

Gender Differences in Relational and Collective Interdependence

Implications for Self-Views, Social Behavior, and Subjective Well-Being

WENDI L. GARDNER
SHIRA GABRIEL

Man's love is of man's life a thing apart . . . but tis woman's
whole existence.

—BYRON (1824), from *Don Juan*, Canto 1

Human attachments are a fundamental source of strength and succor for all individuals. However, common beliefs about gender differences often echo Byron's suggestion that men and women differ strongly in the importance of social bonds. For example, one contemporary best-seller targeted to teens includes a chapter titled "Men and Women Are Different," an ostensible attempt to help teens better understand the behavior of the opposite sex, in which one primary gender difference is stated as "women are social, men are individualistic . . ." (Brain, 1997, p. 111). Although obviously a caricature, this portrayal of the sexes does appear to parallel beliefs current college students may hold about gender differences in sociality, as revealed by our recent survey.

We recently asked 50 undergraduates (equal numbers of males and females) which sex was more likely to place more importance on various aspects of life, including some social aspects (e.g., friendships, club memberships, being an individual) and some nonsocial aspects (e.g., succeeding in classes, creative problem solving, being happy with life), on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 labeled *definitely men*, 7 labeled *definitely women*, and 4 labeled *men and women equally*. For the questions concerning relationships with best friends, family, and romantic partners, the results were in favor of women placing greater importance on these close relationships (M 's = 6.2, 5.5, and 6.8, respectively). Similarly, when we asked which sex was more likely to place more importance on their memberships in groups or organizations, such as fraternity-sorority membership, being members of their university, and membership in social clubs, the results were again in favor of women (M 's = 4.8, 4.7, and 4.9, respectively). At the opposite end of the social spectrum, when we asked which sex was more likely to place more importance on being an individual, going it alone, and being independent from others, results were in favor of men (M 's = 1.9, 2.5, and 2.2, respectively). In contrast to the gender differences seen in the social sphere, the college students we sampled did not expect much of a gender difference in other domains, such as succeeding in classes ($M = 3.9$), being creative problem solvers ($M = 4.2$), or being happy with life ($M = 3.9$).

Such beliefs concerning gender differences in sociality may not be limited to our college student sample. Indeed, when gender stereotypes were sampled in 25 diverse nations, "independent" was identified as a masculine trait in all 25, whereas "affectionate" was identified as a feminine characteristic in 24 of the 25 nations (Williams & Best, 1990). Thus, it appears that one belief about how men and women differ appears to concern the social domain; women may be thought to place greater importance on social interactions and social ties compared to men.

Even in the psychological literature, there is evidence that women are thought to place greater emphasis on relations with others compared to men. For example, one well-explored gender difference concerns itself with gender-linked motivations toward agency or communion that are reflected in and reinforced by the different social roles inhabited by men and women. Men are thought to be oriented toward agency, characterized by traits such as instrumentality, assertiveness, and self-confidence, whereas women are thought to be oriented toward communion characterized by warmth, expressiveness, and concern for others (e.g., Bakan, 1966; Bem, 1974; Wood, Christensen, Hebl, & Rothgerber, 1997). Moreover, these motives have been shown to be internalized into the self-concepts of men and women, with the sex-typed norms of women as warm and expressive, and men as more independent and self-confident,

serving as standards for self-evaluation (Wood et al., 1997). And in a recent review of gender differences in the sociality of the self-concepts of men and women, it has been argued that as a result of these norms, men develop and maintain a more independent view of the self (e.g., one grounded in individual abilities, traits, and preferences), whereas women develop and maintain a more interdependent view of the self (e.g., one grounded in social ties with close relationships and groups; Cross & Madson, 1997).

Sex differences in social aspects of the self have rarely been directly examined. However, recent research has begun to focus on this aspect of gender differences, with potentially surprising results. Instead of finding support for the view of men as individualistic and women as more socially attuned, this work exposes the shared importance of social associations to the self; both men and women appear to look to their social ties as a basis for identity. Despite this basic similarity, potentially distinct features of men's and women's interdependent identities have emerged. Specifically, men appear to emphasize collective (group-based) bonds, whereas women appear to emphasize relational (dyadic) attachments. In other words, the most accurate description of gender differences in interdependence might be that men and women appear to be "separate but equal"; men and women differ in the *aspects* of interdependence that are emphasized and elaborated, but do not differ in the overall *extent* of interdependence, nor in the impact of interdependent construals on social cognition and behavior (e.g., Arndt, Greenberg, & Cook, 2002; Baumeister & Sommer, 1997; Gabriel & Gardner, 1999; Gardner, Gabriel, & Hochschild, 2002; Seeley, Gardner, Pennington, & Gabriel, 2003).

This chapter first briefly reviews the cultural literature from which the construct of an interdependent self-construal emerged. We also describe socialization processes that may encourage interdependence to take distinct and gendered forms within North America. Finally, we review the empirical evidence supporting the notion that interdependence is both represented and communicated differently in men and women. The expanded model of gender and interdependence has received support in domains as diverse as spontaneous self-descriptions, values and worldviews, the encoding and recall of social information, self-evaluation and regulation, and the bases of social attachments and well-being.

AN EXPANDED VIEW OF GENDER AND INTERDEPENDENCE

The distinction between an independent versus interdependent construal of the self, characterized as self-definitions grounded within personal

traits and attributes (e.g., athletic, tall) versus social roles and close relationships (e.g., mother, husband), came to prominence within social psychology as a framework for understanding the robust differences between members of East Asian and North American cultures in social thought and behavior (e.g., Gardner, Gabriel, & Lee, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). An independent self-construal is thought to arise from a belief in the inherent separateness of individuals, and to encourage the goal of discovering and expressing what makes one positively distinct from others. In contrast, an interdependent self-construal is thought to arise from a belief in the fundamental embeddedness of every individual in a larger web of close relationships and group memberships, and thus encourages the goal of maintaining harmony with others (e.g., Heine, Lehman, Markus, & Kitayama, 1999; Lee, Aaker, & Gardner, 2000).

As a framework for understanding cultural differences, the distinction between independent and interdependent self-construals has been successful in both predicting and explaining cultural differences in areas as varied as causal attribution (e.g., Memon, Morris, Chin, & Hong, 1999), social influence (e.g., Ybarra & Trafimow, 1998), self-enhancement and esteem (e.g., Heine et al., 1999), and the bases of subjective well-being (e.g., Suh, 2000). Recently, several researchers have argued that the chronic motives linked to independent and interdependent self-construals may parallel the constructs of agency and communion (Cross & Madson, 1997; Ickes & Barnes, 1978). Others have argued that, to some extent, children grow up in sex-segregated separate cultures, complete with distinct gendered norms and practices (e.g., Hoffman, 1972; Maccoby, 1989, 1990; Maltz & Borker, 1982; Tannen, 1990). Taken in this context, it is understandable that extending the cultural distinction between independent and interdependent self-construals to explore potentially distinct "cultures of gender" would be seen as helpful in understanding sex differences in cognition and behavior.

As previously mentioned, in an interesting and influential article, Cross and Madson (1997) asserted that North American culture encourages the development of a more interdependent focus in women and independent focus in men. Furthermore, they argued that many empirically demonstrated gender differences could be seen as reflecting these differences in self-construal. Certainly much of the developmental literature supports the notion that girls appear to be more strongly attuned to relationships. For example, when asked to describe themselves, young girls spontaneously refer to close relationships and relational characteristics to a greater extent than do their male counterparts (McGuire & McGuire, 1982; Rosenberg, 1989). Moreover, gender differences in sensitivity to close relationships appear to continue into adulthood. Adult women attend to information related to relationships more than do men

(Josephs, Markus, & Tafarodi, 1992; Ross & Holmberg, 1992), and close relationships appear to have a greater impact on women's well-being, in that more women than men describe interpersonal problems as a source of distress (Pratt, Golding, Hunter, & Samson, 1988; Walker, de Vries, & Trevethan, 1987).

However, the broad support for the notion that women appear to maintain relatively more interdependent self-construals and social biases, as reviewed by Cross and Madson (1997), does not necessitate that men must maintain relatively independent self-construals. The indispensability of social ties to well-being is becoming increasingly recognized in medical as well as psychological literature, and the negative consequences of social isolation do not appear to be moderated by gender (e.g., House, Landis, & Umberson, 1986; Mistry, Rosansky, McGuire, McDermott, & Jarvik, 2001). Indeed, the "need to belong"—a need fulfilled only through affiliation with and acceptance from others—is so universally powerful that it has been proposed to be as basic to our psychological makeup as hunger or thirst is to our physical makeup (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Gardner, Pickett, & Brewer, 2000). Thus, to the extent that the interdependent self rests upon and reflects belonging needs (e.g., Gardner et al., 1999), simply being male should not allow one to escape the importance of regulating and maintaining an interdependent self-view.

In their analysis of belonging as a basic human need, Baumeister and Leary (1995) argued that although the motivation is universal, belonging needs may be satisfied in a number of interchangeable ways, ranging from marital satisfaction to church and community involvement. The "substitution postulate" allows for a reconciliation of a universal need to belong, with the empirical evidence that men appear to be significantly less focused on relationships than are women. In fact, Baumeister and Sommer (1997) persuasively argued that men may value interdependent characteristics that do not fundamentally depend on intimate dyadic relationships.

Given the necessity of social connection, then, men and women should not differ in the overall importance of social bonds to the self. To reconcile this notion with the overwhelming evidence that women are much more strongly attuned to relational information, we recently argued for an expanded model of gender and the interdependent self (Gabriel & Gardner, 1999). We theorized that, given childhood socialization patterns, women and men would be differentially encouraged to emphasize distinct aspects of interdependence as important. Specifically, we drew on the distinction between the relational and collective forms of interdependence (Brewer & Gardner, 1996). Relational interdependence reflects the aspect of the self that is defined in terms of roles in close rela-

tionships (e.g., sister, husband) and is analogous to the interdependence described by Cross and Madson (1997). In contrast, collective interdependence reflects the aspect of the self that is defined in terms of membership in important groups (e.g., sorority member, ethnic identity) and is most similar to the construct of social identity (Hogg & Abrams, 1988; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). We hypothesized that women would maintain a greater relational sense of self compared to men, but that men would maintain a greater collective sense of self compared to women; thus, no differences in overall interdependence would be expected. In other words, we proposed that gender differences in interdependent self-construal represent a distinction of "kinds" rather than of extent.

Extensive support exists for the notion that women maintain a greater relational self-construal than men (see Cross & Madson, 1997, for review); however, the collective aspect of interdependent self-construal has traditionally received far less attention in the gender literature. Even so, a number of sources, ranging from those emphasizing evolutionary selection to those demonstrating gender norms in childhood socialization, are all quite consistent with the notion that relational versus collective interdependence may develop distinct importance for girls versus boys.

Indeed, even the classic distinction between agency and communion may be interpreted as consistent with a more expanded model of interdependence. For example, communal traits, such as "affectionate, supportive, and sympathetic," appear strongly relationally interdependent, without implying increased collective interdependence. Moreover, agentic traits, such as "competitive, aggressive and dominant," are not constrained to an individualist and, therefore, independent interpretation. In fact, Baumeister and Sommer (1997) argued that many agentic characteristics are useful in navigating larger social hierarchies, gaining leadership in groups, and other collectively interdependent rather than independent tasks. Thus, the traditional distinction between masculine and feminine stereotypes may be at least as consistent with an expanded view of gender differences in aspects of interdependence as with Cross and Madson's (1997) interpretation of men as independent and women as interdependent.

THE ORIGINS OF GENDERED FORMS OF INTERDEPENDENCE

As with any observable sex difference, the proposed distinction between relational and collective interdependence may potentially be viewed

through multiple perspectives, from the biological to the societal (e.g., Wood & Eagly, 2002). We briefly speculate on the potential origins of these differences by reviewing a number of relevant research areas consistent with the notion of an expanded model of interdependence. Representing multiple perspectives on sex differences, all can be seen as potentially supportive of the notion of gendered forms of interdependence, but, of course, none can be considered definitive.

Viewed through the lens of evolutionary psychology, it is possible that distinct forms of interdependence may at least in part reflect biologically prepared characteristics. Several researchers have speculated on the evolutionary advantages afforded by collective competence in men or relational competence in women (e.g., Baumeister & Sommer, 1997; Taylor et al., 2000; Tiger, 1969). For example, Tiger (1969) argued that survival in early societies might have necessitated men bonding in task-oriented groups to coordinate the complex task of hunting for large prey. That type of large-group bonding may have made it more likely that men would retain genetic tendencies toward group loyalty and collective skills. Additionally, as Baumeister and Sommer (1997) pointed out, skills that increased a male's value to the group would also have increased his attractiveness as a mate.

Taking a similar evolutionary perspective, Taylor et al. (2000) have proposed that women may in part be biologically prepared for relational attachment as a protective mechanism for buffering stress. In a review of the stress and coping literature, they highlight the fact that females respond differently to stress than do males, and that female responses to stress appear to follow a "tend and befriend" pattern, in which nurturant activities reduce psychological and physiological distress. Intriguingly, they link this relational pattern of stress reduction to the release of oxytocin, believed to underlie attachment processes between mothers and offspring, as well as other intimate social bonds. Moreover, "tend and befriend" coping responses put a woman and her offspring at a lower risk than the "fight-or-flight" pattern more typical for males. Finally, because male androgens partially block the soothing effects of oxytocin, these researchers believe that at least some of the benefits of relational support seeking may be specific to women.

Regardless of whether relational and collective interdependence were differentially advantaged in our evolutionary history, gender asymmetries in relational versus collective construals are encouraged by the gender norms of current society. The roles traditionally inhabited by women and men may differ in their emphasis on dyadic relational bonding (e.g., child rearing and other caregiving) versus the emphasis on acceptance and success within larger collectives (e.g., a sports team or corporation). These differing social roles convey gender-linked norms for

behavior, and children are ultimately encouraged to internalize and behave in accordance with these norms (Berndt & Heller, 1986; Eagly, 1987; Lytton & Romney, 1991; Maccoby, 1990; Wood et al., 1997).

One robust area of differential treatment is parental encouragement of gender-typed toys, play, and interests (Eaugh & Liss, 1992; Lytton & Romney, 1991). Gender-typed play, in turn, appears to differentially emphasize relational activities for girls, such as playing at mothering dolls, and collective activities for boys, such as team sports (Bradbard, 1985; Miller, 1987). In one particularly compelling demonstration of the power of gender norms in play, gender socialization was communicated through toys at an astonishingly early age (Sidorowicz & Lunney, 1980). In this study, participants were surreptitiously observed while interacting with a 10-month-old baby, who they were told was either a boy or a girl. The baby's crib held a small football, a doll, and a teething ring. Although one might guess a priori that the teething ring was probably the most appropriate toy for a 10-month-old baby, when participants thought the baby was a boy, 65% chose to play with "him," using the football; conversely, when participants thought the baby was a girl, 80% chose to play with "her," using the doll.

Of course, gender socialization is not limited to parents or caregivers; a good deal of research has documented the powerful role of peers as arbiters of gender-typed behavior (Berndt & Heller, 1986; Carter & McClosky, 1984). Starting at the age of 3, children's play becomes sex-segregated (e.g., Lewis & Phillipsen, 1998; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1987; Martin, Fabes, Evans, & Wyman, 1999) and as children age, there is mounting peer pressure to adhere to gender norms (Berndt & Heller, 1986). Moreover, these sex-segregated play groups themselves often differ in both size and purpose; girls are much more likely to interact with peers in close, same-sex dyads (Broderick & Belz, 1996; Clark & Birtle, 1992; Jones, Bloys, & Wood, 1990), whereas boys spend more time with peers in team and group activities (Belle, 1989; Berndt & Hoyle, 1985; Maccoby, 1989, 1990).

Thus, whether examined from an evolutionary or socialization perspective, gender differences in relational and collective construals are expected to emerge relatively early in childhood and be encouraged and maintained through adulthood. Self-construals are thought to create a powerful interpretive lens through which the social world is viewed (e.g., Gardner et al., 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Thus, we would expect these accessible constructs to shape both cognition and behavior in ways that may be gender-equivalent in their overall focus on social connection, but relatively distinct in the emphasis placed on close relationships versus social groups. Although the expanded model of gender and interdependence is comparatively new, a growing body of research is be-

ginning to reveal the consequences of these distinctions for self-descriptions, social information processing, and the nature of social motives held by men and women.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN SELF-CONSTRUAL

The most obvious prediction of the expanded model of gender and interdependence is specific asymmetries in self-descriptions. Importantly, the model predicts that no gender differences will be found in the overall level of interdependent self-descriptors, but significant gender differences in the aspect of interdependence that is central to the self will be obvious. Specifically, women should employ a greater number of relational roles in self-descriptions compared to men, and men should employ a greater number of group memberships compared to women.

In fact, gender differences in the social aspects of self-construals are easily noticeable when people are asked simply to describe themselves to others. For example, in an analysis of children's self-descriptions, the McGures observed that both boys and girls used social constructs in self-definition, but that the forms expressed were distinct. Consistent with the predictions of the expanded model, girls exceeded boys in self-descriptions centered within close relationships, whereas boys exceeded girls in self-descriptions relying on group memberships (McGuire & McGuire, 1982). In a recent study with young adults, we found parallel gender differences in the spontaneous self-descriptions of college students (Gabriel & Gardner, 1999, Study 1). When we asked men and women to write 20 self-descriptive sentences (Kuhn & McPartland, 1954), we found that whereas women expressed nearly twice as many relational self-descriptors as men (e.g., "I am Pam's sister"; "I am Amanda's best friend"), men expressed approximately twice as many collective self-descriptors as women (e.g., "I am a member of Pi Kappa Alpha"; "I am a Northwestern student"). Importantly, men and women were *not* found to differ significantly in the overall proportion of independent self-descriptors they spontaneously supplied (e.g., "I am ambitious"; "I am good at golf"), providing support for the notion that social self-views are as important to men as to women.

In addition to spontaneous self-descriptions, this same asymmetric pattern has been observed with use of direct measures of relational and collective self-focus (Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000; Gabriel & Gardner, 1999). Susan Cross and her colleagues developed and validated a measure of relational construal (Cross, Morris, & Gore, 2002; Cross et al., 2000) that comprises of endorsements of items such as "When I feel close to someone, it often feels to me like that person is an important

part of who I am." We examined gender differences in scores on the RISC, as well as on a scale created to parallel the RISC but measure level of collective construal, with items such as "When I join a group, I usually develop a strong sense of identification with that group." Across several samples of college-age men and women, we found that women consistently endorsed the relational items to a greater degree, whereas men more often endorsed the collective items (Gabriel & Gardner, 1999, Study 2; Gardner, Gabriel, & Hochschild, 2002). Importantly, these studies failed to find gender differences in a measure of general interdependence (Singelis, 1994), demonstrating once again that the notion that women show greater overall interdependence may be mistaken.

A further examination of gendered patterns in the measures of relational and collective interdependence established that these are functionally distinct constructs, linked to masculine and feminine ways of expressing interdependence. Scores on the relational self-construal scale were significantly correlated with levels of psychological femininity (as measured by the Personal Attributes Questionnaire; Spence & Helmreich, 1978) but not with measures of masculinity. Scores on the collective self-construal scale, in contrast, were correlated with measures of psychological masculinity, but not with measures of femininity (Gabriel & Gardner, 1999, Study 2). Given that the measurement of masculinity and femininity relies heavily on participants' endorsements of agentic and communal traits, these findings also lend credence to the view that agentic traits may be associated with activities and motives within a collective (e.g., Baumeister & Sommer, 1997).

Thus, direct measures of the importance of relational and collective connections to identity appear to reliably support the expanded model of interdependence. The self-descriptions of men were found to be as socially centered as those expressed by women. Gender differences were found, however, in aspects of interdependence: men emphasized the collective aspects and women, the relational aspects. This gender-specific pattern held for both the spontaneous self-descriptions of children and young adults, and endorsements on identity scales. Finally, collective interdependence was specifically related to levels of psychological masculinity, and relational interdependence was related to femininity.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL COGNITION

The expanded model of interdependence is proposed to encompass a broad range of gender differences, in addition to those revealed in self-description. The self has been posited to be the most powerful and elaborated knowledge structure possessed by individuals (Bower & Gilligan,

1979; Linville & Carlston, 1994). As a result, self-schemas and beliefs serve as frequent filters for information; accessible self-constructs shape perceptions of the social world. Indeed, the ability of the self to implicitly guide information processing in the service of chronic concerns and motives is a central tenet in social psychology, backed by decades of empirical evidence (e.g., Markus, 1977; see Baumeister, 1998, for review). To the extent that relational and collective interdependence reflect the differential importance of relationships and groups in satiation of belonging needs, biases in information processing in the service of these needs should be apparent.

Biases in encoding and memory have long been used as indicators of construct accessibility and importance (e.g., Bargh & Tota, 1985; see Higgins, 1996, for review). One paradigm used to assess important concerns capitalizes on biases in the spontaneous recall of information. In one instantiation of this paradigm, individuals are given a diary containing behaviors that differ along dimensions of interest (e.g., gain- vs. loss-focused behaviors; social vs. nonsocial behaviors) and are told to form an impression of the individual described by the diary. After several subsequent filler tasks, a surprise recall task is then used to examine the types of information that individuals remember; biases in recall reflect differential encoding and/or retrieval processes, and have been established as markers of situational motives or chronic concerns (Gardner et al., 2000; Higgins & Tykocinski, 1992).

To investigate whether gender-consistent aspects of self-construal would bias spontaneous cognitive processing, we adapted the diary paradigm to present behaviors that were independent, relational, or collective in nature (Gabriel & Gardner, 1999, Study 4). As expected, results of this study were supportive of the expanded model of interdependence; whereas women to a greater extent than men remembered a greater number of relational behaviors (e.g., a night out with a roommate), men remembered collective behaviors (e.g., a meeting of the church choir) to a greater extent than did women. Gender differences did not emerge for recall of the independent events (e.g., receiving an A on an exam), or for independent versus interdependent events more generally, implying once again that men and women do not appear to differ in the overall accessibility or importance of interdependence per se.

In a recent demonstration of gender differences in accessible interdependence-related constructs, Arndt et al. (2002) have reported gender differences consistent with relational and collective interdependence in studies of terror management theory (Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 1991), which proposes that when death becomes salient, important cultural values become activated and protect the self from fear by reinforcing the notion that the individual is tied to a broader sys-

tem that is both meaningful and enduring. Research in the domain of terror management theory has found consistent and robust evidence that mortality salience (e.g., becoming aware of one's own mortality by either engaging in thoughts of one's own death or being exposed to situations related to mortality, such as walking past a cemetery) motivates defense of one's values and cultural worldview. These defenses may take varied forms, such as negative judgments of those who do not share one's values, false consensus concerning the number of people who share one's own worldviews, or a general reluctance to violate cultural norms oneself (see Greenberg et al., 1997, for review). Importantly, the activation of central values is thought to provide a self-protective function in the face of recognizing one's own mortality.

In a creative series of studies, Arndt and colleagues (2002) investigated potential gender differences in the types of values that became activated by men and women in response to mortality salience. To the extent that the gender differences in relational and collective aspects of interdependence are internalized, the content activated after a mortality prime would be expected to differ in a manner consistent with the expanded model of interdependence.

In fact, across multiple studies, these researchers found reliable evidence that mortality salience activated more relational constructs for women (e.g., marriage) and more collective constructs in men (e.g., nationalism). What is particularly striking about these findings is the nonconscious nature of the relational or collective responses, indexed, for example, by facilitated recognition of the relational word *romance* in women, or the completion of a word fragment such as f _ _ g with the collective word *flag* rather than *frog* in men. Thus, this research implies that the gender-linked distinction between relational and collective interdependence may lead to similar distinctions in the values and social institutions that, when activated, serve ego-protective functions.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN SELF-EVALUATION AND REGULATION

Acknowledging the centrality of relational and collective interdependence to the psyche of women and men suggests a powerful role for these constructs in self-evaluations and regulation. Gender norms themselves often serve as internalized standards for behavior (e.g., Wood et al., 1997). Thus, to the extent that gendered aspects of interdependence are internalized as a part of these standards, adherence to relational or collective behavior would clearly be predicted to influence men and women differently.

In one study examining the potential impact of gender differences in interdependence on behavioral regulation, we asked men and women to imagine themselves in various scenarios in which the welfare and interests of others (either a close friend or an important group) were in conflict with their own personal interests (Gabriel & Gardner, 1999; Study 5). For example, one scenario asked participants to imagine themselves in a situation in which they wished to attend a review session for an upcoming exam (personal interest) at the same time that their student organization needed help with an important project (collective interest). In another scenario, participants imagined a situation in which they were on the way to a highly anticipated concert (personal interest) when they spotted a close friend standing on the side of the road next to a car with its hood up (relational interest). Multiple relational and collective scenarios were presented, and after each scenario, participants indicated how they would respond in the situation (e.g., go to the review session vs. helping their organization, or go to the concert vs. helping their friend). We hypothesized, and found, that women were more likely than men to put their own personal desires aside to assist a friend, whereas men were more likely than women to put their personal desires aside to help their groups. In other words, it appeared that gender differences in relational and collective interdependence also influenced standards for appropriate behavior.

Gender differences in aspects of interdependence may also affect the impact of different forms of social comparisons on self-evaluations. The positive performance of relevant others can affect the self-concept in two very different ways. First, one can "bask in the reflected glory" of a relevant other and feel pride in his or her accomplishments (Cialdini et al., 1976). Conversely, one can compare the self to the other(s) and, thus, feel worse about the self (Festinger, 1954). One factor that can affect which reaction occurs is linking of the other to the self. Specifically, assimilating the target to the self makes "basking in reflected glory" more likely and comparison less likely (e.g., Gardner, Gabriel, & Hochschild, 2002; Stapel & Koomen, 2001). Thus, the impact of the performance of a close relation or group on the self should be moderated by whether the comparison target may be assimilated to the self through a relational or collective view of interdependence.

The impact of self-enhancement motives on the process and outcomes of social comparison has been robustly demonstrated in both dyadic and group settings. For example, self-evaluation maintenance theory (SEM) emphasizes these effects at the dyadic level and proposes that whenever a close other (e.g., sibling) performs well in a self-relevant domain, self-esteem suffers (Tesser, 1980; 1988). To avoid these painful consequences, individuals have been shown to willfully bias the process

of social comparison by both preferring and predicting poorer performance for close others (Tesser & Campbell, 1982) to protect the self. Similarly, the frog pond effect (FPE) emphasizes the interplay of self-enhancement and social comparison at a group level (Davis, 1966). The FPE proposes that being a "big frog in a small pond," or a success in a relatively unsuccessful group, is preferred over situations in which the performance of an individual's group may outshine the individual's own successes. This, too, can lead to esteem-protecting biases and actions that affect both the individual and the group (Chen, Brockner, & Katz, 1998; Marsh, 1987; McFarland & Beuhler, 1995).

The expanded model of gender and interdependence would predict reliable differences in the impact of various targets for the self-evaluations of men versus women. Specifically, given women's levels of relational interdependence, comparisons with close others should be less threatening (because of the assimilation of the close other to the self) than comparisons with a group. In fact, in an examination of social comparison processes in marriages, Beach et al. (1998) reported that wives exhibited a consistently lower tendency to engage in self-evaluation maintenance behaviors with their spouses than did husbands. This difference between husbands and wives had been interpreted as evidence of a higher general level of interdependence in women; this high general level of interdependence was hypothesized to prevent comparisons with others from being as threatening to women as they are to men (Cross & Madson, 1997; see also Kennelmeier & Oyserman, 2001). Conversely, the expanded model would predict that although men's focus on collective interdependence may leave them open to the threatening effects of comparisons with relationship partners, the assimilation of the group to the self should buffer the impact of group comparisons.

We recently examined the moderating role of relational and collective interdependence on the impact of social comparisons with friends or ingroups (Gardner, Gabriel, & Hochschild, 2002). We used a self-evaluation maintenance paradigm in which participants brought close friends into the laboratory with them and were then given the opportunity to predict the performance of their friend and a stranger on an important task (analytic problem solving). Results were as hypothesized: Men showed the classic self-evaluation maintenance effect of predicting better performance for the stranger than the friend, whereas women showed the opposite effect, predicting better performance for the friend than for the stranger. Because the SEM refers specifically to close relationships, we hypothesized that gender patterns of social comparison would be reversed within a more group-oriented context. In fact, when we used an FPE paradigm in which participants could compare their performance to

an ingroup, we found women engaging in greater comparison. When told that they personally had performed badly, but that their group was performing well, men reported more positive moods than women. Similarly, when told that they personally had performed well but that their group had performed poorly, women reported more positive moods than men.

Perhaps most compelling, the proposed causal role of differential relational and collective self-construals in producing the gender differences received support when we activated relational and collective interdependent self-construal using a priming task. Men primed with relational interdependence in a self-evaluation maintenance paradigm lowered their level of social comparison with a friend to the level of women, and women primed with collective interdependence in an FPE paradigm lowered their levels of social comparison with an ingroup to the level of men. The disappearance of gender differences as a result of activating relational or collective interdependence provides still further evidence that it is the differences in aspects of interdependence, rather than alternative gender-linked constructs, that appear to be responsible for the observed differences in social cognition and behavior.

Taken in combination, results of these reviewed research programs converge on the conclusion that although women and men fail to differ in the general importance of social bonds in self-construal, they appear to differ in the aspects of interdependence emphasized in the social self. Spontaneous self-descriptions, direct measures of relational and collective centrality to the self, biases in memory, indirect measures of relational versus collective construct accessibility, and responses to different types of social comparisons all appeared consistent with the theory that women and men place significantly differential weighting on relationships and groups as a basis for identity, and that these distinctions are internalized as distinct gendered values and standards.

Equally important, the stereotype of women placing greater emphasis on the social sphere in contrast to men's emphasis on individualism was refuted. In every study that provided a measure of general independence and interdependence, gender differences failed to emerge on overall levels of interdependence; men and women displayed equivalent levels of social self-descriptions, socially biased encoding and retrieval, and fundamentally social worldviews.

In the final section of this review, we discuss the implications for daily social life that these gender differences might imply. We investigate the extent to which relational and collective interdependence may reflect different strategies for fulfilling belonging needs. In doing so, we briefly review recent evidence suggesting that men and women differ in the patterns of relational and collective social contact they regularly enjoy, in

the factors that lead to loneliness, and in the types of social comfort they seek in times of stress.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE RANGE OF SOCIAL NEEDS

In our initial presentation of the expanded model of interdependence, we focused on evidence that women and men differ in the aspect of the interdependent self that is emphasized, and that, furthermore, these differences result in corresponding cognitive differences in the tendency to focus relatively more on relationships or groups in social information processing (Gabriel & Gardner, 1999). In a recent series of studies, we have begun to explore the consequences of gender differences in interdependence for social attachments and emotional well-being (e.g., Gardner, Seeley, et al., 2002; Seeley et al., 2003). The expanded model of gender and interdependence assumes that gender-linked differences in relational and collective interdependence both result from and reinforce differences in relational versus collective belonging needs. Our more recent research thus examined the hypothesis that gender shapes the way in which belonging needs are both experienced and satisfied.

Obviously, connections with others and an adequate number of positive social relationships are crucial for the well-being of both men and women (e.g., Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The expanded model of interdependence additionally suggests that there may be important differences in the expression and fulfillment of men's and women's social desires. Indeed, the model predicts that women would focus on the relational or dyadic forms of belonging more than men, but that men would focus on the collective or group forms of belonging more than women.

A recent series of studies exploring this possibility have provided persuasive evidence of gender differences in social foci (Gardner, Seeley, et al., 2002). Across four studies of everyday social behavior, coping strategies, precursors of loneliness, and predictors of subjective well-being, we found that men and women differed in their everyday experiences with relationships and groups, as well as in the power that these specific forms of experiences wielded over satisfaction with their social world. For example, in a diary study tracking men's and women's daily events across 2 months, we found the predicted interaction, with women reporting greater relational events than men, and men reporting greater collective events than women. Moreover, women reported experiencing

more pleasure in their relational events compared to men, and men enjoyed their collective events more than did women.

Recall that one gender difference in the literature that clearly pointed to the importance of close relationships to women was the finding of Taylor et al. (2000) that women, when faced with stress, exhibit "tend and befriend" coping responses. In other words, they nurture those close to them, and seek comfort and solace in intimate relationships to a greater degree than do men. This "tend and befriend" response emphasizes relational bonds. In a recent study of coping behavior (Gardner, Seeley, et al., 2002), we both replicated Taylor's findings with women (they turned more to close others in times of stress) and found evidence for a collective social solace strategy in men (they turned to spending time in their social groups in times of stress). Furthermore, the extent to which women reported using relational strategies was a predictor of more successful coping. Women who reported turning to friends suffered less depression and anxiety than those who did not. Similarly, collective coping strategies served to buffer men. Men who reported spending more time in groups, while undergoing stress, suffered less depression and anxiety than those who reported spending less time in groups.

Given the differential social comfort found in relational or collective interactions, we thought it likely that when individuals are deprived of one or the other type of interaction, emotional suffering would also fit the expanded model of gender and interdependence. Thus, we examined reports of loneliness in over 1,000 college freshmen to examine whether men and women require different forms of social interaction to ward off loneliness. Results revealed that endorsement of the relational "connectedness" subscale of the UCLA Loneliness Scale (e.g., "There are people who really understand me"; see Russell, Peplau, & Cutrona, 1980) predicted the frequency and intensity of loneliness for women more than for men. In contrast, the more collective "belonging" subscale (e.g., "I feel part of a group of friends") better predicted loneliness for men than for women. Additionally, we found that although women's scores on the connectedness scale were sufficient to predict loneliness (e.g., no additional significant variance was explained by adding the belonging scale), men's loneliness scores were influenced by both the connected and belonging subscales. Interestingly, these findings imply that men may require both a feeling of intimacy with close others and a feeling of belonging to a group to avoid loneliness, which potentially explains the consistent finding in the literature that men experience more loneliness than women (e.g., Koenig, Isaacs, & Schwartz, 1994; Schultz & Moore, 1986; Wiseman, Guttentund, & Laurie, 1995).

CONCLUSIONS

The desire to be connected and intimate with others is considered primary and essential to the human experience (Baumeister & Leary, 1995). Our goal in this chapter has been to reconcile the universality of social needs with their potentially gendered expressions. The research reviewed in this chapter has established that this important component of existence, interdependence, is different for men and women, with women maintaining greater focus on the close relationships of which they are a part, and men, on the groups to which they belong. We argued that child socialization patterns may encourage the experience and the expression of interdependence to take these gendered forms.

We believe that an expanded view of gender and interdependence has the potential to illuminate mechanisms contributing to a wide array of gender differences in social behavior. Equally important, it refutes the stereotype that men and women differentially value social connection. Importantly, across a multitude of studies, no gender differences were observed in overall levels of independence and interdependence, or autonomy versus sociality. Both men and women defined the self in social ways, were biased toward social information processing, used social networks as part of their protective worldviews, and drew on social values to guide behavior. Both men and women sought social contact, became attached to organizations that fulfilled social needs, and suffered when those needs went unfulfilled. Throughout, gender differences emerged not in the extent of these social needs and processes, but in their expression.

Both men and women are motivated to seek and maintain connection with those around them. The fact that the experience of these connections may be subtly shaped by gender neither alters their shared importance nor limits either sex to a social or autonomous role. Indeed, in recognizing that belonging is an essential component of the human experience, the expanded model of interdependence allows an examination of the way gender differences may be evident on the surface of the social landscape, without losing sight of underlying similarities.

REFERENCES

- Andri, J., Greenberg, J., & Cook, A. (2002). Mortality salience and the spreading activation of worldview-relevant constructs: Exploring the cognitive architecture of terror management. *Journal of Experimental Psychology—General*, 131, 307–324.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Bargh, J., & Tota, M. E. (1985). Context-dependent automatic processing in depression: Accessibility of negative constructs with regard to self but not others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 925–939.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1998). The self. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp. 680–740). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497–529.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Sommer, K. L. (1997). What do men want?: Gender differences and two spheres of belongingness: Comment on Cross and Madson (1997). *Psychological Bulletin*, 122, 38–44.
- Beach, S. R. H., Tesser, A., Fincham, F. D., Jones, D. J., Johnson, D., & Whitaker, D. J. (1998). Pleasure and pain in doing well together: An investigation of performance-related affect in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 923–938.
- Belle, D. (1989). Gender differences in children's social networks and supports. In D. Belle (Ed.), *Children's social networks and social supports* [Wiley series on personality processes] (pp. 173–188). New York: Wiley.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155–162.
- Berndt, T. J., & Heller, K. A. (1986). Gender stereotypes and social influence: A developmental study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 889–898.
- Berndt, T. J., & Hoyle, S. G. (1985). Stability and change in childhood and adolescent friendships. *Developmental Psychology*, 21, 1007–1015.
- Bower, G. H., & Gilligan, S. G. (1979). Remembering information related to oneself. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 13, 404–419.
- Brabard, M. R. (1985). Sex differences in adults' gifts and childrens' toy requests at Christmas. *Psychological Reports*, 56, 969–970.
- Braun, M. (1997). *The teenager's guide to the real world*. Raleigh, NC: BYG.
- Brewer, M. B., & Gardner, W. (1996). Who is this "we"? Levels of collective identity and self-representations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 83–93.
- Broderick, P. C., & Belz, C. M. (1996). The contributions of self-monitoring and gender to preadolescents' friendship expectations. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 24, 35–45.
- Byron, G. G. (1988). "Don Juan." In T. G. Steffan, E. Steffan, & W. Pratt (Eds.), *Lord Byron: Don Juan*. New York: Penguin. (Original work published in 1824)
- Carter, D. B., & McClosky, L. A. (1984). Peers and the maintenance of sex-typed behavior: The development of children's conceptions of cross-gender behavior in their peers. *Social Cognition*, 2, 294–314.
- Chen, Y., Broekner, J., & Katz, T. (1998). Toward an explanation of cultural differences in in-group favoritism: The role of individual versus collective primacy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1490–1502.
- Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 366–375.
- Gender Differences in Relational and Collective Interdependence 187

- Clark, M. L., & Brittle, M. L. (1992). Friendship expectations and the evaluation of present friendships in middle childhood and early adolescence. *Child Study Journal*, 22, 115-135.
- Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 191-808.
- Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122, 5-37.
- Cross, S. E., Morris, M. L., & Gore, J. S. (2002). Thinking about oneself and others: The relational interdependent self-construal and social cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 399-418.
- Davis, J. A. (1966). The campus as a frog-pond: An application of the theory of relative deprivation to career decisions of college men. *American Journal of Sociology*, 72, 17-31.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eraugh, C., & Liss, M. B. (1992). Home, school, and playroom: Training grounds for adult gender roles. *Sex Roles*, 26, 129-147.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.
- Gabriel, S., & Gardner, W. L. (1999). Are there "his" and "hers" types of interdependence? The implications of gender differences in collective versus relational interdependence for affect, behavior, and cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 642-655.
- Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., & Hochschild, L. (2002). When you and I are we, you are not threatening: The role of self-expansion in social comparison. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 239-251.
- Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S., & Lee, A. (1999). "1" value freedom, but "we" value relationships: Self-construal priming mimics cultural differences in judgment. *Psychological Science*, 10, 321-326.
- Gardner, W. L., Pickett, C. L., & Brewer, M. B. (2000). Social exclusion and selective memory: How the need to belong influences memory for social events. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 26, 486-496.
- Gardner, W. L., Seeley, E. A., Pennington, G. L., Gabriel, S., Ernst, J., Skowronski, J., & Solomon, J. (2002). *The role of "his" and "her" forms of interdependence in everyday life: Gender, belonging, and social expertise*. Manuscript under review.
- Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Pyszczynski, T. (1997). Terror management theory of self-esteem and social behavior: Empirical assessments and conceptual refinements. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 61-139). New York: Academic Press.
- Heine, S. J., Lehman, D. R., Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1999). Is there a universal need for positive self-regard? *Psychological Review*, 4, 766-794.
- Higgins, E. T. (1996). Knowledge activation: Accessibility, applicability, and salience. In E. T. Higgins & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 133-168). New York: Guilford Press.
- Higgins, E. T., & Tykocinski, O. (1992). Self-discrepancies and biographical memory: Personality and cognition at the level of psychological situation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18, 527-535.
- Hoffman, L. W. (1972). Early childhood experiences and women's achievement motives. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28, 129-155.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London: Routledge.
- House, J. S., Landis, K. R., & Umberson, D. (1988). Social relationships and health. *Science*, 241, 540-545.
- Ickes, W., & Barnes, R. D. (1978). Boys and girls together—and alienated: On enacting stereotyped sex-roles in mixed sex dyads. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 669-683.
- Jones, D. C., Bloys, N., & Wood, M. (1990). Sex roles and friendship patterns. *Sex Roles*, 23, 133-145.
- Josephs, R. A., Markus, H. R., & Tatarodi, R. W. (1992). Gender and self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63, 391-402.
- Kennelmeier, M., & Oyserman, D. (2001). The ups and downs of thinking about a successful other: Self-construals and the consequences of social comparisons. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 311-320.
- Koenig, L. J., Isaacs, A. M., & Schwartz, J. A. J. (1994). Sex differences in adolescent depression and loneliness: Why are boys lonelier if girls are more depressed? *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28, 27-43.
- Kuhn, M. H., & McPartland, T. (1954). An empirical investigation of self-attitudes. *American Sociological Review*, 19, 58-76.
- Lee, A. Y., Aaker, J., & Gardner, W. L. (2000). The pleasures and pains of distinct self-construals: The role of interdependence in regulatory focus. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 78, 1122-1134.
- Lewis, T., & Phillipsen, L. (1998). Interactions on an elementary school playground: Variations by age, gender, race, group size, and playground area. *Child Study Journal*, 28, 309-320.
- Linville, P. W., & Carlston, D. E. (1994). Social cognition of the self. In P. G. Devine, D. L. Hamilton, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Social cognition: Impact on social psychology* (pp. 143-193). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 109, 267-296.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist*, 45, 513-520.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1989). Gender as a social category. In S. Chess & M. E. Hertzog (Eds.), *Annual progress in child psychiatry and child development* (pp. 127-150). New York: Brunner/Routledge.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1987). Gender segregation in childhood. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 20, 239-287.
- Maltz, D. N., & Borker, R. A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. J. Gunperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 195-216). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 63-78.

- Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224-253.
- Marsh, H. W. (1987). The big frog little pond effect on academic self-concept. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 280-295.
- Martin, C. L., Fabes, R. A., Evans, S. M., & Wyman, H. (1999). Social cognition on the playground: Children's beliefs about playing with girls versus boys and their relations to sex segregated play. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 16, 751-771.
- McFarland, C., & Beutler, R. (1995). Collective self-esteem as a moderator of the frog-pond effect in relation to performance feedback. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 1055-1070.
- McGuire, W. J., & McGuire, C. V. (1982). Significant others in self space: Sex differences and developmental trends in social self. In J. Suls (Ed.), *Psychological perspectives on the self* (Vol. 1, pp. 71-96). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Menon, T., Morris, M., Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (1999). Culture and the construal of agency: Attribution to individual versus group dispositions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76, 701-717.
- Miller, C. L. (1987). Qualitative differences among gender-stereotyped toys: Implications for cognitive and social development in girls and boys. *Sex Roles*, 16, 473-487.
- Mistry, R., Rosansky, J., McGuire, J., McDermott, C., & Jarvik, L. (2001). Social isolation predicts re-hospitalization in a group of older American veterans enrolled in the UPBEAT Program. *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry*, 16, 950-959.
- Pratt, M. W., Golding, G., Hunter, W., & Sampson, R. (1988). Sex differences in adult moral orientations. *Journal of Personality*, 56, 373-391.
- Rosenberg, M. (1989). The self-concept: Social product and social force. In M. Rosenberg & R. H. Turner (Eds.), *Social psychology: Sociological perspectives* (pp. 593-624). New York: Basic Books.
- Ross, M., & Holmberg, D. (1992). Are wives' memories for events in relationships more vivid than their husbands' memories? *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 9, 585-604.
- Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Cutrona, C. E. (1980). The revised UCLA Loneliness Scale: Concurrent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 472-480.
- Schultz, N. R., & Moore, D. (1986). The loneliness experience of college students: Sex differences. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12, 111-119.
- Sealey, E. A., Gardner, W. L., Pennington, G., & Gabriel, S. (2003). Circle of friends or members of a group?: Sex-differences in relational and collective attachment to groups. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 251-264.
- Sidorowicz, L. S., & Lunney, G. S. (1980). Baby X revisited. *Sex Roles*, 6, 67-73.
- Singelis, T. M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 580-591.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (1991). A terror management theory of social behavior: The psychological functions of self-esteem and cultural worldviews. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 24, pp. 93-159). New York: Academic Press.
- Stapel, D. A., & Koomen, W. (2001). I, we, and the effects of others on me: How self-construal level moderates social comparison effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80, 766-781.
- Sub, E. M. (2000). Self, the hyphen between culture and subjective well-being. In E. Diener & E. M. Sub (Eds.), *Culture and subjective well-being* (pp. 63-86). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Morrow.
- Taylor, S. E., Klein, L. C., Lewis, B. P., Gruenewald, T. L., Gurung, R. A., & Updegraff, J. A. (2000). Biobehavioral responses to stress in females: Tend-and-befriend, not fight-or-flight. *Psychological Review*, 107, 411-429.
- Tesser, A. (1980). Self-esteem maintenance in family dynamics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 77-91.
- Tesser, A. (1988). Toward a self-evaluation maintenance model of social behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 21, 181-222.
- Tesser, A., & Campbell, J. (1982). Self-evaluation and the perception of friends and strangers. *Journal of Personality*, 59, 261-279.
- Tiger, L. (1969). *Men in groups*. London: Nelson.
- Turner, J. C., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Walker, L. J., de Vries, B., & Treweethan, S. D. (1987). Moral stages and moral orientations in real-life and hypothetical dilemmas. *Child Development*, 58, 842-858.
- Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring sex-stereotypes: A thirty nation study*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wiseman, H., Gutfreund, D. G., & Lurie, I. (1995). Gender differences in loneliness and depression of university students seeking counseling. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 23, 231-243.
- Wood, W., Christensen, P. N., Hebl, M., & Rothgerber, H. (1997). Conformity to sex-typed norms, affect, and the self-concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 523-536.
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2002). A cross-cultural analysis of the behavior of women and men: Implications for the origins of sex differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 699-727.
- Ybarra, O., & Trafimow, D. (1998). How priming the private self or collective self affects the relative weights of attitudes and subjective norms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 362-370.