identity and as they move from situation to situation, they find themselves uncertain of how to perform. Additionally, those individuals may be more likely to engage in withdrawal behaviors, leading to lower levels of engagement while at work.

**Hypothesis 18:** SCD will be negatively related to work engagement.

Given the previously discussed relationships between self-concept structure and goal-related variables and the relationships between goal-related variables and engagement, it is expected that these goal-related variables will mediate the relationships between self-concept structure, work engagement, and performance. For example, an individual who is high in SCC would have more clearly defined work goals, demonstrating higher levels of commitment towards those goals, which would lead to higher levels of work engagement. Further, for individuals high in SCD, they may experience more work goal conflict when self-concept elements, and thus goals, differ across roles, which would then lead to lower levels of work engagement.

**Hypothesis 19:** Goal commitment (average) will mediate the relationships between SCC and work engagement.

**Hypothesis 20:** Goal conflict will mediate the relationships between SCD and work engagement.
Job Performance

Job performance refers to the “total expected value to the organization of the discrete behavioral episodes that an individual carries out over a standard period of time” (Motowidlo & Keil, 2013, p. 82). Therefore, performance is not only just behavior, as it is evaluated by the organization over a period of time. Several theoretical models of job performance have been proposed (e.g., Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Campbell, 2012; Griffin et al., 2007). However, perhaps the most widely accepted model of performance is Campbell’s (2012) revised eight factor model. This includes: 1) job-specific technical task proficiency, 2) non-job specific technical task proficiency, 3) written and oral communication task proficiency, 4) demonstrating effort, 5) maintaining personal discipline (counterproductive work behavior), 6) facilitating peer and team performance, 7) supervision/leadership, and 8) management/administration. This research focuses on technical performance defined as in-role job performance.

Goal-Related Constructs and Job Performance

Overall, goals have been linked to job performance in a myriad of ways. For example, research has demonstrated that goal commitment is positively related to goal achievement and performance (e.g., Klein & Kim, 1998; Klein et al., 1999). Additionally, in a meta-analysis, goal commitment was found to impact goal achievement, where those who have higher levels of goal commitment have performance that is closer to the goal level (Wooford et al., 1992). This positive effect of goal commitment on performance has been shown in a variety of studies (e.g., Klein et al., 1999). Therefore, goal commitment is expected to be positively related to work performance.

**Hypothesis 21:** Goal commitment (average) will be positively related to in-role job performance.
Prior research has demonstrated the negative effects of pursuing multiple simultaneous goals, such that it leads to lower levels of performance (Humphreys & Revelle, 1984). Based on the amount of resources (e.g., time, effort, attention) that an individual has at any given moment, splitting those resources amongst multiple goals is likely to impact their ability to perform and meet those goals. Consistent with this idea, evidence from the dual-task paradigm, where an individual has to pursue to two tasks simultaneously to achieve each goal, suggests that multiple tasks (i.e., multiple goals) often lead to performance decrements (Sun & Frese, 2013). Additionally, goal conflicts can also lead to a reduction in performance (Locke et al., 1994).

**Hypothesis 22:** Goal conflict will be negatively related to in-role job performance.

**Self-Concept Structure and Job Performance**

Numerous studies have examined the impacts of self-concept content (e.g., self-esteem and core self-evaluations) in performance settings, with findings generally indicating more positive evaluations are associated with higher levels of performance (e.g., Chang et al., 2012; Schaubroeck et al., 2012). Less research has examined the impacts of self-concept structure (i.e., SCC and SCD) on performance. In one example, although not hypothesized, SCC was negatively related to counterproductive work behaviors (Pomerance et al., 2020). Additionally, SCC has been linked to certain aspects of adaptive performance (e.g., problem solving; Cho & Lee, 2013). SCC is likely to be related to work performance overall as well. For example, an individual with high SCC is likely to have a clear sense of the work needed at their job.

**Hypothesis 23:** SCC will be positively related to in-role job performance.

Although the relationship between SCD and job performance has not been studied, it is possible that SCD tends to be somewhat detrimental to performance. For example, SCD may often entail acting differently across contexts, a process that might be somewhat draining. This
drain on energy may then have negative consequences for performance. Similar effects have been observed in the context of emotional labor. Evidence has suggested that greater emotional labor, specifically surface acting through affect delivery, can be associated with lower performance (Goodwin et al., 2011). Given that surface acting can also involve acting differently across contexts, it may be that similar effects hold for SCD. In addition, one study (Pomerance & Converse, 2014) found that SCD has an overall negative relationship with GPA and self-reported leadership behavior in undergraduate students. Therefore, SCD has some implications for performance in an academic setting and that may translate to job performance as well.

**Hypothesis 24:** SCD will be negatively related to in-role job performance.

Given the previously discussed relationships between self-concept structure and goal-related variables and the relationships between goal-related variables and performance, it is expected that these goal-related variables will mediate the relationships between self-concept structure and performance. For example, an individual who is high in SCC would have more clearly defined work goals, demonstrating higher levels of commitment towards those goals, which would lead to higher levels of in-role job performance. Further, for individuals high in SCD, they may experience more work goal conflict when self-concept elements, and thus goals, differ across roles, which would then lead to lower levels of in-role job performance.

**Hypothesis 25:** Goal commitment (average) will mediate the relationships between SCC and in-role job performance.

**Hypothesis 26:** Goal conflict will mediate the relationships between SCD and in-role job performance.
Study 2 Method

Participants

Similar to Study 1, participants were recruited using CloudResearch’s Connect platform (Connect). The same best practices for ensuring data quality were used as well (see Aguinis et al., 2021).

Two hundred and twenty-seven participants were recruited using Connect. Each participant passed the CAPTCHA verification. After examining attention checks, a majority of participants passed \( n = 213 \). Therefore, 213 participants were invited to participate in the daily surveys. A total of 188 participants completed at least one of the daily surveys (mean age = 38.63 [SD = 10.20]; 75.4% White; 44.1% Female; 80.9% Working Full Time; 46.8% Bachelor’s degree). A total of 826 observations were obtained over the course of 5 working days (average observations per participant = 4.40).

Procedure

Similar to Study 1, participants completed a series of surveys over the course of one week. Specifically, participants completed a baseline survey with various individual difference measures, including measures of SCC, SCD, and exploratory variables. Then, participants were invited to participate in an experience sampling component of the study where they completed daily surveys measuring the focal goal-related constructs and outcomes for one week (see Appendix for full list of measures).

Baseline Measures

Self-Concept Clarity (SCC)

SCC was measured using the SCC Scale (SCCS; Campbell et al., 1996). This scale consisted of 12 items regarding self-beliefs. To target SCC while at work, the phrase “while at
work” was added to each of the items. An example item is “Sometimes I feel that I am not really the person that I appear to be while at work.” Each item was scored using a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Each item was averaged across all 12 items with higher scores indicating a higher SCC.

**Self-Concept Differentiation (SCD)**

SCD measurement involved the same two steps taken in Study 1 with one exception: the roles were measured based on the Multiple Self-Aspects Framework (McConnell, 2011) but the focus was on roles while at work. Example roles include: organizational member, leader, mentor, peer, team member, subordinate, etc. The remaining process involving the traits and calculating SCD were the same.

**Personal Projects**

Personal projects were identified in the same way as in Study 1 with one exception: participants first reported and refined the 10 projects that they are presently working on while at work.

**Exploratory Baseline Measures**

**Goal Contents**

Goal Contents were measured using the PINT Goal Contents Scale (Wilkowski et al., 2020). There are four dimensions included in the measure (Prominence, Inclusiveness, Negativity Prevention, and Tradition). Each of these goals were measured from -4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to avoiding this) to 4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to this).
Further, participants categorized their identified goals from the PPA tool into the PINT framework of goals (Wilkowski et al., 2020) to aggregate and compare goals across individuals (Little & Coulombe, 2015) in exploratory analyses outside of the present manuscript.

**Dispositional Goal Commitment**

Goal commitment was measured using the 5-item scale of commitment (Klein et al., 2001; modified from the 9-item scale from Williams & Klein, 1989). This scale was adapted to focus on goals in general rather than a specific goal, and the phrase “while at work” were added to each of the items to target work goal commitment. An example item is “I am strongly committed to pursuing goals while at work.” Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Prior research has demonstrated adequate reliability and validity for this scale (Klein et al., 2001). These items were retained for exploratory analyses outside of the present manuscript.

**Core-Self Evaluations (CSE)**

Core-Self Evaluations (CSE) was measured using the 12-item scale developed by Judge et al. (2003). However, this scale is adapted to focus on a workplace setting rather than life in general. A sample item is “I am confident I get the success I deserve at work.” Each of the items were evaluated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). Prior research has demonstrated adequate reliability and validity of this scale for the broad measurement of CSE (Gardner & Pierce, 2010; Judge et al., 2003).

**Daily Measures**

**Goal-Related Constructs**

Daily goal-related constructs were measured using the PPA tool (Little & Coulombe, 2015) with a slight modification. Participants rated the 5 projects identified in the baseline
survey on a series of three matrices. Participants will be instructed to consider these projects as they relate to their work. The first matrix covered the following: commitment, progress, control, responsibility, time adequacy, and conflict. The second matrix covered how the projects impact each other (i.e., participants will rate each project in terms of whether the project will have (or is having) a positive (+), very positive (++), negative (-), very negative (—), or neutral impact (0) on the other projects). These ratings were converted to the following in order to assess goal conflict: 1 (very positive), 2 (positive), 3 (neutral), 4 (negative) and 5 (very negative), where a higher score indicates higher goal conflict.

For the purposes of this paper, the following ratings from the matrices were used: goal commitment (using commitment), goal conflict (using project impact on each other), and goal progress (using progress). The other ratings in the matrices were retained for exploratory analyses beyond the scope of this manuscript.

*Daily In-Role Job Performance*

In-role job performance was measured with seven items, using a 6-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 6 (Strongly agree), where participants indicate their current level of in-role behavior (i.e., job performance; Williams & Anderson, 1991) while maintaining the perspective of their supervisor (Schoorman & Mayer, 2008). An example item is “*My supervisor would rate my job performance for TODAY as follows:* Met formal performance requirements of the job today.”

*State Work Engagement*

State work engagement was measured using the State Work Engagement (SWE) scale (Breevaart et al., 2012) with a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The scale contains three components: Vigor (e.g., “Today, I felt bursting with energy”),
Dedication (e.g., “Today, my job inspired me”) and Absorption (e.g., “Today, I was immersed in my work”). Previous research has supported the 3-factor structure in a multilevel model (Breevaart et al., 2012).

**Exploratory Daily Measures**

*Daily Goal Contents*

Daily Goal Contents was measured using a shortened version of the PINT Goal Contents Scale (Wilkowski et al., 2020) using the same 3 items for each of the four dimensions (Prominence, Inclusiveness, Negativity Prevention, and Tradition) identified in Study 1. Prior research has indicated that selecting at least three items for each construct is necessary for daily/within-person measurement (Gabriel et al., 2019; Heggestad et al., 2019; Shrout & Lane, 2011). in exploratory analyses outside of the present manuscript.

*Role Variability*

Role variability was measured by asking participants to estimate the amount of time that they spent in each role for that day. Participants responded on a sliding scale from 0% of the Time to 100% of the time accumulating to 100% across roles.

**Study 2 Results**

Prior to conducting analyses, composites were created for each multi-item measure by averaging the items (e.g., SCC), and composites were created for the daily measures using a similar process but within each day (e.g., Monday work engagement). Additionally, intraclass correlations (ICCs) were examined for the daily measures to explore the extent of within-person versus between-person variation in these measures. The intraclass correlations are as follows: goal commitment (ICC1 = .79), goal conflict (ICC1 = .88), goal progress (ICC1 = .81), job performance (ICC1 = .50), and work engagement (ICC1 = .70). Taken together, these results
suggest that multilevel modeling is appropriate. Finally, descriptive statistics, correlations, and reliabilities were examined for the focal variables (see Table 7). These findings indicated that the relationships were generally as expected, and the measures appeared to be reliable.
### Table 7. Study 2 Descriptive Statistics, Correlations, and Reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SCC</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CSE</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SCD</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. RoleVariability</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>(--)</td>
<td>-10**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. GoalCommit</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. GoalConflict</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>(.94)</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Goal Progress</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work Engagement</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>(.96)</td>
<td>.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Job Performance</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>(.93)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** SCC: Self-Concept Clarity, CSE: Core Self-Evaluations, SCD: Self-Concept Differentiation, GoalCommit: Goal Commitment. Within-person correlations are above the diagonal, between-person correlations are below the diagonal (obtained by averaging the daily scores for each variable and then calculating the correlations between these average scores), and between-person alphas are on the diagonal. RoleVariability alpha cannot be calculated due to linear dependency where scores add up to 100. *p < .05. **p < .01.
**Multilevel Path Analysis**

The same analytic approach used in Study 1 was used in Study 2, starting with a multilevel path analysis. First, a model was constructed with (a) SCC, SCD, goal commitment, goal conflict, goal progress, work engagement, and in-role job performance at the between level and (b) these same variables except SCC and SCD at the within-level (see Figure 6). In addition, this model included covariances between the mediators of goal commitment and goal conflict, as well as the outcomes of work engagement and job performance. Note also that goal progress is not a focal variable in this study but was included to examine similarities and differences between Study 1 and Study 2. Focusing on the between level (consistent with the hypotheses), results indicated that SCC was unrelated to goal commitment ($b = 0.26, p = .159$), failing to support Hypothesis 1a (see Table 8 for path analysis results). When examining Research Question 1, SCD was negatively related to goal commitment ($b = -2.26, p = .004$). When examining Research Question 2, SCC was unrelated to goal conflict ($b = -0.00, p = .971$). SCD was positively related to goal conflict ($b = 0.56, p = .023$), providing support for Hypothesis 2. Goal commitment was positively related to work engagement ($b = 0.12, p = .002$), providing support for Hypothesis 15. Goal conflict was unrelated to work engagement ($b = -0.17, p = .138$), failing to provide support for Hypothesis 16. SCC was positively related to work engagement ($b = 0.37, p < .001$), providing support for Hypothesis 17. SCD was unrelated to work engagement ($b = -0.03, p = .937$), failing to provide support for Hypothesis 18. Goal commitment was positively related to job performance ($b = 0.04, p = .001$), providing support for Hypothesis 21. However, goal conflict was unrelated to job performance ($b = 0.00, p = .943$), failing to provide support for Hypothesis 22. SCC was positively related to job performance ($b = 0.13, p < .001$), providing support for Hypothesis 23. SCD was unrelated to job performance ($b = -0.04, p =
.705), failing to provide support for Hypothesis 24. The indirect effects from SCD to work engagement (indirect effect = -0.28, \( p = .008 \)), job performance (indirect effect = -0.10, \( p = .028 \)), and goal progress (indirect effect = -1.59, \( p = .008 \)) through goal commitment were significant. The remaining indirect effects were non-significant (see Table 8), failing to provide support for Hypotheses 19, 20, 25, or 26.

Table 8. Study 2 Multilevel Path Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within-Person Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Estimate/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Job Performance</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Goal Progress</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-Person Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Estimate/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalConflict</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-2.89*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>4.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→Job Performance</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>7.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Goal Progress</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect Effects

| SCC→GoalCommit→Work Engagement | 0.03     | 0.03| 1.26        |
| SCC→GoalCommit→Job Performance | 0.01     | 0.01| 1.25        |
| SCD→GoalConflict→Work Engagement | -0.09  | 0.08| 1.16        |
| SCD→GoalConflict→Job Performance | 0.00   | 0.02| 0.07        |
| SCC→GoalCommit→Goal Progress  | 0.18     | 0.13| 1.37        |
| SCD→GoalConflict→Goal Progress | -0.08  | 0.14| -0.59       |
| SCD→GoalCommit→Work Engagement | -0.28   | 0.12| -2.27*      |
SCD→GoalCommit→Job Performance  -0.10  0.05  -2.20*
SCD→GoalCommit→Goal Progress -1.59  0.60  -2.64*

Note. SCC: Self-Concept Clarity, CSE: Core Self-Evaluations, SCD: Self-Concept Differentiation, GoalCommit: Goal Commitment.
*p < .05.

Location-Scale Analysis

Two models were constructed to examine the goal commitment variance hypotheses (one with SCC and one with SCD as predictors). Similar to Study 1, these location-scale models involved a Bayesian approach.

SCC was unrelated to goal commitment variability ($b = -0.33$ [-0.69, 0.04]; thus, Hypothesis 1b was unsupported. Goal commitment variance was unrelated to work engagement ($b = -0.07$ [-0.16, 0.02]). Goal commitment variance was negatively related to in-role job performance ($b = -0.04$ [-0.07, -0.01]) and goal progress ($b = -0.59$ [-0.80, -0.37]). This suggests that as goal commitment variance increased, in-role job performance and goal progress decreased. However, all indirect effects were non-significant (see Table 9).

Table 9. Study 2 Self-Concept Clarity (SCC) Location-Scale Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-Person Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>[-.69, 0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.02]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Job Performance</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.07, -0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Goal Progress</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>[-0.80, -0.37]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect Effects

| SCC→GoalCommit→Work Engagement      | 0.02     | 0.02         | [-0.01, 0.08]|
| SCC→GoalCommit→Job Performance      | 0.01     | 0.01         | [-0.00, 0.03]|
| SCC→GoalCommit→Goal Progress        | 0.19     | 0.11         | [-0.02, 0.43]|

Note. SCC: Self-Concept Clarity, GoalCommit: Goal Commitment, PA: Positive Affect, NA: Negative Affect, LifeSat: Life Satisfaction, PsychRich: Psychological Richness. CI = Credible Interval. CIs containing 0 are non-significant.

2 Similar to Study 1, SCC and SCD were included in separate models due to convergence issues. When SCC and SCD were included in a single model, the model failed to converge.
For Research Question 1b, SCD was positively related to goal commitment variance \((b = 1.92 [0.50, 3.34])\); thus, as SCD increases, goal commitment variability increases. Similar to the previous model, goal commitment variance was unrelated to work engagement \((b = -0.04 [-0.14, 0.06])\). However, goal commitment variance was also unrelated to in-role job performance \((b = -0.03 [-0.07, 0.00])\). Goal commitment variance was negatively related to goal progress \((b = -0.53 [-0.78, -0.28])\), suggesting that as goal commitment variability increased, goal progress decreased. The indirect effect from SCD to goal progress through goal commitment variability was significant \((\text{indirect effect} = -0.97 [-2.02, -0.23]; \text{see Table 10})\). The remaining indirect effects were non-significant (see Table 11 for a summary of hypotheses support).

### Table 10. Study 2 Self-Concept Differentiation (SCD) Location-Scale Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between-Person Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Posterior SD</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>[0.50, 3.34]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>[-0.14, 0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Job Performance</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Goal Progress</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>[-0.78, -0.28]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect Effects**

| SCD→GoalCommit→Work Engagement                   | -0.07    | 0.11         | [-0.32, 0.12]|
| SCD→GoalCommit→Job Performance                   | -0.07    | 0.05         | [-0.17, 0.00]|
| SCD→GoalCommit→Goal Progress                     | -0.97    | 0.46         | [-2.02, -0.23]|

**Note.** SCD: Self-Concept Differentiation, GoalCommit: Goal Commitment, PA: Positive Affect, NA: Negative Affect, LifeSat: Life Satisfaction, PsychRich: Psychological Richness. CI = Credible Interval. CIs containing 0 are non-significant.

### Table 11. Study 2 Hypotheses/Research Questions and Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Level 2 DV</th>
<th>Level 2 IV</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1a</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Intercept</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1b</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Variance*</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1a</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Intercept</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 1b</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Variance*</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Question 2</td>
<td>Goal Conflict Intercept</td>
<td>SCC</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Goal Conflict Intercept</td>
<td>SCD</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 15</td>
<td>Work Engagement Intercept</td>
<td>Goal Commitment Intercept</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. *For the variance hypotheses, the within-person variance of the outcome was regressed on the predictors using the approach outlined by McNeish (2020). X = predictor, M = mediator. ✓ = fully supported. ~✓ = partially supported.

Exploratory Analyses

Given that the hypotheses focused on the between level, the within-person relationships between the mediators and outcomes were examined as exploratory analyses. Goal commitment was positively related to goal progress ($\gamma = 0.35, p < .001$) and job performance ($\gamma = 0.04, p = .019$). The remaining within-person relationships were non-significant (see Table 8).

Finally, role variability and CSE were examined as control variables for the hypotheses related to SCC/SCD with goal commitment. When CSE and role variability were included in the model that incorporated goal commitment intercept and conflict, results remained similar with the following exceptions (see Table 12). SCC was positively related to goal conflict ($b = 0.18, p = .044$). CSE was negatively related to goal conflict ($b = -0.38, p = .001$). CSE was positively related to work engagement ($b = 0.67, p < .001$) and job performance ($b = 0.11, p = .023$). However, the relationship between SCC and work engagement became non-significant ($b = 0.03, p = .756$). Role variability was negatively related to goal progress ($b = -0.05, p = .002$). The remaining relationships involving CSE and role variability were non-significant (see Table 12).

Table 12. Study 2 Multilevel Path Model with CSE/Role Variability
## Within-Person Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Estimate/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>3.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Job Performance</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Goal Progress</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Between-Person Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Estimate/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalConflict</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>2.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalCommit</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-2.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalCommit→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>3.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoalConflict→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→Job Performance</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→GoalCommit</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→GoalConflict</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→GoalCommit</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→GoalConflict</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>5.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→Work Engagement</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RoleVar→Goal Progress</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-3.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Indirect Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Relationship</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Estimate/SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCC→GoalCommit→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→Work Engagement</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→Job Performance</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCD→GoalConflict→Goal Progress</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. SCC: Self-Concept Clarity, CSE: Core Self-Evaluations, SCD: Self-Concept Differentiation, GoalCommit: Goal Commitment. \(*p < .05.\)

**Study 2 Discussion**

The goal of Study 2 was to further examine (a) how self-concept structure relates to self-regulatory process and (b) how these connections may help explain why self-concept structure relates to well-being and performance focused on the workplace. As in Study 1, three sets of relationships are relevant: self-concept structure to well-being and performance, self-concept structure to self-regulatory processes, and self-regulatory processes to well-being and performance.

For the first set of relationships (self-concept structure to well-being and performance), limited research has examined the effects of self-concept structure in the workplace. SCC has been shown to positively relate to two aspects of work engagement: dedication and absorption (Balunde & Paradnike, 2016). Further, only one study examined the effects of SCD on work engagement, finding that SCD is negatively related to work engagement (Garczynski et al., 2013). However, previous research has yet to examine the relationships between SCC and SCD and in-role job performance. This research expanded these findings by examining the relationships between SCC and SCD and work engagement and in-role job performance. This research supports the notion that SCC is positively related to both work engagement and in-role job performance. However, SCD was unrelated to both work engagement and in-role job performance.

For the second set of relationships (self-concept structure to self-regulatory processes), prior research has yet to examine this in a work setting specifically. In this research, SCD was negatively related to goal commitment and positively related to goal conflict. In addition, SCD was positively related to goal commitment variability. The other relationships between self-
concept structure and self-regulatory processes were non-significant. Overall, these findings suggest that in the workplace, SCC may have implications for engagement and performance but less so for goal commitment and conflict, whereas the opposite pattern holds for SCD.

For the third set of relationships (self-regulatory processes to well-being and performance), the effects of goal commitment and goal conflict on work engagement and in-role job performance has been understudied. However, previous theory has supported that goal commitment would be positively related to work engagement and in-role job performance through requiring individuals to be engaged for goal accomplishment (Klein et al., 1999; Wofford et al., 1992). Additionally, goal conflict should be negatively related to work engagement and in-role job performance through splitting attentional resources and focus (e.g., Rothbard, 2001; Sun & Frese, 2013). This research partially supports these assertions. Goal commitment was positively related to work engagement; however, goal conflict was unrelated to work engagement. Additionally, goal commitment was positively related to job performance; however, goal conflict was unrelated to job performance. Finally, goal commitment variability was unrelated to work engagement and job performance; however, it was negatively related to goal progress.

In combination, these three sets of proposed relationships suggest that the goal-related variables (i.e., goal commitment and goal conflict) may play a role in any relationships between self-concept structure and well-being and performance. Results for these indirect effect hypotheses were mostly non-significant. The indirect effect from SCD to goal progress through goal commitment variability was significant. The remaining indirect effects from self-concept structure to work engagement and in-role job performance were non-significant.
In exploratory analyses, role variability experienced throughout the week and CSE were examined as control variables. Interestingly, role variability did not affect SCD relationships but was negatively related to goal progress. However, CSE did impact several of the relationships observed. Specifically, when CSE was included in the model, the relationship between SCC and goal conflict was significant and positive (originally non-significant), suggesting that increases in SCC increased goal conflict when holding CSE constant. Additionally, CSE was positively related to work engagement and job performance and negatively related to goal conflict. The positive relationship between SCC and goal conflict is unexpected, suggesting that individuals with more clearly and confidently defined self-concepts actually experience more goal conflict at work when accounting for their levels of CSE. This is discussed further in the following section.

**General Discussion**

The self-concept has been a major focus of research for decades. This research has explored self-concept contents—such as self-perception, self-esteem, and core-self evaluations—in substantial detail, whereas self-concept structure—involving how one’s self-concept content is organized—has been relatively neglected. This is particularly true in organizational research, where constructs such as self-esteem, self-efficacy, and core self-evaluations have been extensively examined (e.g., Judge et al., 1998; Judge et al., 2007; Pierce & Gardner, 2004), while constructs such as SCC and SCD have received very little attention. However, conceptual analysis of self-concept structure and some previous empirical findings suggest that structural variables may have important implications for achievement and well-being. Thus, the purpose of this research was to address these potential implications, focusing on (a) how self-concept structure may relate to self-regulatory processes and (b) how these connections may help explain why self-concept structure relates to well-being and performance. Study 1 examined these issues
in terms of individuals’ lives in general, and Study 2 examined them in the context of the workplace.

Findings

Overall, hypotheses concerning the direct effects of self-concept structure on psychological well-being, goal progress, work engagement, and in-role job performance were mostly supported, with a few exceptions. For example, SCC was positively related to eudaimonic psychological well-being, positive affect, and life satisfaction, and negatively related to negative affect (in Study 1), and positively related to work engagement and in-role job performance (in Study 2). In addition, SCD was positively related to negative affect and negatively related to eudaimonic psychological well-being, positive affect, and life satisfaction (in Study 1).

Regarding self-concept structure to self-regulatory processes, SCC was positively related to goal commitment in Study 1 but not in Study 2. Additionally, SCD was unrelated to both goal commitment and goal conflict in Study 1 but was significantly related to both goal commitment (negative) and goal conflict (positive) in Study 2. Interestingly, SCC and SCD were related to goal commitment variability in Study 1, but only SCD was related to goal commitment variability in Study 2.

Regarding self-regulatory processes to well-being outcomes, goal commitment was unrelated to psychological well-being (in Study 1) and positively related to work engagement (in Study 2), while goal conflict was negatively related to eudaimonic psychological well-being and positive affect (in Study 1) and was unrelated to work engagement (in Study 2). Regarding self-regulatory processes to performance outcomes, goal commitment was positively related to goal progress (in Study 1 and 2) and in-role job performance (in Study 2). Goal conflict was unrelated to goal progress (in Study 1 and 2) and in-role job performance (in Study 2).
For the indirect effects, the effect from SCC to goal progress through goal commitment was significant in Study 1; however, in Study 2, the only significant indirect effects involved SCD. Specifically, there were negative indirect effects from SCD to goal progress, work engagement, and in-role job performance through goal commitment. Taken together, these results suggest that self-concept structure may have notable implications for self-regulatory processes, well-being, and achievement both within and outside the work context (see Figures 7-10).

**Figure 7. Study 1 Overall Findings**

Note. Dashed lines = no significant relationship. Thin solid lines = significant negative relationship. Thick solid lines = significant positive relationship.

**Figure 8. Study 1 Location-Scale Findings**

Note. Dashed lines = no significant relationship. Thin solid lines = significant negative relationship. Thick solid lines = significant positive relationship.

**Figure 9. Study 2 Overall Findings**
Theoretical Implications

There are several theoretical implications of this research. For example, this research proposed a conceptual model that extended a framework presented by Pomerance et al. (2020) that in turn was based on Greenwald et al.’s (2002) unified theory involving social knowledge structures (SKSs). Specifically, Greenwald et al. developed a theory in which self-concept was represented as links between a central “self” node and other nodes representing various characteristics, Pomerance et al. extended this by proposing that SCC can be represented as the association strength of those links, and the current work extended that by proposing that SCD...
can be represented as the extent to which different roles are linked to different characteristics within that structure and goals can be added to the structure as separate but connected nodes. This conceptual framework was then used as a foundation for proposing relationships between SCC, SCD, goal-related variables, and well-being and performance. The current findings provide some support for this framework. For instance, this framework indicates that SCC should involve association strength of links (i.e., thickness of lines in the model), suggesting that an individual who has a clearly and confidently defined self-concept will have thicker lines (or stronger associations) between nodes including goal nodes. Consistent with this, the current findings indicated that SCC was positively related to goal commitment and negatively related to goal commitment variability. These findings may reflect stronger associations within an individual’s SKS, including goal associations, when the individual is higher in SCC. In addition, the framework suggests that SCD involves self-concept elements across roles, such that high SCD entails different self-concept elements across roles whereas low SCD entails similar self-concept elements across roles. This conceptualization was then used to hypothesize an increased likelihood of goal conflict for those higher in SCD. The current findings, in Study 2, were consistent with this notion in that SCD was related to goal conflict. Results also indicated that SCD was negatively related to well-being outcomes. This provides further clarification to previous research that indicates that a greater number of roles is associated with increased levels of psychological well-being (e.g., Aldemann, 1994). That is, it appears that a greater number of roles might be beneficial but a feeling of greater differentiation across those roles may be detrimental.

Note, however, that some hypothesized relationships were not consistently supported. For instance, there were differences between the studies in terms of which relationships were
supported. Thus, additional research based on the current conceptual framework may be useful in clarifying whether these inconsistencies in findings may stem from methodological issues or whether they may signal a need to revise the conceptual framework. The current framework may also highlight additional directions for future research. For example, although the current studies focused on between-person differences, it is possible that an individual’s SKS shifts over time as they gather experiences or move from context to context (especially with low SCC or high SCD), suggesting future work might focus on within-person relationships as well.

In addition, this research adds to our understanding of self-concept structure by examining the SKS-based model in the context of work. Past work on self-concept structure has primarily focused on non-work settings (e.g., education [Thomas & Gadbois, 2007] or aging and adulthood [Lodi-Smith & Roberts, 2010]). Thus, this research adds to the limited literature examining these elements in the workplace (e.g., Light, 2017; Pomerance et al., 2020). Findings from the current studies indicate that the relationships between SCC, SCD, and self-regulatory processes may be influenced by context. For instance, the current pattern of findings suggests that SCD may be more relevant in the workplace while SCC may be more relevant outside the work context. Future research might expand on this by examining other domains (e.g., education, clinical, and development) and by exploring implications in the work domain in more detail.

Through examining these aspects of the self-concept in the workplace, organizations can begin to understand the implications of an individual’s self-concept while at work. The following section elaborates on potential workplace implications.

**Practical Implications**

Practically speaking, the current findings may have implications for both individual goal pursuit (based on Study 1) and employee functioning in organizations (based on Study 2). For
individual goal pursuit in general, results indicated SCC was positively related to goal commitment (Study 1) and SCD was positively related to goal conflict (Study 2). Based on this, individuals higher on SCC might need to spend additional developmental time reviewing aspects of themselves and goals that they set in order to facilitate commitment towards those goals or reduce the amount of conflict that occurs. Further, individuals who tend to be higher on SCD may benefit from spending more time reflecting on aspects of themselves in order to identify traits that apply across different roles to minimize the amount of goal conflict that they may experience. Additionally, individuals could identify moments when they experience fluctuations in their commitment to specific goals and determine whether they should revise their goals, either upward or downward, in order to improve their overall psychological well-being or progress towards those goals.

For employee functioning in organizations, the results of this research may provide organizations with an opportunity to understand the dynamics that occur at work on a day-to-day basis with individuals related to goals, well-being, and performance. Specifically, organizations could structure work to improve the goal commitment that individuals have toward their goals (e.g., participative goal setting; Hollenbeck & Klein, 1987) as that may have downstream effects for their work engagement, job performance, and overall goal progress. Additionally, those higher in SCD showed decreased goal commitment, increased variability in that goal commitment, and increased goal conflict. This suggests that higher SCD in the work context may be particularly concerning. Organizations might consider attempting to reduce SCD across work roles by encouraging authenticity and creating an inclusive environment. For example, SCD may occur for one of two reasons: (a) a natural tendency or (b) pressure and tension from the environment. For the latter, organizations may be able to mitigate these tensions through
establishing an inclusive environment. Additionally, organizations could also directly target goals by providing just-in-the-moment adaptive interventions (JITAI; Wang & Miller, 2020) for when a particular employee is experiencing goal conflict or a lack of goal commitment while at work.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

This research has several limitations that should be mentioned. For example, measurement may have been an issue in some cases. As one example, the measure used for goal conflict may have posed issues for the participants. Although previous research has examined goal conflict with the PPA impact tool (Little & Columbe, 2015), it may be that on a daily level, this measure does not work as intended. Specifically, this measure is somewhat complicated and time-consuming, which may have negatively affected the accuracy of responses. For example, several participants made note of how they were unsure of how to answer the questions and how they felt they may have misunderstood the instructions in comments on the study. Additionally, given that the measure was presented online, participants were unable to ask questions in real time regarding the instructions and may have been confused when filling out the survey. In addition, all the measures were self-report. Although this appears to be appropriate given the nature of the variables, additional studies involved alternative measurement approaches may be useful.

Additionally, CloudResearch participants were used in this research, and while previous studies have suggested that these individuals should be appropriate for research (e.g., Peer et al., 2022), there may have been a lack of motivation to pay close attention given the relatively limited pay provided for participation. Additionally, while CloudResearch’s panels are similar to Prolific in terms of payment norms and population, the CloudResearch panels are relatively new.
(launched in late 2022) and thus less is known about them. Related to Study 2 in particular, although CloudResearch offers the option to examine full-time and part-time workers as part of their panels, the individuals who participate in online research through this system may be systematically different from the general workforce. Thus, future studies might involve different participant sources.

Finally, this research involved measurement over the course of one week. While this should have provided adequate power based on the a priori power analysis, a longer period of measurement may have allowed for a better picture of individuals’ experiences and behaviors. Additionally, although the proposed predictors (SCC and SCD) were measured before the proposed mediators and outcomes, there were no time lags between the mediator and outcome measures, as they were measured at each time point (i.e., daily). This does not allow for the examination of causal effects and may not capture the true relationships between variables. Thus, future research might involve longer timeframes and different sequencing of measurement to address these issues.

Beyond addressing these limitations, future studies could expand this research in at least three ways. First, research could attempt to examine these issues using experimental designs. For example, researchers could manipulate an individual’s SCC by giving them ‘bogus’ feedback suggesting that they have high SCC or low SCC (e.g., Jiang et al., 2022). This would allow researchers to test whether an individual’s goal commitment is influenced by manipulation. Additionally, researchers could manipulate SCD by having individuals imagine themselves in a variety of different roles with different traits across these roles or the same traits across these roles. Then, goal conflict could be measured to see if the SCD manipulation has the expected effect.
Second, future research could examine other potential mechanisms to explain the relationships between self-concept structure and psychological well-being and performance. For example, aspects of self-control could be examined as potential mechanisms. Previous research has suggested that self-concept and self-control are related (e.g., Jiang et al., 2022) and that self-control is positively related to psychological well-being and job performance (e.g., Moon et al., 2020). Based on this, connections between self-concept and performance and well-being may also operate through self-control.

Finally, future research could further examine the interconnections between aspects of self-concept structure (e.g., SCC, SCD) and other aspects of self-concept (e.g., awareness, self-confidence). These studies could, for example, address the relative importance of each of these aspects of self-concept in predicting outcomes. It is possible that each of these self-concept elements uniquely predict outcomes when examined in conjunction. In addition, aspects of the self-concept might interact in influencing outcomes. For example, self-confidence has both positive (Zeb et al., 2023) and negative (Woodman et al., 2010) implications for performance. Other aspects of self-concept (e.g., SCC or SCD) may help account for these relationship differences; for instance, those higher in SCC may demonstrate a positive relationship whereas those lower in SCC may demonstrate a negative relationship.

**Conclusion**

This research examined the implications of self-concept structure (i.e., SCC and SCD) for well-being and achievement-related outcomes through self-regulatory processes (i.e., goal commitment and goal conflict). Overall, the results suggest that these aspects of self-concept structure relate to self-regulatory processes, well-being, and achievement but the findings were somewhat variable between studies. Future research should examine these relationships across other contexts as well as explore other potential mechanisms to further develop our
understanding of the relationships between self-concept structure, self-regulation, performance, and well-being.
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Appendix: Measures

Study 1 Measures

Baseline Measures

Self-Concept Clarity (Campbell et al., 2003)

Instructions: Listed below are statements about your opinions and beliefs about yourself. For each one, please indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, or strongly agree.

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neither agree nor disagree), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree)

1. My beliefs about myself often conflict with another.
2. On one day I might have one opinion of myself and on another day I might have a different opinion.
3. I spend a lot of time wondering about what kind of person I really am.
4. Sometimes I feel that I am not really the person that I appear to be.
5. When I think about the kind of person I have been in the past, I’m not sure what I was really like.
6. I seldom experience conflict between the different aspects of my personality.
7. Sometimes I think I know other people better than I know myself.
8. My beliefs about myself seem to change very frequently.
9. If I were asked to describe my personality, my description might end up being different from one day to another day.
10. Even if I wanted to, I don’t think I would tell someone what I’m really like.
11. In general, I have a clear sense of who I am and what I am.
12. It is often hard for me to make up my mind about things because I don’t really know what I want.

Roles

**Instructions:** Out of the roles listed below, please select the Top 5 roles most important to you or identify your own roles that are most important to you in the blanks.

- Student
- Employee
- Son/Daughter
- Parent
- Romantic Partner
- Friend
- Religious Member
- Community Member
- Volunteer
- Job Seeker
- Leader
- Coworker/Colleague
- Sibling
- Other Role 1: _____________
- Other Role 2: _____________
- Other Role 3: _____________

*Self-Concept Differentiation (Donahue et al., 1993)*
Instructions: Imagine yourself as a [role] and please rate how well each of these attributes describes you in that role.

Scale: 1 (Does not describe me), 2 (Describes me slightly well), 3 (Describes me moderately well), 4 (Describes me very well), 5 (Describes me extremely well)

1. Bashful
2. Cold
3. Organized
4. Resentful
5. Innovative
6. Shy
7. Rude
8. Neat
9. Tense
10. Uniformed
11. Talkative
12. Unkind
13. Inefficient
14. Irritable
15. Unimaginative
16. Extraverted
17. Pleasant
18. Disorganized
19. Nervous
20. Creative
21. Quiet
22. Harsh
23. Careless
24. Depressed
25. Imaginative

Goal Commitment (Klein et al., 2001)

**Instructions:** The following statements are about the goals that you set in your life *in general.*

Please indicate the extent to which you agree for each of the following statements.

**Scale:** 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neither agree nor disagree), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree)

1. It’s hard to take goals seriously.
2. Quite frankly, I don’t care if I achieve goals or not.
3. I am strongly committed to pursuing goals.
4. It wouldn’t take much to make me abandon goals.
5. I think goals are good to shoot for.

PINT Goals (Wilkowski et al., 2020)

**Instructions:** In your day-to-day life, you undoubtedly expend effort trying to reach certain desirable goals; and trying to stay away from other things that would be undesirable. On the following questionnaire, please indicate whether each word you see represents a goal of yours or not *at the present moment.* To do so, use the nine-point response scale provided.

For example, if a word represents something desirable that you are highly committed to reaching, keeping, or having, select the +4 option (i.e., “I have an extremely strong commitment to this”). Alternatively, you may select +3 (i.e., “I have a very strong commitment to this”), +2 (i.e., “I have a moderately strong commitment to this”), or +1 (i.e., “I have a somewhat strong commitment to this”) options to indicate less strong commitments to reaching, keeping, or having something.
If a word does not represent a goal of yours at all, select the 0 option (i.e., “I have no commitment to this”).

If a word represents something that you are strongly committed to avoiding, select the -4 option (i.e., “I have an extremely strong commitment to avoiding this”). To indicate a less strong commitment to avoiding something, select either -3 (i.e., “I have a very strong commitment to avoiding this”), -2 (i.e., “I have a moderately strong commitment to avoiding this”), or -1 (i.e., “I have a somewhat strong commitment to avoiding this”).

We are interested in your current goals in your life. If a word represents a goal you had in the past, but do not have now at all, please select the 0 option (i.e., “I have no commitment to this”). Only indicate something is a goal if you are currently committed to spending effort on it.

Also, there are many things in life that we like or dislike, but that we are not committed to spending effort on. You may like puppy dogs, for example, but not spend any effort trying to help puppy dogs. If this is the case, helping puppy dogs is not a goal of yours. Please be sure that you are only saying something is your goal when you are committed to spending effort on it.

**Scale:** -4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to avoiding this), -3 (I have a very strong commitment to avoiding this), -2 (I have a moderately strong commitment to avoiding this), -1 (I have a somewhat strong commitment to avoiding this), 0 (I have no commitment to this), 1 (I have a somewhat strong commitment to this), 2 (I have a moderately strong commitment to this), 3 (I have a very strong commitment to this), and 4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to this).

1. Championship
2. Competition
3. Control
4. Glory
5. Greatness
6. Moneymaking
7. Perfection
8. Popularity
9. Power
10. Privilege
11. Sexiness
12. Activism
13. Comradery
14. Diplomacy
15. Diversity
16. Empathy
17. Equity
18. Inclusion
19. Interconnectedness
20. Philanthropy
21. Solidarity
22. Transcendence
23. Abnormality
24. Craziness
25. Death
26. Fighting
27. Fatness
28. Hypersensitivity
29. Isolation
30. Mediocrity
31. Melancholy
32. Pity
33. Unemployment
34. Atheism
35. Blessedness
36. Conservatism
37. Marriage
38. Obedience
39. Obligation
40. Parenthood
41. Patriotism
42. Pureness
43. Tradition

Personal Projects Project Elicitation (Little & Coulombe, 2015)

To start, please take 10-15 minutes and type in the following cells as many personal projects and activities you can that you are currently engaged in or considering -- remember these need not be formal projects or even important ones -- we would prefer you to give us more of the everyday kinds of activities or concerns that characterize your life during this week.

Please be completely honest in your answers, as they will not be connected to your name. Also, if possible, please fill out this survey in one sitting.

1. Project 1: _________________________________
2. Project 2: _________________________________
3. Project 3: _________________________________
4. Project 4: _________________________________
5. Project 5: _________________________________
6. Project 6: _________________________________
7. Project 7: _________________________________
8. Project 8: _________________________________
9. Project 9: _________________________________
10. Project 10: ________________________________

Reduced Projects

Please select 5 of the projects you've listed that are the most important to understanding you.

☐ Project 1
☐ Project 2
☐ Project 3
☐ Project 4
☐ Project 5
☐ Project 6
☐ Project 7
☐ Project 8
☐ Project 9
☐ Project 10

Project for Next Week

Please select 1 of the projects you've listed that you will be working on over the course of the next week.

☐ Project 1
☐ Project 2
☐ Project 3
☐ Project 4
□ Project 5
□ Project 6
□ Project 7
□ Project 8
□ Project 9
□ Project 10

**Project Categories**
Please pick the most appropriate category for each project from the dropdown menu beside it.

Here are the definitions of the categories:

**Prominence**: a goal to earn the respect, admiration, and voluntary deference of others through one’s achievements

**Inclusiveness**: a goal to open-mindedly accept people of all types

**Negativity Prevention**: a broad goal to prevent or avoid negative outcomes

**Tradition**: a goal to adhere to long-standing institutions of one’s cultural in-group (e.g., church, nation, and family)

1. Project 1: _______________
2. Project 2: _______________
3. Project 3: _______________
4. Project 4: _______________
5. Project 5: _______________

**Five Factor Model of Personality (Donnellan et al., 2006)**

**Instructions**: Using the statements below, please describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence.
Indicate for each statement whether it is very inaccurate, moderately inaccurate, neither accurate nor inaccurate, moderately accurate, or very accurate as a description of you.

**Scale**: 1 (Very Inaccurate), 2 (Moderately Inaccurate), 3 (Neither Accurate nor Inaccurate), 4 (Moderately Accurate), 5 (Very Accurate)

**Extraversion**

1. Am the life of the party.
2. Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
3. Don’t talk a lot.
4. Keep in the background.

**Agreeableness**

5. Sympathized with others’ feelings.
6. Feel others’ emotions.
7. Am not really interested in others.
8. Am not interested in other people’s problems.

**Conscientiousness**

9. Get chores done right away.
10. Like order.
11. Often forget to put things back in their proper place.
12. Make a mess of things.

**Neuroticism/Emotional Stability**

13. Have frequent mood swings.
15. Am relaxed most of the time.
16. Seldom feel blue.

*Openness to Experience/Intellect*

17. Have a vivid imagination.

18. Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.

19. Am not interested in abstract ideas.

20. Do not have a good imagination.

*Core Self-Evaluations (Judge et al., 2003)*

**Instructions:** Below are several statements about you with which you may agree or disagree. Using the response scale below, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by selecting the appropriate response for that item.

**Scale:** 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neither agree nor disagree), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree)

1. I am confident I get the success I deserve in life.

2. Sometimes I feel depressed.

3. When I try, I generally succeed.

4. Sometimes when I fail I feel worthless.

5. I complete tasks successfully.

6. Sometimes, I do not feel in control of my work.

7. Overall, I am satisfied with myself.

8. I am filled with doubts about my competency.

9. I determine what will happen in my life.

10. I do not feel in control of my success in my career.

11. I am capable of coping with most of my problems.
12. There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me.

**Daily Measures**

Goal-Related Constructs; Personal Projects Matrices (Little & Coulombe, 2015)

**Instructions:** Please rate each project below from 0-10 on the series of dimensions listed above them. For example, Michelle might rate her project "Get the car muffler replaced" as an 8 on Importance, 3 on Difficulty, 5 on Visibility, 7 on Control, 9 on Responsibility, 2 on Time Adequacy, and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Time Adequacy</th>
<th>Outcome/Likelihood</th>
<th>Self-identity</th>
<th>Other’s view</th>
<th>Value congruency</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Absorption</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goal Impact (Goal Conflict; Little & Coulombe, 2015)

**Instructions:** Now for each project separately, starting with project 1 on the left, decide whether the project will have (or is having) a positive (+), very positive (++), negative (-), very negative (--) or neutral impact (0) on the remaining projects (across the top).

Do the same for project 2, 3, etc. filling in the blocks on both sides of the diagonal 0s.

Remember, evaluating the impact of project 2 on project 3 is not necessarily the same as evaluating the impact of project 3 on project 2. That is why we want you to complete this entire matrix.
Daily Goal Contents (Wilkowski et al., 2020)

Instructions: In your day-to-day life, you undoubtedly expend effort trying to reach certain desirable goals; and trying to stay away from other things that would be undesirable. On the following questionnaire, please indicate whether each word you see represents a goal of yours or not today. To do so, use the nine-point response scale provided.

Also, there are many things in life that we like or dislike, but that we are not committed to spending effort on. You may like puppy dogs, for example, but not spend any effort trying to help puppy dogs. If this is the case, helping puppy dogs is not a goal of yours. Please be sure that you are only saying something is your goal when you are committed to spending effort on it.

Today, I am committed to…

1. Championship
2. Greatness
3. Power
4. Comradery
5. Equity
6. Inclusion
7. Abnormality
8. Craziness
9. Fighting
10. Tradition
11. Obedience
12. Obligation

**Role Variability**

**Instructions:** Please estimate the amount of time that you spent in each role TODAY that you identified:

1. Role 1: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale
2. Role 2: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale
3. Role 3: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale
4. Role 4: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale
5. Role 5: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale

**Eudaimonic**

**Instructions:** Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements using a 7-point scale (1 = strongly agree; 7 = strongly disagree).

Indicate to what extent you feel this way TODAY.

1. Today, I like most parts of my personality.
2. Today, I am good at managing the responsibilities of my daily life.
3. Today, I have warm and trusting relationships with others.
4. Today, I have experiences that challenge me to grow and become a better person.
5. Today, I am confident to think or express my own ideas and opinions.
6. Today, my life has a sense of direction or meaning to it.

**Positive Affect**
Instructions: This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and using the scale below, select how much you feel like this.

Indicate to what extent you feel this way TODAY.

1. Inspired
2. Alert
3. Excited
4. Enthusiastic
5. Determined

Negative Affect

Instructions: This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and using the scale below, select how much you feel like this.

Indicate to what extent you feel this way TODAY.

1. Afraid
2. Upset
3. Nervous
4. Scared
5. Distressed

Life Satisfaction

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

Indicate to what extent you feel this way TODAY.

1. Today, I am satisfied with my life.
2. In most ways, my life today is close to my ideal.
Psychological Rich Life

Instructions: We define a psychologically rich life as a life characterized by variety, depth, and interest. A life could be psychologically rich if a person experiences a variety of interesting things, and/or feels and appreciates a variety of deep emotions via first-hand experiences or vicarious experiences such as novels, films, and sports on TV. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements, using the 1–7 point scale below.

Indicate to what extent you feel this way TODAY.

1. Today, I have had a lot of interesting experiences
2. Today, I have had a lot of novel experiences.
3. My day has been full of unique, unusual experiences.
Study 2 Measures

Self-Concept Clarity (Campbell et al., 2003)

Instructions: Listed below are statements about your opinions and beliefs about yourself while at work. For each one, please indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, or strongly agree.

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neither agree nor disagree), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree)

1. My beliefs about myself often conflict with another while at work.

2. On one day I might have one opinion of myself and on another day I might have a different opinion while at work.

3. I spend a lot of time wondering about what kind of person I really am while at work.

4. Sometimes I feel that I am not really the person that I appear to be while at work.

5. When I think about the kind of person I have been in the past, I’m not sure what I was really like while at work.

6. I seldom experience conflict between the different aspects of my personality while at work.

7. Sometimes I think I know other people better than I know myself while at work.

8. My beliefs about myself seem to change very frequently while at work.

9. If I were asked to describe my personality, my description might end up being different from one day to another day while at work.

10. Even if I wanted to, I don’t think I would tell someone what I’m really like while at work.

11. In general, I have a clear sense of who I am and what I am while at work.
12. It is often hard for me to make up my mind about things because I don’t really know what I want *while at work*.

**Roles**

**Instructions:** Out of the roles listed below, please select the Top 5 roles most important to you or identify your own roles that are most important to you in the blanks.

- [ ] Organizational Member
- [ ] Leader
- [ ] Mentor
- [ ] Peer
- [ ] Team Member
- [ ] Subordinate
- [ ] Job Seeker
- [ ] Manager
- [ ] Follower
- [ ] Trainer
- [ ] Facilitator
- [ ] Customer
- [ ] Project Manager
- [ ] Product Developer
- [ ] Analyst

[ ] Other Role 1: ____________
[ ] Other Role 2: ____________
[ ] Other Role 3: ____________
Self-Concept Differentiation (Donahue et al., 1993)

**Instructions:** Imagine yourself as a [role], please rate how well each of these attributes describe you while at work.

**Scale:** 1 (Does not describe me), 2 (Describes me slightly well), 3 (Describes me moderately well), 4 (Describes me very well), 5 (Describes me extremely well)

1. Bashful
2. Cold
3. Organized
4. Resentful
5. Innovative
6. Shy
7. Rude
8. Neat
9. Tense
10. Uniformed
11. Talkative
12. Unkind
13. Inefficient
14. Irritable
15. Unimaginative
16. Extraverted
17. Pleasant
18. Disorganized
19. Nervous
20. Creative
21. Quiet
22. Harsh
23. Careless
24. Depressed
25. Imaginative

Goal Commitment (Klein et al., 2001)

Instructions: The following statements are about the goals that you set in your life in general. Please indicate the extent to which you agree for each of the following statements.

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (neither agree nor disagree), 4 (agree), 5 (strongly agree)

1. It’s hard to take goals seriously at work.
2. Quite frankly, I don’t care if I achieve goals or not at work.
3. I am strongly committed to pursuing goals at work.
4. It wouldn’t take much to make me abandon goals at work.
5. I think goals are good to shoot for at work.

PINT Goals (Wilkowski et al., 2020)

Instructions: In your day-to-day life, you undoubtedly expend effort trying to reach certain desirable goals; and trying to stay away from other things that would be undesirable. On the following questionnaire, please indicate whether each word you see represents a goal of yours or not at the present moment while at work. To do so, use the nine-point response scale provided.

For example, if a word represents something desirable that you are highly committed to reaching, keeping, or having, select the +4 option (i.e., “I have an extremely strong commitment to this”). Alternatively, you may select +3 (i.e., “I have a very strong commitment to this”), +2 (i.e., “I have a moderately strong commitment to this”), or +1 (i.e., “I have a somewhat strong commitment to this”) options to indicate less strong commitments to reaching, keeping, or
having something.

If a word does not represent a goal of yours at all, select the 0 option (i.e., “I have no commitment to this”).

If a word represents something that you are strongly committed to avoiding, select the -4 option (i.e., “I have an extremely strong commitment to avoiding this”). To indicate a less strong commitment to avoiding something, select either -3 (i.e., “I have a very strong commitment to avoiding this”), -2 (i.e., “I have a moderately strong commitment to avoiding this”), or -1 (i.e., “I have a somewhat strong commitment to avoiding this”).

We are interested in your current goals in your life. If a word represents a goal you had in the past, but do not have now at all, please select the 0 option (i.e., “I have no commitment to this”). Only indicate something is a goal if you are currently committed to spending effort on it.

Also, there are many things in life that we like or dislike, but that we are not committed to spending effort on. You may like puppy dogs, for example, but not spend any effort trying to help puppy dogs. If this is the case, helping puppy dogs is not a goal of yours. Please be sure that you are only saying something is your goal when you are committed to spending effort on it.

Scale: -4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to avoiding this), -3 (I have a very strong commitment to avoiding this), -2 (I have a moderately strong commitment to avoiding this), -1 (I have a somewhat strong commitment to avoiding this), 0 (I have no commitment to this), 1 (I have a somewhat strong commitment to this), 2 (I have a moderately strong commitment to this), 3 (I have a very strong commitment to this), and 4 (I have an extremely strong commitment to this)

1. Championship
2. Competition
3. Control
4. Glory
5. Greatness
6. Moneymaking
7. Perfection
8. Popularity
9. Power
10. Privilege
11. Sexiness
12. Activism
13. Comradery
14. Diplomacy
15. Diversity
16. Empathy
17. Equity
18. Inclusion
19. Interconnectedness
20. Philanthropy
21. Solidarity
22. Transcendence
23. Abnormality
24. Craziness
25. Death
26. Fighting
27. Fatness
28. Hypersensitivity
29. Isolation
30. Mediocrity
31. Melancholy
32. Pity
33. Unemployment
34. Atheism
35. Blessedness
36. Conservatism
37. Marriage
38. Obedience
39. Obligation
40. Parenthood
41. Patriotism
42. Pureness
43. Tradition

Personal Projects Project Elicitation (Little & Coulombe, 2015)

To start, please take 10-15 minutes and type in the following cells as many personal projects and activities you can that you are currently engaged in or considering -- remember these need not be formal projects or even important ones -- we would prefer you to give us more of the everyday kinds of activities or concerns that characterize your life during this week **while at work**.

Please be completely honest in your answers, as they will not be connected to your name. Also, if possible, please fill out this survey in one sitting.

1. Project 1: _______________________________________
2. Project 2: _______________________________________
3. Project 3: _______________________________________
4. Project 4: _______________________________________
5. Project 5: _______________________________________
6. Project 6: _________________________________

7. Project 7: _________________________________

8. Project 8: _________________________________

9. Project 9: _________________________________

10. Project 10: ________________________________

**Reduced Projects**

Please select 5 of the projects you've listed that are the most important to understanding you while at work.

- [ ] Project 1
- [ ] Project 2
- [ ] Project 3
- [ ] Project 4
- [ ] Project 5
- [ ] Project 6
- [ ] Project 7
- [ ] Project 8
- [ ] Project 9
- [ ] Project 10

**Project for Next Week**

Please select 1 of the projects you've listed that you will be working on over the course of the next week **while at work.**

- [ ] Project 1
- [ ] Project 2
Project Categories
Please pick the most appropriate category for each project from the dropdown menu beside it.

Here are the definitions of the categories:

**Prominence**: a goal to earn the respect, admiration, and voluntary deference of others through one’s achievements

**Inclusiveness**: a goal to open-mindedly accept people of all types

**Negativity Prevention**: a broad goal to prevent or avoid negative outcomes

**Tradition**: a goal to adhere to long-standing institutions of one’s cultural in-group (e.g., church, nation, and family)

1. Project 1: ______________
2. Project 2: ______________
3. Project 3: ______________
4. Project 4: ______________
5. Project 5: ______________

Five Factor Model of Personality (Donnellan et al., 2006)
Instructions: Using the statements below, please describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself while at work, in relation to other people you know of the same sex as you are, and roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence.

Indicate for each statement whether it is very inaccurate, moderately inaccurate, neither accurate nor inaccurate, moderately accurate, or very accurate as a description of you.

Scale: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Somewhat disagree), 4 (Neither agree nor disagree), 5 (Somewhat agree), 6 (Agree), 7 (Strongly agree)

Agreeableness

1. At work, I sympathize with others’ feelings.
2. I show interest in other people’s problems at work.
3. At work, I feel others’ emotions.
4. I care about others at work.

Conscientiousness

5. At work, I get my tasks done right away.
6. I am careful to put things back in their proper place at work.
7. At work, I like order.
8. I am always prepared at work.

Extraversion

9. At work, I feel comfortable around people.
10. I make friends easily at work.
11. At work, I am skilled in handling social situations.
12. I talk a lot at work.

Openness to Experience
13. At work, I enjoy hearing different ideas.
14. I have a vivid imagination at work.
15. At work, I enjoy thinking about things.
16. I enjoy philosophical discussions at work.

**Neuroticism/Emotional stability**

17. I am not easily bothered by things at work.
18. At work, I am relaxed most of the time.
19. I don’t get upset easily at work.
20. At work, I remain calm under pressure.

**Core Self-Evaluations (Judge et al., 2003)**

**Instructions:** Below are several statements about you with which you may agree or disagree. Using the response scale below, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by selecting the appropriate response for that item.

**Scale:** 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly agree)

1. I am confident I get the success I deserve at work.
2. Sometimes I feel depressed at work.
3. When I try, I generally succeed at work.
4. Sometimes when I fail I feel worthless at work.
5. I complete tasks successfully at work.
6. Sometimes, I do not feel in control of my work.
7. Overall, I am satisfied with myself at work.
8. I am filled with doubts about my competency at work.
9. I determine what will happen at work.

10. I do not feel in control of my success in my career.

11. I am capable of coping with most of my problems at work.

12. There are times when things look pretty bleak and hopeless to me at work.

**Daily Measures**

Goal-Related Constructs; Personal Projects Matrices (Little & Coulombe, 2015)

**Instructions:** Please rate each project below from 0-10 on the series of dimensions listed above them. For example, Michelle might rate her project "Complete the client assignment" as an 8 on Importance, 3 on Difficulty, 5 on Visibility, 7 on Control, 9 on Responsibility, 2 on Time Adequacy, and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Commitment</th>
<th>Progress</th>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Time Adequacy</th>
<th>Outcome/Likelihood</th>
<th>Self-identity</th>
<th>Other’s view</th>
<th>Value congruency</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Absorption</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal Impact (Goal Conflict; Little & Coulombe, 2015)**

**Instructions:** Now for each project separately, starting with project 1 on the left, decide whether the project will have (or is having) a positive (+), very positive (++), negative (−), very negative (--) or neutral impact (0) on the remaining projects (across the top).

Do the same for project 2, 3, etc. filling in the blocks on both sides of the diagonal 0s.
Remember, evaluating the impact of project 2 on project 3 is not necessarily the same as evaluating the impact of project 3 on project 2. That is why we want you to complete this entire matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
<th>Project 3</th>
<th>Project 4</th>
<th>Project 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daily Goal Contents (Wilkowski et al., 2020)

**Instructions:** In your day-to-day life, you undoubtedly expend effort trying to reach certain desirable goals; and trying to stay away from other things that would be undesirable. On the following questionnaire, please indicate whether each word you see represents a goal of yours or not today while at work. To do so, use the nine-point response scale provided.

Also, there are many things in life that we like or dislike, but that we are not committed to spending effort on. You may like puppy dogs, for example, but not spend any effort trying to help puppy dogs. If this is the case, helping puppy dogs is not a goal of yours. Please be sure that you are only saying something is your goal when you are committed to spending effort on it.

**Today, I am committed to…**

1. Championship
2. Greatness
3. Power
4. Comradery
5. Equity
6. Inclusion
7. Abnormality
8. Craziness
9. Fighting
10. Tradition
11. Obedience
12. Obligation

Role Variability

Instructions: Please estimate the amount of time that you spent in each role TODAY that you identified:

1. Role 1: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale
2. Role 2: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale
3. Role 3: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale
4. Role 4: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale
5. Role 5: 0% of the time – 100% of the time sliding scale

State Work Engagement

Instructions: Below are several statements about you with which you may agree or disagree. Using the response scale below, indicate your agreement or disagreement with each item by selecting the appropriate response for that item.

Scale: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly agree)

1. Today, I feel bursting with energy.
2. Today, I felt strong and vigorous at my job.
3. When I got up this morning, I felt like going to work.
4. Today, I was enthusiastic about my job.
5. Today, my job inspired me.
6. Today, I was proud of the work that I do.
7. Today, I felt happy when I was working intensely.
8. Today, I was immersed in my work.
9. Today, I got carried away when I was working.

In-Role Job Performance

Instructions:

Please indicate how your SUPERVISOR would have rated your JOB PERFORMANCE over the course of TODAY.

My supervisor would rate my job performance for TODAY as follows:

Scale: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree), 5 (Strongly agree)

1. Adequately completed assigned duties today.
2. Fulfilled responsibilities specified in the job description today.
3. Performed tasks that are expected of him/her today.
4. Met formal performance requirements of the job today.
5. Engaged in activities that will directly affect his/her performance evaluation today.
6. Neglected aspects of the job he/she is obligated to perform today.
7. Failed to perform essential duties today.