

SELF-COMPLEXITY, SELF-CONSTRUAL, AND NEGATIVE EMOTION IN FILIPINO ADOLESCENTS

LIANE PEÑA-ALAMPAY
Ateneo de Manila University

Two features of the Filipino adolescent self were explored: *self-complexity*, referring to the number and degree of differentiation among self-aspects, and *self-construal*, or how the self is conceived in relation to others. The relationship between these facets and the experience of negative emotions in adolescence was also determined. Participants were 207 12- to 21- year-olds who were administered a trait-sorting task to measure self-complexity, and self-report scales assessing degree of independence and interdependence in self-construals, and the extent of experienced identity confusion, emotional extremity, anxiety, and self-devaluation. Self structures were found to be multifaceted and differentiated, as well as relational and situation-bound in content. Complexity increased across age, bearing out social-cognitive perspectives on self development. While predominantly interdependent, self-construals also endorsed independent attitudes and values, suggesting a more bicultural self in Filipino youth. Only emotionality was related to self-complexity, with greater complexity associated with higher levels of emotionality.

Classic and contemporary developmental theorists concur that the formation of a sense of self, or a sense of *who one is*, is a crucial task to be fulfilled by the adolescent. Indeed, it is during the adolescent stage that substantial changes in the content and organization of the self first occur. Pivotal events in this period precipitate self development and reorganization: biological changes alter the physical body and self-conceptions; cognitive development allows adolescents to conceive of the self in new ways through the tools of formal, hypothetical thought; new social roles, experiences, and demands provoke and necessitate questions about self and identity. The significance of the self in adolescence provides a strong impetus for clarifying its role in adolescent processes and experiences.

Developmental and social-cognitive models of the self postulate that cognitive development precipitates changes in self content and structure, making the self abstract, multidimensional, differentiated, and integrated (Harter, 1983, 1986, 1990, 1997; Rosenberg, 1986). Linville (1985) has also suggested that increasing experience in varied roles, relationships, and situations leads to a greater number and specificity in self-aspects. In no other developmental stage are changes in cognition and social roles and experiences more apparent and far-reaching than in adolescence. Moreover, such transitions in the self have implications for the adolescents' emotional experiences, in that a highly differentiated and integrated self-structure is associated with increased stability in emotions (Evans, 1994; Harter & Monsour, 1992). This line of research casts a different light on the conceptualization of adolescence as a period of "storm and stress". For while it may be true that most adolescents do *not* experience overwhelmingly negative emotions and familial conflicts in this stage (Feldman & Elliott, 1990; Steinberg, 1996), normative emotional disturbances in the form of confusion, anxiety, and depression may still result from pressures to differentiate within the self-system.

On the other hand, contemporary theoretical and empirical frameworks reflect a more sociocultural approach to the study of the self. While the self is subjectively known and experienced, it is shaped by membership in the experiences and practices of a cultural community (Shweder, Goodnow, Hatano, Levine, Markus, & Miller, 1997), and cannot be isolated from the cultural norms and values that determine its representation and regulation of the individual's cognitions, emotions, relationships, and behaviors (Shweder et al., 1997; Kagitcibasi, 1996; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

The present study focused on the distinction between *independent* and *interdependent* construals of self, where the former is a conception of the self as a bounded, stable entity, comprised of a configuration of internal attributes and separate from social contexts. In contrast, the interdependent self-construal is connected, rather than differentiated from others. Situations and social others are integral parts of the self, and is thus more fluid and variable by nature (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis, 1994).

Whether one's self-construal is independent or interdependent has consequences for both cognition and emotion. Abstract and hierarchical self-attributes are more likely in independent, but not in interdependent construals (Cousins, 1989). Moreover, emotions that focus on the self, such

as anger and pride, are experienced more frequently by the independent self, whereas other-focused emotions such as empathy and shame are more prevalent in interdependent selves (Markus & Kitayama, 1991).

Given the foregoing, how may the Filipino adolescent self-structure be described in terms of complexity, and independence or interdependence? What is the relationship between these aspects of the self and negative emotions experienced in the adolescent period?

Self-Complexity

From a social-cognitive perspective, the self is broadly defined as an organized knowledge structure consisting of the individual's self-beliefs and self-relevant propositions, such as personal attributes, roles, experiences, and goals (Greenwald & Pratkanis, 1984; Kihlstrom & Cantor, 1984; Markus & Wurf, 1987). Different models have been proposed on the structure or representation of these self contents, such as in terms of schemata, hierarchies, and networks (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Markus & Wurf, 1987; see Greenwald & Pratkanis, 1984, for a review).

More recently, a structural aspect of the self that has garnered interest is *complexity*. Self-complexity is defined according to two dimensions: the number of self-aspects that one uses to organize knowledge about the self (such as roles, relationships, superordinate traits, goals), and the degree of differentiation among elements included in these aspects. An individual is said to possess greater self-complexity to the extent that she organizes self-knowledge according to numerous and differentiated self-aspects. Differentiation also entails that feelings and cognitions about one aspect vary independently from those about another. For instance, a person's "academic" and "relationship" aspects are independent to the extent that the ups and downs about one are relatively uncorrelated with the ups and downs of the other.

Self-complexity has been implicated in various indices of emotional well-being. Linville (1985) has hypothesized that the less complex a person's representation of the self, the more extreme will be that person's affect and self-appraisals. This occurs by way of a "spillover process", whereby the affect associated with a positive or negative event is spread across related self-aspects. If a person's self-representation is dominated by a few, undifferentiated self-aspects, this would result in a greater proportion of the self likely to be affected by an emotionally salient event; on the other

hand, a greater number of distinct self-aspects would imply less spillover and a smaller proportion of the self that is emotionally affected.

The *self-complexity-affective extremity hypothesis* therefore predicts that people lower in self-complexity would experience greater swings in affect and self-appraisal in response to life events. To test this hypothesis, Linville (1985) used a trait-sorting procedure to assess self-complexity, and related this score to responses to mood and self-evaluation checklists administered after a contrived-feedback situation. In support of the hypothesis, she found that those with less complex selves showed a greater increase in positive affect following a success experience and a greater decrease in positive affect following a failure experience. Changes in affect were not as extreme for those with greater self-complexity. In other studies, individuals possessing less complex selves also demonstrated greater mood variability over a 14-day period. Complexity has also been able to account for individual differences in vulnerability to depression and stress-related illnesses (Linville, 1987).

More germane to the present study, Evans (1994) examined the relationship between self-complexity and symptoms of psychopathology among 11 to 18 year olds. Using a Self-complexity Inventory (SCI), adolescent respondents were asked to indicate the degree to which their overall self-concept and other self-aspects (e.g., romantic, scholastic, peer) would be emotionally affected given certain stressful scenarios. For high-complexity respondents, the effects of the negative event affected their different self-aspects to a constrained and small degree, whereas adolescents low in self-complexity report that many more of their aspects were adversely affected. Consistent with Linville (1985, 1987), Evans found that low self-complexity was significantly correlated with higher incidences of internalizing problems such as depression, somatic complaints, and withdrawal. Indeed, self-complexity was found to contribute the highest variance in depression scores. This indicates that self-complexity may have an impact not only on affective responses to specific events (as Linville's self-complexity-emotion extremity hypothesis maintains) but in the valence of emotions overall.

The Self in Developmental Perspective

Developmental psychologists have likewise established that the cognitive representation of the self is multidimensional, or comprised of several domains (e.g., physical, social, academic), and hierarchical, with

superordinate and subordinate categories (Byrne & Shavelson, 1996; see Harter, 1986, for a review). A ubiquitous finding in developmental research is that the content of self-descriptions change over time from concrete physical or behavioral characteristics, to statements of abilities and preferences, to more abstract attitudes, emotions, and inner thoughts (Harter, 1983, 1986, 1997; Rosenberg, 1986). Concurrent with changes in self content, the child also develops the ability to recognize, differentiate, and integrate different self-aspects, resulting in a more complex, hierarchical, and integrated structure with age (Harter, 1983, 1986, 1990, 1997; Rosenberg, 1986). Social and cognitive development are thought to be the major factors that propel such changes in the self.

Drawing from a neo-Piagetian model, Harter posited that the self structure develops through processes of 1) differentiation, where global and generalized attributes become more multifaceted, and 2) integration, where single abstractions are combined to form higher-order ones. Her work (1983, 1986, 1990, 1997; Harter & Monsour, 1992) illustrates how these processes may be related to the experience of inner conflict in adolescence. Specifically, the adolescent first recognizes the discrepancies among her increasingly multifaceted traits, typically resulting in negative emotions, before these self-attributes differentiate and then integrate, which would stabilize emotion.

More concretely, the emergent formal cognitive abilities of the early adolescent enable her to include diverse attributes, roles and experiences into her self-concept, in the form of single abstractions or traits. However, the young adolescent is, as yet, unable to simultaneously compare these attributes, thereby forestalling potential conflict or distress that arises from an awareness of contradictions between traits. The ability to relate attributes with each other emerges at middle adolescence. The adolescent may attempt, but without much success, to integrate single abstractions (such as being shy with boys but gregarious with friends, for instance) into higher-order ones (such as social competence). In doing so, the adolescent frequently has to grapple with seeming inconsistencies in traits, bringing about possible distress, inner conflict, and confusion regarding "the real me". Moreover, an immature ability to integrate single traits may lead her to think in a compartmentalized fashion, such as "always shy". Such overgeneralized, "all or nothing" thinking makes the adolescent vulnerable to low self-esteem and depression (Higgins, 1989).

Finally, at late adolescence, further advancement in cognitive ability allows the individual to subsume single traits under more generalized and compatible higher-order abstractions. Thus, the adolescent may be able to eventually reconcile and accept the two opposing abstractions of her self by defining herself as an introvert.

This framework has been empirically supported by Harter and Monsour (1992). In their study, early, middle, and late adolescents were first asked to describe themselves in four roles: with parents, friends, romantic relationships, and in the classroom. The participants were then asked to identify those pairs of attributes that they considered to be opposites (e.g., friendly vs. shy), to describe the extent to which these were in conflict with each other, and to report their emotional responses to these opposing attributes.

Their findings showed that with increasing age, there is greater differentiation among self-attributes in the four roles. Moreover, the number of opposing attributes, perceived conflicts between opposing attributes, and consequent negative emotional experiences (e.g., confusion, anxiety) increased from early to middle adolescence, and systematically decreased from middle to late adolescence.

Self-Construal: Independence and Interdependence

Advances in cultural psychology have revealed the many ways in which people from different cultures conceptualize their selves, which vary markedly from the Western model that predominates the scientific literature (as seen in the foregoing). The cultural perspective posits that self-representations, even the very meaning of self, are grounded on the values, beliefs, norms, and practices that arise from being a member of a larger cultural community (Shweder et al., 1997). The resulting constellation of self-relevant thoughts, feelings, and behaviors has been called *self-construal* (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis, 1994).

The independent construal is a conception of the self as a bounded, autonomous entity comprised of a unique and stable configuration of internal attributes which directly affect and organize behavior. This construal is believed to be predominant among European Americans, whose culture has been characterized as individualist (Triandis, 1989; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis & Sharkey, 1995; Shweder et al., 1997). The major goals of the

independent construal include expressing and enhancing the self, promoting personal goals, and being direct in communication (Singelis, 1994; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder et al., 1997).

In contrast, an interdependent construal of the self is connected to, rather than differentiated from others. One sees his or her self as part of encompassing social relationships, and the critical task is to maintain such interdependence among individuals. Instead of internal attributes determining one's behavior, actions are regulated by and contingent on situational contexts and perceptions of the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others. The situation and social others are integrated into the self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Singelis & Sharkey, 1995). This construal is thought to characterize Asian, Latin American, and African cultures, which are mostly collectivist (Triandis, 1989).

If the self functions as an interpretative and orienting framework for behavior, then whether the self is construed as independent or interdependent has enormous implications for an individual's cognitive and emotional processes. One consequence of having an interdependent, rather than an independent self, is the possession of richer and more elaborated interpersonal knowledge (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Because it is essential in such cultures that harmonious relations are maintained, knowledge about the other and the social environment may be more accessible than knowledge about the self, a finding that has found moderate support in studies of self-other similarity judgments (see Markus & Kitayama, 1991 for a review). Likewise, abstract characterizations of personality attributes (e.g., I am generous) are more likely with independent construals. Given that selfhood in interdependent settings is embedded in relatedness, self-attributes may be more easily accessed in concrete social situations where such relatedness is experienced (e.g., I like to give gifts when visiting friends) (Cousins, 1989).

In the area of emotions, Markus and Kitayama (1991) proposed that the independent self predominantly experiences ego-focused emotions such as anger, frustration, and pride, while the interdependent self more frequently feels other-focused emotions such as sympathy, shame, and interpersonal communion (Singelis & Sharkey, 1995). The former emotions have an individual's internal attributes as primary referent (i.e., one's needs, goals, abilities), and serve to validate the autonomy and uniqueness of the self when expressed privately and publicly. Other-focused emotions, in contrast, have another person as referent; they result from being sensitive to and taking the perspective of the other, and promote cooperation and

interdependence when expressed. Inner feelings are seen as less important in determining one's consequent actions and may be perceived as threatening and dysfunctional when expressed. Cultural research has described, for instance, how the Eskimo rarely experience and express anger, and how the Chinese more often feel pride for others' accomplishments, rather than their own (see Markus & Kitayama, 1991, for a review). Both these cultures have been described as collectivist, with their members likely to possess interdependent self-construals.

The Filipino Self

The predominant characterizations of Filipino personality are congruent with the interdependent conception of self: that is, the perception of the self as fundamentally connected with others, and the organization of behavior according to others' feelings, thoughts, and actions. Enriquez (1994) developed the concept of *kapwa* as central to the Filipino self, where *kapwa* does not simply refer to the "other", but reflects the unity between self and other: "*Hindi ako iba sa aking kapwa*". This conceptualization of the self extends to the moral domain of Filipino values and behavior. For instance, the recognition of the shared inner identity between the self and other leads to an acceptance and relationship with the other person as an equal, with the appropriate regard for the dignity inherent in the other. Thus, the core value guiding the Filipino's actions is a basic respect for a person's being, or *pagkatao*. To think and act as if the self were separate from *kapwa* (i.e., *Wala akong pakialam sa aking kapwa*; I don't care about my fellow being) is to be *walang kapwa tao*, the ultimate transgression in Filipino society (Enriquez, 1994).

The Filipino's emphasis on harmonious social relations has also been widely noted. In fact, the local vernacular has at least eight terms, with concurrently different social rules, denoting different levels of social interaction that depend on the degree of familiarity between parties and whether the other is an insider or an outsider. Attendant to the value granted to social relationships, emotions such as *hiya* (sense of propriety) and *utang na loob* (feelings of deep gratitude) are central to the Filipino psyche (Enriquez, 1994; Church, 1987). Pivotal to all these values is *pakikiramdam*, which refers to a heightened sensitivity and feeling for another (Mataragnon, 1987, in Enriquez, 1994).

Fewer studies have specifically investigated the adolescent transition as it is experienced by Filipino youth, much less as it relates to the developing self-system. Among these is Pasao's (1979), wherein she developed a self-concept scale for Filipino adolescents, and determined four factors that uniquely comprised the self: the "Not Me" factor, which reflects culturally undesirable traits such as criticizing others, arrogance, impatience, and wanting to be flattered; Emotionality, which captured the sensitive nature of the Filipino; Family Relations, which pertained to the centrality and close-knit nature of the Filipino family; and Peer Relations, which highlighted the significance granted to interpersonal relationships. Pasao's analysis is consistent with the previously discussed relational nature of the Filipino self elaborated by Enriquez and his colleagues (1994).

Mendez and Jocano's (1979) pioneering study more generally sought to characterize adolescent personality and values among rural and urban adolescents. In contrast to traditional "storm and stress" conceptions of the adolescent stage, their findings showed that adolescent family relations were marked by respect, obedience, and affection, rather than by conflict, rebellion or detachment. The authors further claim that they found no evidence of identity crises undergone by the adolescents, and nor were there any trends of turbulence and confusion.

Mendez and Jocano attributed the absence of an identity crisis to the Filipino's "unintrospective nature". That is, they propose that the adolescent is not likely to engage in self-searching for answers to such questions as "Who am I?", "What kind of person would I like to be?", or "What are my values and roles in life?" The authors have implied that this is because Filipino youth tend to acquire, without much question, the values and roles handed down to them by their parents.

A similar conclusion was reached by Baes (1985), who assessed the psychosocial development of adolescents using an inventory based on Erikson's psychosocial stages. In Erikson's theory, an identity crisis is a normative occurrence in adolescence, for it is in the resolution of such a crisis that the individual's identity becomes consolidated (Erikson, 1960). However, Baes found evidence to the contrary in the responses of her sample of over a thousand youth. Specifically, significantly more of the adolescents were identity achieved rather than confused or in moratorium. Baes interpreted these results as indicating that Filipino adolescents generally do not undergo an identity crisis.

Yet in a more recent investigation of Filipino adolescents' evaluations of their self-concepts, Vasquez (1992) found that self-conceptions varied according to age, with relatively more perturbations in the younger years. Adolescents aged 11 to 13 had significantly lower self-concepts than middle (aged 14-16) and late adolescents (aged 17-19). This pattern was attributed to the different adjustment challenges facing the adolescent at each phase: early adolescents are initially confronted with the dramatic physical and cognitive changes of puberty, bringing about negative self-evaluations, which level-off at mid-adolescence, when the adolescent has presumably adapted to the transition and developed self-acceptance. Still, upon entry into adulthood, the adolescent experiences some degree of renewed self-uncertainty, as vocational, relationship, and independence issues come to the fore.

Questions and Hypotheses

This study aims to characterize the Filipino adolescent self in terms of self-complexity and self-construal. Beyond this, it also examined the relationship between these aspects of the self-structure and negative emotions, namely, *self and identity confusion, emotional lability and extremity, self anxiety, and self-devaluation*. Many factors may account for the experience of negative emotions in the adolescent transition, and both developmental (i.e., Harter, 1986, 1997; Harter & Monsour, 1992) and social-cognitive models (i.e., Linville, 1985, 1987) posit that the self-structure is one such factor that critically affects adolescent emotion. The self develops into an increasingly multi-dimensional, differentiated, and integrated structure as the adolescent develops cognitively. In the process, however, the still fragmented and unstable structure may result in negative emotional experiences, such as confusion, globally negativistic thinking, and low self-esteem. Moreover, greater self-complexity, in terms of a large number of well-differentiated self-aspects, is associated with more moderate and stable affect, while lesser complexity is associated with greater emotional extremity, lability, and depression. It was therefore hypothesized that lesser complexity in an adolescent's self is associated with the experience of more negative emotions.

The developmental literature also maintains that the self develops progressively into a more differentiated structure as the adolescent develops cognitively. Greater exposure to a wider range of social roles and experiences also brings about a more complex self-structure. Given these, it was

hypothesized that the degree of self-complexity will vary across age, with the most complex self apparent in the late adolescents.

In terms of self-construal, it was predicted that the Filipino adolescent self is relatively more interdependent than independent. This corresponds to the sociocultural and local literature which have emphasized the relational nature of the Filipino self. The predominantly collectivist Philippine culture likely encourages the development of an interdependent self through its local socialization practices, institutions, norms, and values.

Regarding the relationship between self-construal and emotions, it was hypothesized that the independent self-construal is more likely to be associated with the experience of the emotions examined in this study, particularly self and identity confusion, self anxiety, and self-devaluation, as these are primarily ego-focused and concern the adolescent's individuality and personal attributes. A stronger independent self, is therefore likely to engender such emotions.

METHOD

Participants

A total of 207 adolescents participated in the study. Thirty-four percent ($n = 71$) were early adolescents aged 12 to 14, 30% ($n = 63$) were middle adolescents aged 15 to 17, and 35% ($n = 73$) were late adolescents aged 18 to 21. The female participants numbered 124, and comprised 60% of the total, while the males were 84 in all, and comprised the remaining 40%.

The early adolescents and 78% of the middle adolescents were randomly sampled from students enrolled at a public high school, while the rest were sampled from General Psychology classes in a public university. As all the participants were sampled from the same university community, the high school and college samples were likely to be homogeneous in socioeconomic status and intellectual ability.

To facilitate sampling in the high school, the participants' year level was used to approximate age (i.e., freshmen and sophomores for the early adolescents; juniors and seniors for the middle adolescents). The researcher randomly chose three sections from each year level, and randomly picked out ten numbers from each section's class list. The students which

corresponded with the numbers were selected to participate in the research. For the college sample, General Psychology students voluntarily signed up for research participation and were given course credit for their involvement.

Variables and Measures

Self-Complexity. Self-complexity refers to the number and degree of differentiation of self-aspects in the individual's self-system. A person possesses greater self-complexity to the extent that he organizes self-knowledge according to numerous and distinct self-aspects.

Self-complexity was measured using the Self-Complexity Task (SC Task), a sorting task developed by Linville (1985, 1987). The SC Task provides a unique way of assessing not only the number and differentiation of self-aspects, but the kinds of categories formed as well, thereby revealing both the structural and content dimensions of the adolescent self.

In the SC task, participants were given a packet of index cards, each containing the name of one trait/feature. They were then asked to think about their selves and to form groups of traits that go together, where each group corresponds to an aspect of their selves. The traits could be sorted on any meaningful basis, and the participants could form as many or few groups as they wished. The same trait could be used in multiple groups, and participants did not have to use all the traits. Finally, the participants were asked to provide labels for the categories of self-aspects formed.

To ensure that the traits to be sorted represented the most typical dimensions that Filipino adolescents use to think about themselves, these were taken from a trait-generation task with 48 college students and 45 high school students. In the task, the students were asked to think of their significant self roles (e.g., as a son/daughter, student, etc.) and to write each role at the top of each page in a booklet that they were given. They were then asked to generate traits that are characteristic of them in that role. The most frequently-occurring traits from the high school and college groups were set aside for use in the SC task. The final traits – 16 positive, 10 negative, and 7 neutral – are presented in Appendix A.

The SC task was pretested with seven college students, aged 17 to 21, nine high school students, aged 13 to 15, and three elementary students, aged 11 and 12 years. Comments were solicited regarding the comprehensibility of the instructions, the ease of the task, and the number and

representativeness of the traits. Most of the students found the task interesting, and found it neither too easy nor too difficult to perform. The researcher decided to include two examples of self-aspects in the standardized directions to be used in the actual study to assist the younger students, who found it difficult to begin the task without an example to guide them. To minimize the possibility that the examples given would bias the responses of the participants, the examples chosen were those that spontaneously appeared in nearly all the trait sorts generated by the pretest sample: self as *anak*, and self as *kaibigan*. The final number of traits was 33, and the maximum time provided for the task was 20 minutes.

A self-complexity score was calculated for each participant, and was based on the number of groups formed and the degree of independence among the groups. In statistical terms, the score or the H statistic, is interpreted as the minimal number of independent binary attributes needed to reproduce the trait sort. The formula for H is explained in greater detail in the section presenting the research results.

Self-Construal. Self-construal refers to the constellation of cognitions, emotions, and behaviors that reflect the individual's conception of the self in relation to and as distinct from others. An independent self-construal is a conception of the self as a bounded, unitary, and stable entity that is composed of internal attributes and is separate from context. On the other hand, an interdependent self-construal is a conception of the self as part of encompassing relationships. The relative strength of an individual's independent and interdependent self-construals was measured using Singelis' (1994) Self-construal Scale (SCS), which was modified to fit the characteristics of the sample. In keeping with the orthogonal dimensions of the construct, each participant obtained two scores: one corresponding to the independent construal subscale, and another to the interdependent construal subscale. The Independent (IND) subscale is composed of 12 items which tap the defining features of the construct, such as the emphasis on internal attributes as referents for behavior, being unique and expressing individuality, promoting one's own goals, and direct communication. The Interdependent (INTER) subscale also contains 12 items embodying the construct, with the emphasis on status, roles, and relationships, group belongingness, conforming to group norms and expectations, and being indirect in communication. The SCS has been shown in previous studies to possess adequate internal reliability, and construct and predictive validity

(i.e., alpha coefficients obtained range from .68 to .78; Singelis, 1994; Singelis & Sharkey, 1995).

For the purposes of the present study, the items were translated into Filipino by the researcher and two psychologists specializing in Filipino Psychology. Moreover, a 5-point, rather than the original 7-point Likert scale was used (where 1 = *Hinding-Hindi Totoo*, and 5 = *Totoong-Totoo*), in anticipation of the difficulties the younger participants might have in responding to a more complex scale. All items were positively-stated, a result of the theoretical stance that independence and interdependence do not form a single bipolar dimension, i.e., conceptually opposite items cannot be constructed (Singelis, 1994). A higher score was indicative of a stronger self-construal measured by that subscale.

The scale was pretested with 60 students, 30 of whom were in college, and 30 in high school. The resulting reliability analysis showed moderate levels of internal consistency, comparable to those obtained in previous studies. Comments about the ambiguity and complexity of certain items resulted in further item modifications and translations. The obtained reliability coefficients from the actual study were acceptable, but quite low: for IND, $\alpha = .66$; for INTER, $\alpha = .72$. The items in the questionnaire are in Appendix B.

Adolescent Emotion. The particular emotions of interest in this study were *identity/self confusion, anxiety, emotional lability and extremity, and self-devaluation*. These emotions are among those commonly experienced – at least in Western theory – during the adolescent stage. As such, they are potentially implicated in self processes, specifically self-complexity, and are possibly susceptible as well to sociocultural influences.

To date, no instrument measuring the degree of negative emotions typically experienced by adolescents has been developed for Filipinos. For this reason, the researcher developed a scale to measure experience of the emotions in question, the Adolescent Emotion Scale (AE). From the literature, various aspects of adolescent emotional disturbance such as uncertainty about the self, changes in self-esteem, heightened self-consciousness, sensitivity to shame and humiliation, and global, negative self-attributions were organized by the researcher according to their common conceptual elements. This resulted in four major dimensions: 1) *self and identity confusion* (Identity), 2) *emotional extremity and lability* (Emotionality), 3) *self anxiety* (Anxiety), and 4) *self-devaluation* (Lowself). Conceptually, self and identity

confusion pertains to the extent that the individual has knowledge and understanding about himself or herself, versus not knowing "the real me". Emotional extremity and lability refers to the intensity, regulation, and fluctuation of felt emotions. Self anxiety refers to self-consciousness and sensitivity to others' opinions about the self, while self-devaluation has to do with one's feelings of satisfaction with the self.

Forty-five items were initially constructed, based on the literature on the feelings, behaviors and attitudes that embody the four emotion factors. In addition, the researcher consulted the *Maramdamin* and *Mahinahon* subscales of the *Panukat ng Pagkataong Pilipino* (Carlota, 1996), and the Emotionality items of the 16 Personality Factor test (Cattell, Eber, & Tatsuoka, 1970) for comparative item content. Psychologists specializing in personality theory and measurement were consulted to verify content validity. The items were written in Filipino in the form of independent statements.

The scale was initially pretested with 88 college students majoring in Psychology. The subsequent Cronbach's reliability and item analysis resulted in items being removed from the scale. The remaining items were further simplified to accommodate the language level of the youngest target age group. The revised scale was again administered to a sample of 108 students aged 11 to 20. Again, items which had low comprehensibility and item-total correlations were removed from the scale.

The final scale contained 34 items, 16 of which were positively-stated and 18 negatively-stated. The participants responded through 5-point Likert-type rating scales, where 1 corresponds to *Hinding-Hindi Totoo*, and 5 to *Totoong-Totoo*. A higher score was indicative of greater negative emotions felt. The Cronbach's reliability coefficients obtained from the actual sample were as follows: .72 for the Identity subscale, .78 for the Emotionality subscale, .80 for the Anxiety subscale, and .80 for the Lowself subscale. These obtained alpha coefficients are adequate to establish the internal consistency of the scales. The AE items are shown in Appendix C.

Procedure

For the high school sample, participants were tested in groups of ten in the school's audio-visual room. The participants were positioned apart from each other and facing the wall so that opportunities to talk or look at others' work was minimized. This arrangement, as well as the small groupings,

was to facilitate the participants' concentration and to prevent them from being influenced by the behaviors of the other participants.

The researcher began each session by giving a standard introduction of herself and the purpose of the testing intended to minimize performance anxiety, social desirability effects, and other subject artifacts. After the introduction, either the Adolescent Emotion Scale (AE) or the Self-Constraint Scale (SCS) was administered, the order being counterbalanced for each session.

The Self-Complexity Task (SC Task) was always administered between the other two tests. The purpose of this particular ordering was to minimize anxiety by letting the participants first answer a relatively simple instrument, before asking them to fulfill the more complex SC task. By placing the novel SC task between the two other scales, the level of interest and task engagement was also kept high. As the researcher collected the first questionnaire (AE or SCS), the participants were handed two sheets of bond paper lined with one-inch wide columns, and a pack of 33 3"x 6" index cards, where the traits were printed in black marker pen. The standard instructions for the SC task were read orally by the researcher, and were as follows:

Sa gawain na ito ay interesado akong malaman kung paano niyo inilalarawan ang inyong sarili. Sa harapan ninyo ay may 33 na kard at dalawang pirasong papel. Pwede ninyong tingnan ang mga kard pagkatapos kong ibigay ang mga direksyon sa gagawin ninyo. Sa bawat kard ay may nakasulat na katangian. Ang gagawin ninyo ay pagsasama-samahin ninyo ang mga katangian na ito sa mga grupo, kung saan ang bawat grupo na inyong mabuo ay naglalarawan sa isang aspeto ng inyong sarili. Kayo ang bahala kung paano ninyo pagsasama-samahin ang mga katangian, basta't isipin ninyo ang inyong sarili habang ginagawa ninyo ang pag-gru-grupong ito. Halimbawa, ang pag-grupo ay maaaring ayon sa mahahalagang papel na ginagampanan ninyo sa inyong buhay, tulad nang bilang anak. Pwede rin namang ang grupo ay naglalarawan sa inyong sarili sa iba't ibang sitwasyon; halimbawa, kapag kasama ang mga kaibigan. Maaari kayong bumuo ng kahit na ano at kahit na ilang grupo na inyong maisip, basta't ang mga ito ay umaayon sa mga mahahalagang aspeto ng inyong sarili. Kung umabot na kayo sa punto na nahihirapan na kayong mag-isip ng mga grupo, marahil ibig sabihin ay kailangan na ninyong tumigil.

Kayo rin ang bahala sa kung ano at kung ilan ang mga katangian na ipagsasama-sama ninyo sa isang grupo. Hindi ninyo kailangang gamitin ang lahat ng mga katangian; gamitin niyo lamang ang iyong sa palagay ninyo ay talagang naglalarawan sa inyo. Isa pa, maaari ninyong ulit-ulitin ang paggamit ninyo sa isang katangian sa iba't-ibang grupo.

Itatala ninyo ang mga grupo ng katangian na inyong nabuo sa papel na ibinigay sa inyo. Ang bawat isang grupo ay itatala ninyo sa loob ng isang hanayan o column. Ang isusulat ninyo sa papel ay yoong lamang numero ng katangian, at hindi yung katangian mismo. Sa bawat hanayan, isulat ang mga numero ng mga katangian na bumubuo sa isang grupo.

Ang isang paraan ng paggawa sa gawaing ito ay ang pag-aralan ang mga katangian, at isaayos ang mga katangian sa mga grupo ayon sa mga aspeto ng inyong pagkatao. Itala ang mga grupong ito sa inyong papel. Pagkatapos ay paghaluin muli ang mga kard at tingnan kung mayroon pa kayong ibang grupo na mabubuo, at itala muli ang mga ito sa papel. Pagulit-ulitin ang proseso na ito hanggang sa nabuo na ninyo ang lahat ng mahahalagang grupo sa inyong pagkatao. Lagyan ng titulo o label ang mga grupo ng katangian na inyong nabuo, at isulat ito sa itaas ng bawat hanayan.

Mahalagang maging totoo ang inyong mga kasagutan; hindi hinihingi ang inyong pangalan, kaya't hindi naman kayo makikilala. Tandaan din na inilalarawan ninyo ang inyong sarili sa gawain na ito. Hindi ninyo kailangang gamitin ang lahat ng katangian, at maaari ninyong ulitin ang isang katangian sa higit sa isang grupo. Huwag din magmadali, sapagkat walang takdang oras na kailangan kayong matapos. Meron bang mga tanong? Kung wala na kayong tanong, maaari na kayong magsimula. Ibaba na lamang ang panulat at manatili sa puwesto kapag natapos na.

Questions were entertained after giving the instructions. The participants were given 20 minutes to complete their trait sorts. If some participants were not finished by this time, they were given five more minutes to complete the task.

Once everyone had accomplished the SC Task, the second scale was administered (either the AE or the SCS). When these were completed, the researcher thanked the participants for their participation. The entire session took between 45 minutes to one hour.

The same procedure was followed for the college sample, except that this group was tested in groups of seven, in two adjacent rooms. They were also handed a debriefing sheet when they had completed the entire session.

RESULTS

Self-Complexity

The Self-Complexity score (SC) is a function of both the number of groups formed by the participant, and the degree of independence among these groups. This was determined by calculating the H statistic, which is interpreted as the minimal number of independent binary attributes needed to reproduce a trait sort. A higher H value is indicative of a larger number of groups (or self-aspects) formed, and greater differentiation among the traits in these groups — hence, greater complexity. The formula for H is:

$$H = \log_2 n - (\sum n_i \log_2 n_i) / n$$

where n is the total number of traits sorted (i.e., 33) and n_i is the number of traits that appear in a particular group combination¹; $n = \sum n_i$. In the present case, the scores may range from 1 to 5.04 (i.e., 5.04 is the \log_2 of 33). The highest score of 5.04 is attained if the individual, for instance, categorizes each of the 33 traits as one self-aspect. (In this extreme case, n_i is always equal to 1, and as the \log_2 of 1 is zero, then the second part of the equation will be zero.)

The mean SC score of the entire sample was 3.75, with a standard deviation of .75. The SC scores ranged from 1.39 to 4.92. The distribution was negatively skewed (skewness coefficient = -.77), indicating that the scores were concentrated at the higher end of the range. Table 1 illustrates an actual trait sort created by a 15 year-old female participant with an SC score of 3.98.

The preceding example illustrates several aspects about the self. One is that it is multifaceted, including categories of roles (*Anak; Kaibigan*), situations (*Sa Klase*), and superordinate categories of traits (*Ano Ako; Hindi Ako*). It can also include seemingly contradictory traits within and across aspects. In the example, the participant is both *responsable* and *irresponsable* under *Sa Klase*, as well as *mainitin ang ulo* under *Hindi Ako*, but *mainitin ang ulo* under *Pag May Problema*.

Table 1. An Example of One Participant's Trait Sort (SC score= 3.98)

Anak	Kaibigan	Sa Klase	Para Sa Akin, Ano Ako?	Sa Hindi Ako Kilala, Ano Ako?
Mapagmahal	Tapat	Masipag	Malambing	Masungit
Masunurin	Mabait	Matalino	Mapagmahal	
Responsible	Mapagkaka- tiwalaan	Tahimik	Masipag	
Masipag	Masayahin	Nakikinig	Palakaibigan	
Nakikinig	Palabiro	Masunurin		
Matulungin	Makulit	Palaisip		
Malambing		Mapagpa- sensiya	Hinding- Hindi Ako	
Mabait		Matiyaga		
Maalalahanin	Palakaibigan	Seryoso		
Maunawain	Malambing	Responsible		
Mapagkaka- tiwalaan	Maunawain	Iresponsible		
Masayahin	Mapagmahal			
Seryoso				
Hindi Ako	Gusto Ko Sa Akin	Pag May Problema	Mayabang Iresponsible	
Mayabang	Malambing	Matigas ang ulo		
Tamad	Masayahin	Mainitin ang ulo		
Makwento	Maunawain	Masungit		
Mapag-isa	Mapagmahal	Seryoso		
Matampuhin	Mapagkaka- tiwalaan	Mapag-isa		
Mainitin ang ulo		Tahimik		

The groups or self-aspects formed by the participants were content analyzed, and five major categories were derived from the data. These are groupings of traits according to Social Roles (e.g., *Estudyante; Miyembro ng Student Organization*), Relational Social Roles (e.g., *Anak; Kaibigan*), Situations (e.g., *Sa Bahay; Pag May Problema*), Superordinate Categories (e.g., *Ang Gusto Gong Baguhin; Palaging Ugali*), and groups that had No Contextual Reference (e.g., *Ako; Bilang Tao*). The difference between the category of Social Roles and that of Relational Social Roles is that the former refers to membership in more abstract or general groups, while the latter highlights particular relationships with others.

Of the total 1,583 groups or self-aspects formed, the most number were relational in nature, with a frequency of 725 or 45%. This was followed by

Situational ($f = 408$, or 33%) and Social Roles ($f = 316$, or 22%). Traits organized according to superordinate and decontextualized categories were relatively scarce ($f = 92$ and $f = 42$, respectively).

Self-Construal

The Self-Construal scale is composed of two subscales measuring the independent (IND) and interdependent (INTER) self-construals. The IND and INTER construals were treated as separate dimensions, and were answered and analyzed separately.

Overall, the respondents scored somewhat high in both the IND and INTER self-construals: along a 5-point scale, the mean for IND was 3.51 ($SD = .43$); for INTER, the mean was 3.75 ($SD = .43$). However, a paired samples t -test showed that the participants were relatively more INTER than IND, $t(206) = 6.57$, $p < .01$.

Self-Complexity and Age

It was hypothesized that the self becomes more complex as the adolescent develops. An analysis of variance of SC by age (i.e., early, middle, or late adolescence) showed a main effect, with SC scores increasing significantly across age, $F = 8.77$, $df = 2, 205$, $p < .001$. Scheffé post-hoc comparisons determined that the mean score of the late adolescents was significantly different from both the early and middle adolescents at $p < .05$. These means are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Self-complexity Scores by Age

	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>F</i> (2, 205)
Early Adolescent	70	3.54	.71	9.67**
Middle Adolescent	63	3.63	.85	
Late Adolescent	73	4.04	.59	

** $p < .001$

Analyzing the SC categories across age also revealed main effects. Scheffé post-hoc tests verified that the late adolescents formed a significantly larger number of relational categories than the early and middle adolescents ($F =$

7.99, $df = 2, 200, p < .001$), and a significantly larger number of social role categories than the early adolescents ($F = 4.28, df = 2, 200, p < .05$). There were no age differences in the number of situational, no context, and superordinate categories formed. Overall, the late adolescents also formed a larger number of self-aspects ($F = 5.76, df = 2, 205, p < .01$). Table 3 presents the means for number and type of self-aspects across age.

Table 3. Differences in Number and Type of Self-Aspects by Age

	<i>n</i>	Number of self-aspects		Relational self-aspects		Social role self-aspects	
		M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Early adolescent	70	6.77	2.60	2.70	1.80	1.28	1.39
Middle adolescent	63	7.49	3.60	3.79	2.24	1.39	1.33
Late adolescent	73	8.48	2.85	4.11	2.38	1.98	1.79

Self-Complexity and Negative Emotion

Negative emotional experience was measured by the Adolescent Emotion scale, which is composed of four subscales: Identity/Self Confusion (Identity), Emotional Lability & Extremity (Emotionality), Self Anxiety & Insecurity (Anxiety), and Self-devaluation (Lowself). Higher scores in these subscales indicate higher levels of the particular emotion being measured. The means and standard deviations of each subscale are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of the AE Subscales (N = 207)

	M	SD
Identity	2.84	.74
Emotionality	3.11	.56
Anxiety	3.00	.56
Lowself	2.59	.59

The hypothesized relationship between self-complexity and negative emotion – that greater self-complexity is associated with lower levels of negative emotion – was not supported by the data. SC had a positive but

low correlation with Emotionality ($r = .20, p < .01$, two-tailed), and was not significantly correlated with Identity, Anxiety, and Lowself.

As the absence of higher correlations could possibly have been due to the restricted range of SC scores, SC was also analyzed as a categorical variable. The scores were split at the median (3.87) and scores below the median were designated as low self-complexity, and the rest as high self-complexity. Consistent with the correlational analysis, an analysis of variance of the four emotion subscales by SC showed a significant main effect only in Emotionality, $F = 5.90, df = 1, 206, p = .02$. Those high in self-complexity also had higher scores in Emotionality: for high SC, $M = 3.21, SD = .54$; for low SC, $M = 3.02, SD = .57$.

Self-Construal and Negative Emotion

It was hypothesized that a strong independent self-construal would be associated with greater experience of ego-focused negative emotions, or Identity, Anxiety, and Lowself. The results showed that IND scores were negatively associated with these emotions, indicating that the stronger the IND construal, the lower the scores on these negative emotion scales. Table 5 presents the correlation coefficients between both self-construals and the four emotion scales.

Table 5. Correlations Between Self-construal and Negative Emotion (N = 207)

	IND	INTER	Identity	Emotionality	Anxiety
IND					
INTER	.20**				
Identity	-.34**	-.17*			
Emotionality	-.07	-.03	.43**		
Anxiety	-.24**	-.08	.58**	.49**	
Lowself	-.35**	-.18**	.66**	.40**	.58**

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

As IND and INTER were correlated with each other, regression analyses were conducted to tease apart their relative contributions to the variance in the emotion factors. In the resulting models (where each emotion was the outcome and IND and INTER were predictor variables), only IND was found

to be a significant predictor of Identity, Anxiety, and Lowself. For Identity, $B = -.27$, $SE = .06$; for Anxiety, $B = -.20$, $SE = .06$; for Lowself, $B = -.34$, $SE = .07$ (all $p < .01$). The correlations with INTER were nonsignificant.

DISCUSSION

Complexity and Biculturalism in the Filipino Adolescent Self

The participants' self structures were generally high in complexity; that is, the adolescents characterized themselves according to a large number of differentiated self-aspects. More specifically, the Filipino adolescent self may be described as multifaceted, including categories of roles, relationships, situations, and attributes; it is hierarchical, with self-aspects being organized according to superordinate categories and sub-categories; it is integrated, in that seemingly contradictory attributes were included both across and within self-aspects.

Even as the adolescents' self structures are consistent with the Western self literature, the qualitative analysis of self-aspect categories corroborate local perspectives that describe the Filipino self as fundamentally connected with others (Enriquez, 1994; Church, 1987; Pasao, 1979). These findings are consistent as well with the characterizations of collectivist peoples and interdependent self-construals as defined according to relationships and roles, and as being sensitive to the surrounding context (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Shweder et al., 1997).

Likewise, in terms of self-construal, results indicate that the respondents were more interdependent than independent, confirming the hypothesis that Filipino youth value good interpersonal relationships, collective goals, and social norms and values. It was notable, however, that the respondents also endorsed, to a moderate extent, independent attitudes and values such as self-assertion, achievement, and an autonomous self. This is consistent with a number of frameworks positing an increasing meld between individualism and collectivism, especially with the pressures of globalization and modernization. Triandis (1990), Kagitcibasi (1996), and Protacio-Marcelino (1996) have noted that many cultures are neither one or the other, but maintain qualities of both. Likewise, individuals may possess cognitions about both their personal and collective selves, and may see themselves as both independent and interdependent, albeit in differing degrees. Such a

bicultural self may be particularly adaptive in today's increasingly complex society, and the youth may be most liable to the development of such a self.

The Development of Self-Complexity

Self-complexity was found to increase along a developmental trajectory, with the late adolescents possessing the most complex self-structure relative to the younger sample. This finding is consistent with the developmental literature on the self (Harter, 1990, 1997; Shavelson & Byrne, 1996; Evans, 1994), which posit that with increasing age, the self incorporates more dimensions, and becomes more differentiated and integrated. Although the study did not directly investigate the specific causal mechanisms of self-complexity development, analyzing the categories of self-aspects formed by the respondents suggested that increases in social experiences, relationships, and roles attendant in the adolescent period may partly account for the increase in self-complexity in the college-age sample. Cognitive development has also been theoretically linked to this development, with particular emphasis on such capacities as the abstraction and integration of self-attributes (Harter, 1990, 1997; Rosenberg, 1986; Markus & Wurf, 1987). In this study, there is no direct evidence that this is indeed the process by which the self increases in complexity. It has also been noted in cultural studies that while a certain level of cognitive abilities may be necessary to have a *sense* of self and to *think about* the self, the tendency to characterize the self according to abstract, hierarchical attributes may be more an offshoot of the Western ideal, rather than a necessary consequence of increases in cognitive ability per se (Shweder et al., 1997). Indeed, the self-attributes and aspects in this sample of Filipino adolescents were more grounded on concrete relationships, roles, and situations, rather than on generalized abstractions. Further studies focusing on the cognitive mechanisms driving self development are necessary.

Self-Complexity and Negative Emotion

Among the negative emotions investigated, only Emotionality was related to self-complexity, in that greater self-complexity was associated with higher levels of emotional extremity and lability. This result is opposite to what was expected, and contrary to what was found in prior studies (Evans, 1994; Linville, 1985, 1987). It is possible that emotionality and self-

complexity are related to the degree in which an individual is self-focused. Self-focused individuals are more attuned to internal states and emotions, and have a more clearly articulated self. Yet the tendency is for such individuals to also experience more extreme and distressing emotions. In the psychopathology literature, this phenomenon has been called the "self-absorption paradox" (Campbell, Trapnell, Heine, Katz, Lavalley, & Lehman, 1996). The heightened, chronic self-attention that adolescents are prone to may indeed promote self-complexity, but emotional extremity as well. Similarly, Harter's cognitive-developmental framework (1997) asserts that concurrent with self differentiation, adolescents may become more vulnerable to negative emotions as they become more aware of the inconsistencies and complexities of the self. The foregoing suggests that self-complexity may be associated with different outcomes in the process of its development, other than to buffer against negative events as proposed in social-cognitive theories (when self-complexity is already assumed to be a stable feature of the self).

That the hypothesized negative relationship between self-complexity and negative emotion was not obtained may have been due to how emotion was operationalized in the study. Here, negative emotion, rather than affect, was associated with self-complexity. The emotions investigated were conceptualized as states and experienced over time, and were measured via self-report. But as Linville (1985) conceptualized it, self-complexity serves to moderate affective reactions in actual stressful events, or when a positive or negative life event is experienced, rather than influence emotional states in general.

Other studies (Evans, 1994; Mikulincer, 1995) suggest that self-complexity may also affect the overall valence of emotional experience. However, this may be true only for more pathologic and pervasive emotions such as depression, withdrawal, and other internalizing symptoms that were assessed in these studies, and not the more normative ones in focus here.

The self-complexity framework may be enriched with the consideration of the moderating functions of age, gender, and self-construal. Interactions among the variables were not analyzed in this study, although some results suggest that the relationship between self-structure and emotion may be a function of these factors.

Self-Construal and Negative Emotion

Contrary to the hypothesis that an independent self-construal would be associated with higher levels of identity confusion, self anxiety, and self-devaluation, the results show negative relationships between independence and these three emotions. However, there was no way of ascertaining whether the negative correlations are not due to the fact that independent individuals are also likely to be highly interdependent in this sample. A majority of the sample scored high in *both* independence and interdependence, making it difficult to determine the implications of having a stronger independent versus interdependent construal on emotion (Only four respondents scored at least one standard deviation above the mean in INTER and one standard deviation below the mean on IND, while only seven were high on IND and low on INTER.)

Another point is that certain items in the IND subscale denote behaviors depicting a strong sense of individuality and identity, such that persons who scored high on these items would likely possess a well-formed sense of self that they are confident about; for instance, *Hindi problema para sa akin ang sumagot at magsalita sa harap ng klase; Gusto kong maging prangka at tapat sa mga bagong kakilala ko*. Hence, the lower levels of identity confusion, self anxiety, and self-devaluation. Alternative measures or methods of assessing self-construal may bear out the hypothesized relationship with emotion, as well as measures tapping emotional tendencies that are more specific to how one views himself in relation to others, such as anger and frustration, and sympathy and shame.

Limitations and Recommendations

One major limitation in this study is the use of self-report and Western-developed procedures and instruments (i.e., the SC Task and the Self-Construal scale). Such procedures may have limited the kinds of information and interpretations that can be gleaned from the data. Future research should place more emphases on methodologies that look into the sociocultural practices and beliefs that shape the self, and consequently, adolescent experience. Moreover, given the scarcity of local knowledge and theory in adolescent development, emic and ethnographic approaches focusing on sociocultural practices and mentalities are promising tools for investigating the factors that shape the Filipino adolescent self and his experiences. In

doing so, studies may address the more important issues of processes and mechanisms of self development, and the effects of such on the adolescent's psychological functioning.

The present study limited its participants to urban, university-based adolescents. Such adolescents are likely to have been more exposed to modernization and social change, and may be more predisposed to be aware of and attend to their selves. Thus, the results may be applicable only to adolescents belonging to this particular demographic. Future research should also involve a more heterogeneous Filipino sample. Differences in social structures, cultural beliefs and practices, and exposure to Western influences among adolescents of varying gender, socio-economic strata, or rural/urban background imply diverging adolescent selves, processes and experiences.

NOTE

¹To define a group combination, consider a trait that is sorted in Group 1 and Group 2 but in no others. This trait is said to fall into the group combination (1 & 2). If a person forms two groups, a given trait may fall into one of four possible group combinations: (1), (2), (1 & 2), or (no group) (Linville, 1985).

REFERENCES

- Baes, V. (1985). *The development and validation of an adjustment inventory based on Erikson's stages of development*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Byrne, B., & Shavelson, R. (1996). On the structure of the social self-concept for pre-, early, and late adolescents: A test of the Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976) model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70 (3), 599-613.
- Campbell, J., Trapnell, P., Heine, S., Katz, I., Lavallee, L., & Lehman, D. (1996). Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70 (1), 141-156.

- Carlota, A. (1996). *Manual of the Panukat ng Pagkataong Pilipino*. Department of Psychology, University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Cattell, R., Eber, H., & Tatsuoka, M. (1970). *Handbook for the 16 PF Questionnaire*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.
- Church, T. (1987). Personality research in a non-Western culture: The Philippines. *Psychological Bulletin*, 102 (2), 272-292.
- Cousins, S. (1989). Culture and self-perception in Japan and United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56 (1), 124-131.
- Enriquez, V. (1994). *From colonial to liberation psychology*. Manila: De La Salle University Press.
- Erikson, E. (1960). The problem of ego-identity. In M. Stein, A. Vidich, & D. White (Eds.), *Identity and anxiety*. NY: Free Press.
- Evans, D. (1994). Self-complexity and its relation to development, symptomatology and self-perception during adolescence. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 24 (3), 173-182.
- Feldman, S., & Elliott, G. (1990). *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (Chapter 1, pp. 1-13). MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fiske, S., & Taylor, S. (1991). *Social cognition*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Greenwald, A., & Pratkanis, A. (1984). The self. In R. S. Wyer & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (Vol. 3, pp. 129-178). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harter, S. (1983). Developmental perspectives on the self-system. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 4, pp. 275-385). NY: Wiley.
- Harter, S. (1986). Processes underlying the construction, maintenance, and enhancement of self-concept in children. In J. Suls & A. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 3, pp. 136-182). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Harter, S. (1990). Self and identity development. In S. Feldman & G. Elliott (Eds.), *At the threshold: The developing adolescent* (pp. 352-386). MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harter, S. & Monsour, A. (1992). Developmental analysis of conflict caused by opposing attributes in the adolescent self-portrait. *Developmental Psychology*, 28 (2), 251-260.

- Harter, S. (1997). The development of self-representations. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 5, pp. 553-618). NY: John Wiley.
- Higgins, E. T. (1989). Continuities and discontinuities in self-regulatory and self-evaluative processes: A developmental theory relating self and affect. *Journal of Personality*, 57 (2), 407-444.
- Kagitcibasi, C. (1996). *Family and human development across cultures: A view from the other side*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kihlstrom, J., & Cantor, N. (1984). Mental representations of the self. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 17, 1-47.
- Linville, P. (1985). Self-complexity and affective extremity: Don't put all of your eggs in one cognitive basket. *Social Cognition*, 3, 94-120.
- Linville, P. (1987). Self-complexity as a cognitive buffer against stress-related illness and depression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52 (4), 663-676.
- Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98 (2), 224-253.
- Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social-psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 299-337.
- Mendez, P., & Jocano, F. L. (1979). *The Filipino adolescent in a rural and urban setting*. Manila: Centro Escolar University Research and Development Center.
- Mikulincer, M. (1995). Attachment style and the mental representation of the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69 (6), 1203-1215.
- Pasao, M. (1979). *Self-Concept: A conceptual and methodological study in the Philippine context*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of the Philippines, Quezon City.
- Protacio-Marcelino, E. (1996). *Identidad at etnisidad: Karanasan at pananaw ng mga estudyanteng Filipino-Amerikano sa California*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Social Science and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Quezon City.

- Rosenberg, M. (1986). Self-concept from middle childhood through adolescence. In J. Suls & A. Greenwald (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 3, pp. 107-136). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shweder, R., Goodnow, J., Hatano, G., LeVine, R., Markus, H., & Miller, P. (1997). The cultural psychology of development: One mind, many mentalities. In R. Lerner & W. Damon (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 865-937). NY: John Wiley.
- Singelis, T. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20 (5), 580-591.
- Singelis, T., & Sharkey, W. (1995). Culture, self-construal, and embarrassment. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26 (6), 622-644.
- Steinberg, L. (1996). *Adolescence*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Triandis, H. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96 (3), 506-520.
- Vasquez, V. (1992). *An exploratory study on the relationship of self-concept, body image, and nutritional status of Filipino adolescents*. Unpublished masteral thesis, College of Social Science and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Quezon City.

AUTHOR NOTE

This paper is based on the author's masteral thesis "An Exploratory Study of Self-Complexity, Self-Construal, and Negative Emotion in Filipino Adolescents", College of Social Sciences and Philosophy, University of the Philippines, Diliman, Quezon City. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Liane Peña-Alampay, Ateneo de Manila University, P.O. Box 194, Manila 0917. Email: lpalampay@ateneo.edu.

APPENDIX A

Traits Used In The Self-Complexity Task

mabait	matulungin	maunawain	mapagpa-	palakaibigan
seryoso	tapat	responsable	sensiya	nakikinig
masunurin	malambing-	masipag	masayahin	matiyaga
mayabang	matigas ang	maaalala-	palaisip	walang
mapagmahal	ulo	hanin	matampuhin	pasensiya
makulit	walang	irespon-	masungit	tahimik
mapag-isa	tiyaga	sable	tamad	makuwento
	mapagkaka-	matalino		
	tiwalaan	palabiro		
	mainitin ang			
	ulo			

APPENDIX B

Self-Construal Scale Items

Interdependent Items

1. Importante para sa akin ang irespeto ang mga desisyon na ginawa ng grupong kinabibilangan ko.
It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group.
2. Isasakripisyo ko ang aking sariling interes kung ito ay para sa ikabubuti ng grupong kinabibilangan ko.
I will sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of the group I am in.
3. May respeto ako para sa mga taong may awtoridad na nakakaugnay ko (halimbawa: magulang, guro).
I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact.
4. Mananatili ako sa isang grupo kung kailangan nila ako, kahit na hindi ako masaya sa grupong ito.
I will stay in a group if it needs me, even when I am not happy with the group.

5. Kahit na hindi ako sumasang-ayon sa mga miyembro ng grupo, iiwasan ko hangga't maaari ang makipagtalo sa kanila.
Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument.
6. Kailangang isaalang-alang ko ang payo ng aking mga magulang sa pagbuo ng aking mga plano sa edukasyon at trabaho.
I should take into consideration my parents' advice when making education/career plans.
7. Importante para sa akin ang panatilihin ang magandang relasyon sa loob ng aking grupo.
It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.
8. Madalas kong maramdaman na mas importante ang aking relasyon sa iba kaysa sa sarili kong mga tagumpay.
I often have the feeling that my relationships with others are more important than my own accomplishments.
9. Nakasalalay ang aking kasiyahan sa kasiyahan ng mga kasama ko.
My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me.
10. Nirerespeto ko ang mga taong mapagkumbaba.
I respect people who are modest about themselves.
11. Ako ay may pananagutan sa ginagawang pagkakamali ng aking kapatid.
If my brother or sister fails, I feel responsible.
12. Iaalok ko sa aking guro ang aking upuan sa bus.
I would offer my seat in a bus to my professor.

Independent Items

1. Gusto ko ang maging katangi-tangi at iba sa karamihan sa maraming aspeto.
I enjoy being unique and different from others in many respects.
2. Hindi problema para sa akin ang sumagot at magsalita sa harap ng klase.
Speaking up during a class is not a problem for me.

3. Gusto kong maging prangka at tapat sa mga bagong kakilala ko.
I prefer to be direct and forthright when dealing with people I have just met.
4. Komportable ako na ako lang sa grupo ang bibigyan ng pansin at pupurihin.
I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards.
5. Ang sarili kong pagkatao, na hiwalay sa iba, ay mahalagang-mahalaga sa akin.
My personal identity, independent of others, is very important to me.
6. Pareho ang aking ugali at pagkilos, kahit na sino pa ang kasama ko.
I act the same way no matter who I am with.
7. Komportable akong gamitin ang palayaw ng isang bagong kakilala, kahit na mas matanda siya sa akin.
I feel comfortable using someone's first name soon after I meet them, even when they are much older than I am.
8. Kung ano ako sa bahay ay iyon din ako sa eskuwela.
I am the same person at home that I am at school.
9. Gusto kong sinasabi agad ang talagang iniisip at nararamdaman ko, kaysa hindi kami magkaintindihan ng kausap ko.
I would rather say "no" directly than risk being misunderstood.
10. Mahalagang-mahalaga sa akin ang mapangalagaan ko ang aking sarili.
Being able to take care of myself is a primary concern for me.
11. Pinapahalagahan ko ang aking kalusugan higit sa lahat.
I value being in good health above everything.
12. Importante sa akin ang magkaroon ng aktibong imahinasyon.
Having a lively imagination is important to me.

APPENDIX C

Adolescent Emotion Scale Items*Identity/Self confusion*

1. Kilalang-kilala ko ang aking sarili.
2. Naguguluhan ako sa kung sino talaga ako.
3. Naiintindihan ko kung bakit ko ginagawa ang mga ginagawa ko.
4. Minsan, para bang hindi ko maintindihan ang aking sarili.
5. Hindi ko pinoproblema ang kung sino ako.
6. Nahihirapan akong ilarawan ang aking sarili sa ibang tao.

Emotional Lability and Extremity

1. Nakakaramdam ako ng lubos na kasiyahan at lubos na kalungkutan sa loob ng maikling panahon.
2. Nangyayari na hindi ko matapos ang mga kailangan kong gawin dahil sa sobrang pagdaramdam.
3. Mahinahon ako sa harap ng mga problema o kaguluhan.
4. Hindi ako nagpapadala sa lungkot o pagkalito sa harap ng mga problema.
5. May mga panahon na isang sandali ay masaya ako, at sa susunod naman ay biglang malungkot na.
6. Hindi ko maitago ang mga nararamdaman ko sa harapan ng ibang tao.
7. Hindi pabagu-bago ang aking mga damdamin.
8. Madali para sa akin na iisang-tabi ang aking galit o lungkot kung may kailangan akong tapusin na gawain.
9. Madali akong mapasigaw, magdabog, o maiyak sa sobrang galit o lungkot.
10. Nasabihan na ako ng ibang tao na maramdamin ako.
11. Madali akong makaramdam ng matinding lungkot, galit, o tuwa kahit sa maliit na bagay lang.

Self anxiety

1. Hindi ako nag-aalangan na ipakita sa iba ang tunay kong pagkatao.
2. Madalas akong nag-aalala sa iniisip ng ibang tao tungkol sa akin.
3. Nakakasiguro ako na matatanggap ako ng ibang tao para sa kung sino talaga ako.
4. Nag-aalala ako na hindi magugustuhan ng ibang tao ang tunay kong pagkatao.
5. Sumasama ang loob ko kapag may nampupuna sa akin.
6. Hindi ko pinoproblema ang iniisip ng ibang tao tungkol sa akin.
7. Palagi akong nag-aalala kung tama ba o mali ang mga kilos at salita ko.
8. Natatanggap ko nang walang sama ng loob ang mga puna ng ibang tao tungkol sa akin.

Self-devaluation

1. Ayokong makipagpalit ng katangian o sitwasyon sa ibang tao.
1. Masaya at kontento ako sa kung sino ako.
2. Nalulungkot lang ako sa tuwing iniisip ko ang aking sarili.
3. Marami akong hindi gusto sa aking sarili.
4. Alam ko kung ano ang mga magagandang katangian ko.
5. Marami akong kakayahang maipagmamalaki.
6. Pakiramdam ko, marami akong pagkukulang sa mga taong may mga inaasahan sa akin.
7. Naiisip ko na sana ibang tao na lang ako.
8. Natutupad ko ang mga inaasahan ko at ng ibang tao sa akin.