We know that the situation can significantly effect how we react. Self knowledge is therefore organised in terms of self-aspects, different roles, activities and relationships.  Future Selves  Higgins (1987) differentiates between actual, ideal and ought self. Any goal is based on a discrepancy between a person's actual and desired self.  He argues that self knowledge is not based on the question "who am !?" but rather "what is my relation to the world", suggesting that self-knowledge is pursued for adaptive benefits.  Our understanding of our previous selves is bias. We regularly make downward comparisons of our self, for example Ross et al. (2001) with student ratings of how sociable they were.  Our perceptions are inaccurate. For example, remember Neisser's study on the challenger shuttle disaster.  Cognitive Dissonance we remember feeling differently to how we actually did.  Ross et al (1979) Joint Contributions are remembered better when outcome was positive, but people deflate their contributions when outcome was negative.			action conse challe
Higgins (1987) differentiates between actual, ideal and ought self. Any goal is based on a discrepancy between a person's actual and desired self.  He argues that self knowledge is not based on the question "who am !?" but rather "what is my relation to the world", suggesting that self-knowledge is pursued for adaptive benefits.  Our understanding of our previous selves is bias. We regularly make downward comparisons of our self, for example Ross et al. (2001) with student ratings of how sociable they were.  Our perceptions are inaccurate. For example, remember Neisser's study on the challenger shuttle disaster.  Cognitive Dissonance we remember feeling differently to how we actually did.  Ross et al (1979) Joint Contributions are remembered better when outcome was positive, but people deflate their contributions when	effect how we react organised in terms	. Self knowledge is therefore of self-aspects, different Multiple	Selves The (Relative) Self
ideal and ought self. Any goal is based on a discrepancy between a person's actual and desired self.  He argues that self knowledge is not based on the question "who am !?" but rather "what is my relation to the world", suggesting that self-knowledge is pursued for adaptive benefits.  Our understanding of our previous selves is bias. We regularly make downward comparisons of our self, for example Ross et al. (2001) with student ratings of how sociable they were.  Our perceptions are inaccurate. For example, remember Neisser's study on the challenger shuttle disaster.  Cognitive Dissonance we remember feeling differently to how we actually did.  Ross et al (1979) Joint Contributions are remembered better when outcome was positive, but people deflate their contributions when			uture Selves
the question "who am !?" but rather "what is my relation to the world", suggesting that self–knowledge is pursued for adaptive benefits.  Our understanding of our previous selves is bias. We regularly make downward comparisons of our self, for example Ross et al. (2001) with student ratings of how sociable they were.  Our perceptions are inaccurate. For example, remember Neisser's study on the challenger shuttle disaster.  Cognitive Dissonance we remember feeling differently to how we actually did.  Ross et al (1979) Joint Contributions are remembered better when outcome was positive, but people deflate their contributions when	<b>ideal and</b> discrepan	ought self. Any goal is based on a cy between a person's actual and	S <mark>ources of S</mark> o
We regularly make downward comparisons of our self, for example Ross et al. (2001) with student ratings of how sociable they were.  Our perceptions are inaccurate. For example, remember Neisser's study on the challenger shuttle disaster.  Cognitive Dissonance we remember feeling differently to how we actually did.  Ross et al (1979) Joint Contributions are remembered better when outcome was positive, but people deflate their contributions when	the question "who ar relation to the world	n I?" but rather "what is my ", suggesting that self-	Past Selves
remember Neisser's study on the challenger shuttle disaster.  Cognitive Dissonance we remember feeling differently to how we actually did.  Ross et al (1979) Joint Contributions are remembered better when outcome was positive, but people deflate their contributions when		We regularly make downward compariso our self, for example Ross et al. (2001)	ons of with
differently to how we actually did.  Ross et al (1979) Joint Contributions are remembered better when outcome was positive, but people deflate their contributions when		remember <b>Neisser's</b> study on the cha	The state of the s
remembered better when outcome was positive, but people deflate their contributions when			er feeling
		remembered better when outcome was but people deflate their contributions w	positive,

The self interprets and organises self-relevant actions and experiences; it has motivational consequences and adjusts in response to challenges from the social environment.

**Cultural Differences** 

Self-construal is relative. Though the basic ingredients are the same, the weighting and some of the content is different. Kanagawa et al (2001) found that when participants described their selves, they considered their connection to the group differently. I.e. people from collectivist cultures were more likely to mention group memberships etc.

Priming Mindsets (Gardner et al. 1999)
Participants were primed to collectivist values to reflect self-construals of collectivist individuals.

**Cohen et al.** have shown that "culture of honor" mediates people's responses to insult.

S<mark>o</mark>urces of Self-Concept

**Self-Perception Theory (Bem, 1972)** Our own behaviour acts as a basis for inference.

Social Comparison Theory (Festinger, 1954)
Comparisons with others are ubiquitous. People use others to evaluate their own traits, abilities and personal characteristics. We compare ourselves more if others are close and more if the domain is central or important to our selfconcept.

Mussweiler et al. (2004) Self Evaluation Primed participants with either athletic vs. non-athletic people (Clinton vs. Lauda) and super-athletic and super-nonathletic (Jordan vs. Pope) and then asked them to perform a self evaluation; how many push ups can you perform and can you run 100 meters? Moderate primes elicited congruent estimates of athletic ability (Clinton=Lower) whereas extreme primes elicited incongruent estimates (Jordan=Lower), suggesting that self-other evaluations are relative and context dependent.

Looking Glass Self Other people's reactions.

**Tice** asked participants to complete counter attitudinal essay in front of graduate student or not. Those in front of student were more likely to change their attitude, suggesting that our self-perceptions are affected by our situation.