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# Study 1

**Temporal and Personal Self-Continuity**

We averaged the four temporal self-continuity items to index temporal self-continuity (*M* = 4.42, *SD* = 1.29; α = .88) and the four personal self-continuity items to index personal self-continuity (*M* = 4.71, *SD* = 1.18; α = .85).

**Participant Age**

Age was correlated with self-concept clarity (*r*[212] = .30, *p* < .001), self-continuity (*r*[212] = .20, *p* = .004), temporal self-continuity (*r*[212] = .14, *p* = .045), and personal self-continuity (*r*[212] = .23, *p* = .001).

**Participant Sex**

Men and women differed in self-continuity (*F*[1, 210] = 4.05, *p* = .045, *ηp2*= .019, 90% CI [.0002, .0595]) and temporal self-continuity (*F*[1, 210] = 5.41, *p* = .021, *ηp2*= .025, 90% CI [.0020, .0695]), but not in personal self-continuity (*F*[1, 210] = 1.68, *p* = .196, *ηp2*= .008, 90% CI [.0000, .0392]) and self-concept clarity (*F*[1, 210] = 2.16, *p* = .143, *ηp2*= .010, 90% CI [.0000, .0438]). We present Means and SDs in Table 1. (We explicate the Revised SCC, or SCC-R, below.)

Table 1. Sex Differences (Means and SDs) in Study 1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SCC | SCC-R | SC | TSC | PSC |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Men | 4.78 | 1.37 | 4.81 | 1.29 | 4.72 | 1.08 | 4.62 | 1.29 | 4.81 | 1.11 |
| Women | 4.51 | 1.31 | 4.57 | 1.30 | 4.41 | 1.16 | 4.21 | 1.26 | 4.60 | 1.25 |

SCC: self-concept clarity; SCC-R: revised self-concept clarity index; SC: self-continuity; TSC: temporal self-continuity; PSC: personal self-continuity.

**Controlling for Participant Age and Sex**

Controlling for age and sex, self-concept clarity was correlated with self-continuity (*r*[208] = .26, *p* < .001): Participants lower on self-concept clarity reported decreased self-continuity.

With no covariates, self-concept clarity was also correlated with temporal self-continuity (*r*[212] = .22, *p* = .001) and personal self-continuity (*r*[212] = .37, *p* < .001). Controlling for age, self-concept clarity was correlated with personal self-continuity (*r*[209] = .32, *p* < .001). Controlling for age and sex, self-concept clarity was correlated with temporal self-continuity (*r*[208] = .17, *p* = .012).

**Revised Self-Concept Clarity Scale Index (SCC-R)**

We excluded from the 12-item Self-Concept Clarity Scale (Campbell et al., 1996) four items that seem to assess temporal stability. These items were: “On one day I might have one opinion of myself and on another day I might have a different opinion,” “When I think about the kind of person I have been in the past, I'm not sure what I was really like,” “My beliefs about myself seem to change very frequently,” and “If I were asked to describe my personality, my description might end up being different from one day to another day.” We averaged the remaining eight items to index self-concept clarity (*M* = 4.69, *SD* = 1.30; α = .88). Men and women did not differ on the SCC-R (*F*[1, 210] = 1.85 *p* = .175, *ηp2*= .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0409]). We present Means and SDs in Table 1.

**SCC-R, The Overall Index of Self-Continuity, Temporal Self-Continuity, and Personal Self-Continuity**

Age was correlated with the SCC-R index (*r*[212] = .28, *p* < .001). Also, this index was correlated with self-continuity (*r*[212] = .33, *p* < .001), temporal self-continuity (*r*[212] = .23, *p* < .001), and personal self-continuity (*r*[212] = .37, *p* < .001).

Finally, controlling for age and sex, the SCC-R was correlated with self-continuity (*r*[208] = .28, *p* < .001), and temporal self-continuity (*r*[208] = .19, *p* = .006). Controlling for age, SCC-R was correlated with personal self-continuity (*r*[209] = .33, *p* < .001).

# Study 2

**Temporal and Personal Self-Continuity**

We averaged the four temporal self-continuity items and the four personal self-continuity items to index temporal self-continuity (*M* = 5.48, *SD* = 1.75; α = .88) and personal self-continuity (*M* = 6.10, *SD* = 1.68; α = .85), respectively. The self-concept clarity manipulation check index was positively associated with both temporal self-continuity (*r*[108]= .37, *p* < .001) and personal self-continuity (*r*[108]= .39, *p* < .001).

**Participant Age**

Age was uncorrelated with the self-concept clarity manipulation check index (*r*[108] = -.02, *p* = .87), self-continuity (*r*[108] = .04, *p* =.72), temporal self-continuity (*r*[108] = .01, *p* = .92), and personal self-continuity (*r*[108] = .06, *p* = .57).

**Participant Sex**

We found no sex differences in self-continuity (*F*[1, 106] = .10, *p* = .76, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0297]), temporal self-continuity (*F*[1, 106] = .44, *p* = .51, *ηp2*= .004, 90% CI [.0000, .0464]), personal self-continuity (*F*[1, 106] = .01, *p* = .92, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0085]), and the self-concept clarity manipulation check index (*F*[1, 106] = .09, *p* = .77, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0287]). We present Means and SDs in Table 2.

Table 2. Sex Differences (Means and SDs) in Study 2

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SCC Manipulation Check Index | SC | TSC | PSC |
|  | *M*4.394.29 | *SD*1.611.63 | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Men | 5.73 | 1.41 | 5.33 | 1.65 | 6.13 | 1.56 |
| Women | 5.83 | 1.65 | 5.56 | 1.80 | 6.09 | 1.75 |

SC: self-continuity; TSC: temporal self-continuity; PSC: personal self-continuity.

**Controlling for Word Count and Participant Age**

**Self-Concept Clarity and Self-Continuity.** Controlling for word count and age, participants in the low self-concept clarity condition (*M* = 5.50, *SD* = 1.59) reported decreased self-continuity relative to those in the high self-concept clarity condition (*M* = 6.22, *SD* = 1.46), *F*(1, 104) = 6.45, *p* = .013, *ηp*2 = .058, 90% CI [.0069, .1429]. Low self-concept clarity undermined self-continuity.

**Self-Concept Clarity and Temporal Self-Continuity.** Controlling for word count, participants in the low self-concept clarity condition (*M* = 5.20, *SD* = 1.74) reported decreased temporal self-continuity relative to their high self-concept clarity counterparts (*M* = 5.90, *SD* = 1.69), *F*(1, 105) = 4.17, *p* = .044, *ηp*2 = .038, 90% CI [.0006, .1133]. Also, controlling for word count and age, participants in the low self-concept clarity condition (*M* = 5.20, *SD* = 1.74) reported decreased temporal self-continuity relative to their high self-concept clarity counterparts (*M* = 5.90, *SD* = 1.69), *F*(1, 104) = 4.52, *p* = .036, *ηp*2 = .042, 90% CI [.0014, .1180]. Low self-concept clarity undermined temporal self-continuity.

**Self-Concept Clarity and Personal Self-Continuity.** Finally, controlling for word count, participants in the low self-concept clarity condition (*M* = 5.80, *SD* = 1.68) reported decreased personal self-continuity compared to their high self-concept clarity counterparts (*M* = 6.53, *SD* = 1.60), *F*[1, 105] = 5.29, *p* = .023, *ηp*2 = .048, 90% CI [.0034, .1278]. Low self-concept clarity undermined personal self-continuity. Controlling for word count and age, participants in the low self-concept clarity condition (*M* = 5.80, *SD* = 1.68) reported decreased personal self-continuity compared to their high self-concept clarity counterparts (*M* = 6.53, *SD* = 1.60), *F*[1, 104] = 6.42, *p* = .013, *ηp*2 = .058, 90% CI [.0068, .1425]. Low self-concept clarity undermined personal self-continuity.

# Study 3

**Participant Age**

Age was correlated with the self-concept clarity manipulation check index (*r*[185) = .26, *p* < .001), but not with autobiographical memory task preference (*r*[185] = .12, *p* = .11), control task preference (*r*[185] = .06, *p* = .39), perceived difficulty of autobiographical memory task (*r*[185] = -.02, *p* = .79), and perceived difficulty of control task (*r*[185] = .05, *p* = .53).

**Participant Sex**

Women and men did not differ in control task preference (*F*[1, 183] = .14, *p* = .71, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0196]), control task difficulty (*F*[1, 183] = .03, *p* = .85, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0109]), and the self-concept clarity manipulation check index (*F*[1, 183] = 1.33, *p* = .25, *ηp2*= .007, 90% CI [.0000, .0406]). However, women preferred the autobiographical memory task more so than men (*F*[1, 183] = 10.41, *p* = .001, *ηp2*= .054, 90% CI [.0129, .1145]). Also, women perceived the autobiographical memory task as easier than men did (*F*[1, 183] = 4.25, *p* = .041, *ηp2*= .023, 90% CI [.0005, .0694]). We present the relevant Means and SDs Table 3.

Table 3. Sex Differences (Means and SDs) in Study 3

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SCC Manipulation Check Index | AM Task Preference | Control TaskPreference | AM difficulty | Controldifficulty |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |  *M* |  *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Men | 4.47 | 1.59 | 5.46 | 2.73 | 5.89 | 2.44 | 3.69 | 1.89 | 3.92 | 1.63 |
| Women | 4.74 | 1.51 | 6.69 | 2.33 | 6.04 | 2.63 | 3.12 | 1.77 | 3.88 | 1.72  |

AM: autobiographical memory; AM difficulty: perceived difficulty of the autobiographical memory task; control difficulty: perceived difficulty of the control task.

**Controlling for Word Count, Participant Age, and Participant Sex**

**Task difficulty.** Controlling for word count, age, and sex, a 2 (self-concept clarity: low, high) x 2 (task: autobiographical, control) Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) on task difficulty produced a non-significant interaction (*F*[1, 180] = 1.99, *p* = .16, *ηp2* = .011, 90% CI [.0000, .0489]). Neither the main effect of self-concept clarity (*F*[1, 180] = 1.45, *p* = .23, *ηp2* = .008, 90% CI [.0000, .0427]) nor the main effect of task (*F*[1, 180] = .21, *p* = .64, *ηp2* = .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0225]) was significant.

**Task preferences.** Controlling for word count, participant age, participant sex, and task difficulty, a 2 (self-concept clarity: low, high) x 2 (task: autobiographical, control) ANCOVA on task preferences yielded a marginally significant interaction (F[1, 178] = 3.55, *p* = .061, *ηp2* = .020, 90% CI [.0000, .0649]). Participants in the low self-concept clarity condition (*M* = 6.89, *SD* = 2.37) tended to express a stronger preference for the autobiographical memory task than those in the high self-concept clarity condition (*M* = 5.85, *SD* = 2.57), *F*(1, 179) = 6.08, *p* = .015, *ηp2* = .033, 90% CI [.0035, .0858]. However, participants in the low (*M* = 6.15, *SD* = 2.71) and high (*M* = 5.88, *SD* = 2.47) self-concept clarity conditions did not differ in their preferences for the general memory task, *F*(1, 179) = .61, *p* = .44 *ηp2* = .003, 90% CI [.0000, .0313]. The main effect of self-concept clarity was marginally significant (*F*[1, 178] = 3.13, *p* = .078, *ηp2* = .017, 90% CI [.0000, .0610]). The main effect of task was significant (*F*[1, 178] = 9.92, *p* = .002, *ηp2* = .053, 90% CI [.0120, .1140]).

# Study 4

**Temporal and Personal Self-Continuity**

As in Studies 1-2, we averaged the four temporal self-continuity items and the four personal self-continuity items to index temporal self-continuity (*M* = 5.64, *SD* = 1.90; α = .93) and personal self-continuity (*M* = 6.04, *SD* = 1.82; α = .91), respectively.

**Participant Age**

Age was correlated with self-concept clarity (*r*[173] = .28, *p* < .001), self-continuity (*r*[173] = .18, *p* = .020), temporal self-continuity (*r*[173] = .16, *p* = .033), and personal self-continuity (*r*[173] = .17, *p* = .027), but not with autobiographical memory (*r*[173] = -.06, *p* = .41).

**Participant Sex**

We obtained no sex difference in self-continuity (*F*[1, 171] = .56, *p* = .46, *ηp2*= .003, 90% CI [.0000, .0318]), temporal self-continuity (*F*[1, 171] = .10, *p* = .75, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0188]), personal self-continuity (*F*[1, 171] = 1.21, *p* = .27, *ηp2*= .007, 90% CI [.0000, .0418]), autobiographical memory (*F*[1, 171] = .07, *p* = .80, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0166]), and self-concept clarity (*F*[1, 171] = .58, *p* = .45, *ηp2*= .003, 90% CI [.0000, .0322]). We display Means and SDs in Table 4.

Table 4. Sex Differences (Means and SDs) in Study 4

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SCC | SCC-R | SC | TSC | PSC | AM |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Men | 4.97 | 1.33 | 4.95 | 1.33 | 5.94 | 1.69 | 5.69 | 1.85 | 6.19 | 1.79 | 4.21 | 1.18 |
| Women | 4.81 | 1.41 | 4.80 | 1.38 | 5.74 | 1.79 | 5.60 | 1.96 | 5.88 | 1.85 | 4.26 | 1.27 |

SCC: Self-concept clarity; SCC-R: revised self-concept clarity index; SC: self-continuity; TSC: temporal self-continuity; PSC: personal self-continuity; AM: autobiographical memory.

**Intercorrelations Among Key Variables**

Self-concept clarity was correlated with temporal self-continuity (*r*[173] = .27, *p* < .001) and personal self-continuity (*r*[173] = .35, *p* < .001). Autobiographical memory was not significantly correlated with temporal self-continuity (*r*[173] = .10, *p* = .20), but was significantly correlated with personal self-continuity (*r*[173] = .15, *p* = .045).

Controlling for age, self-concept clarity was correlated with self-continuity (*r*[170] = .30, *p* < .001), temporal self-continuity (*r*[170] = .23, *p* = .002), personal self-continuity (*r*[170] = .32, *p* < .001), and autobiographical memory (*r*[170] = -.29, *p* < .001). Also, autobiographical memory was not significantly correlated with temporal self-continuity (*r*[170] = .11, *p* = .15), but was significantly correlated with personal self-continuity (*r*[170] = .17, *p* = .029).

**Model Testing: Self-Continuity as Dependent Measure Controlling for Age**

We tested our proposed suppressed mediational model for self-continuity, controlling for age. In particular, we conducted a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations, using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered self-concept clarity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.09, SE = .04), given that the 95% confidence interval for this effect [-.2100, -.0291] did not include 0. We also tested an alternative plausible model, with self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and self-concept clarity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.04, *SE* = .03), given that the 95% confidence interval for this effect [-.0979, .0064] did include 0. Thus, this model was not supported.

**Self-Concept Clarity Scale**

**Model testing: Temporal self-continuity as dependent measure.** We tested our proposed suppressed mediational model for temporal self-continuity. We conducted a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered self-concept clarity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and temporal self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.08, SE = .04), as the 95% confidence interval [-.1902, -.0122] did not include 0. We proceeded to test the alternative model, with temporal self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and self-concept clarity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.02, *SE* = .02), as the 95% confidence interval [-.0741, .0181] included 0. We found no support for the alternative model.

The results were similar *controlling for age*. Again, we carried out a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered self-concept clarity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and temporal self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.08, SE = .05), with the 95% confidence interval [-.1917, -.0112] not including 0. We also tested the alternative model, with temporal self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and self-concept clarity as dependent variable. Here, the indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.02, SE = .02), with the 95% confidence interval [-.0779, .0126] including 0. We obtained no support for the alternative model.

 **Model testing: Personal self-continuity as dependent measure.** We tested our proposed suppressed mediational model for personal self-continuity. We conducted a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations, using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered self-concept clarity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and personal self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.11, SE = .04), as the 95% confidence interval [-.2204, -.0396] did not include 0. Subsequently, we tested the alternative model, with personal self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and self-concept clarity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.04, *SE* = .03), as the 95% confidence interval [-.1025, .0027] did include 0. The alternative model received no support.

We obtained similar results *controlling for age*. As before, we conducted a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4).We entered self-concept clarity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and personal self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.11, SE = .05), given that the 95% confidence interval [-.2238, -.0385] did not include 0. Also as before, we tested the alternative model with personal self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and self-concept clarity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.04, SE = .03), given that the 95% confidence interval [-.1006, .0004] included 0. The alternative model was unsupported.

**Revised Self-Concept Clarity Scale Index**

As in Study 1, we removed from the self-concept clarity scale (Campbell et al., 1996) four items that appeared to assess temporal stability. We averaged the remaining eight items to index self-concept clarity (*M* = 4.88, *SD* = 1.36; α = .90). Age was correlated with the SCC-R (*r*[173] = .27, *p* < .001). We found no sex differences on that index (*F*[1, 171] = .56, *p* = .46, *ηp2*= .003, 90% CI [.0000, .0318]). We present relevant Means and SDs in Table 4.

The SCC-R was correlated with self-continuity (*r*[173] = .32, *p* < .001), temporal self-continuity (*r*[173] = .26, *p* < .001), personal self-continuity (*r*[173] = .33, *p* < .001), and autobiographical memory (*r*[173] = -.28, *p* < .001). Also, controlling for age, the SCC-R was correlated with self-continuity (*r*[170] = .28, *p* < .001), temporal self-continuity (*r*[170] = .23, *p* = .003), personal self-continuity (*r*[170] = .30, *p* < .001), and autobiographical memory (*r*[170] = -.28, *p* < .001).

**Model testing with the revised self-concept clarity index: Self-continuity as dependent measure.** We next tested our proposed suppressed mediational model using the SCC-R and self-continuity as dependent variable. We carried out a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered the SCC-R as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.09, SE = .04), as that the 95% confidence interval [-.1896, -.0260] did not include 0. We then tested the alternative model, with self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and the SCC-R as dependent variable. The indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.03, *SE* = .03), as the 95% confidence interval [-.0955, .0102] included 0. The alternative model was not supported.

The results were similar *controlling for age*. As before, we performed a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered the SCC-R as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.09, SE = .04), given that the 95% confidence interval [-.2021, -.0247] did not include 0. We proceeded to test the alternative model. We entered self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and the SCC-R as dependent variable. The indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.04, SE = .03), as the 95% confidence interval [-.0940, .0051] included 0. The alternative model was unsupported.

**Model testing with the revised** **self-concept clarity index: Temporal self-continuity as dependent measure.** In addition, we tested our proposed suppressed mediational model using the SCC-R and temporal self-continuity as dependent variable. We performed a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered the SCC-R as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and temporal self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.07, SE = .04), as the 95% confidence interval for this effect [-.1856, -.0086] did not include 0. We also tested the alternative model, with temporal self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and the SCC-R as dependent variable. The indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.02, *SE* = .02), as that the 95% confidence interval for this effect [-.0725, .0169] included 0. The alternative model was not supported.

We obtained similar results *controlling for age*. We conducted a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered the SCC-R as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and temporal self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.08, SE = .04): The 95% confidence interval for this effect [-.1894, -.0071] did not include 0. For the alternative model, which featured temporal self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and the SCC-R as dependent variable, the indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.02, SE = .02): The 95% confidence interval [-.0727, .0142] included 0. This model was not supported.

**Model testing with the revised self-concept clarity index: Personal self-continuity as dependent measure.** Finally, we tested our proposed suppressed mediational model using the SCC-R and personal self-continuity as dependent variable. We carried out a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered the SCC-R as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and personal self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.10, SE = .04): The 95% confidence interval [-.2156, -.0349] did not include 0. We also tested the alternative model, with personal self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and the SCC-R as dependent variable. The indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.04, *SE* = .03): The 95% confidence interval [-.0963, .0038] did include 0. This model was unsupported.

We found similar results *controlling for age*. As before, we conducted a bootstrapping analysis, with 5,000 iterations using PROCESS Macro (Preacher & Hayes, 2008, Model 4). We entered the SCC-R as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and personal self-continuity as dependent variable. The indirect effect was significant (*b* = -.10, SE = .05): The 95% confidence interval [-.2201, -.0314] did not include 0. For the alternative model, which featured personal self-continuity as independent variable, autobiographical memory as mediator, and the SCC-R as dependent variable, the indirect effect was not significant (*b* = -.04, SE = .02): The 95% confidence interval [-.0984, .0003] did include 0. This model, then, was unsupported.

# Study 5

**Temporal and Personal Self-Continuity**

As in Studies 1, 2, and 4, we averaged the four temporal self-continuity items and the four personal self-continuity items to index temporal self-continuity (*M* = 6.10, *SD* = 1.79; α = .91) and personal self-continuity (*M* = 6.81, *SD* = 1.54; α = .85), correspondingly.

**Participant Age**

Age was correlated with self-concept clarity (*r*[123] = .38, *p* < .001), but not with self-continuity (*r*[123] = .10, *p* = .29), temporal self-continuity (*r*[123] = .08, *p* = .37), or personal self-continuity (*r*[123] = .10, *p* = .26).

**Participant Sex**

We found no sex differences in self-continuity (*F*[1, 121] = 1.09, *p* = .30, *ηp2*= .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0555]), temporal self-continuity (*F*[1, 121] = .61, *p* = .44, *ηp2*= .005, 90% CI [.0000, .0454]), personal self-continuity (*F*[1, 121] = 1.48, *p* = .23, *ηp2*= .012, 90% CI [.0000, .0625]), or self-concept clarity (*F*[1, 121] = .06, *p* = .81, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0219]). We provide Means and SDs in Table 5.

Table 5. Sex Differences (Means and SDs) in Study 5

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SCC | SCC-R | SC | TSC | PSC |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Men | 4.89 | 1.25 | 4.82 | 1.24 | 6.30 | 1.45 | 5.97 | 1.69 | 6.64 | 1.40 |
| Women | 4.84 | 1.44 | 4.85 | 1.40 | 6.60 | 1.67 | 6.22 | 1.88 | 6.97 | 1.65 |

SCC: Self-concept clarity; SCC-R: revised self-concept clarity index; SC: self-continuity; TSC: temporal self-continuity; PSC: personal self-continuity.

**Analyses Involving the Self-Concept Clarity Scale**

We coded the autobiographical memory condition as 1 and the control condition as -1. We standardized scores for self-concept clarity, word count, and age. In subsequent analyses, we used standardized word count and age as covariates.

**Self-continuity.** We conducted a general linear model with self-continuity as a dependent measure *controlling for word count as age*. *R2* = .061, 90% CI [.0095, .1473]. Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*b* = .14, *SE* = .16, *t*[115] = .87, *p* = .39, *ηp2* = .007, 90% CI [.0000, .0512]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .12, *SE* = .15, *t*[115] = .80, *p* = .43, *ηp2* = .006, 90% CI [.0000, .0484]) was significant. However, the interaction was significant (*b* = -.32, *SE* = .15, *t*[115] = -2.23, *p* = .028, *ηp2* = .041, 90% CI [.0024, .1143]). In the autobiographical memory condition, self-concept clarity was unrelated to self-continuity (*b* = -.19, *SE* = .20, *t*[115] = -.93, *p* = .35, *ηp2* = .007, 90% CI [.0000, .0536]), whereas, in the control condition, self-concept clarity was positively related to self-continuity (*b* = .46, *SE* = .22, *t*[115] = 2.05, *p* = .043, *ηp2* = .035, 90% CI [.0006, .1048]).

**Temporal self-continuity.** We conducted a general linear model with temporal self-continuity as a dependent measure *controlling for word count*. *R2* = .064, 90% CI [.0112, .1502]. Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*b* = .19, *SE* = .16, *t*[118] = 1.15, *p* = .25, *ηp2* = .011, 90% CI [.0000, .0613]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .23, *SE* = .17, *t*[118] = 1.34, *p* = .18, *ηp2* = .015, 90% CI [.0000, .0693]) was significant. The interaction, though, was significant (*b* = -.32, *SE* = .16, *t*[118] = -2.00, *p* = .047, *ηp2* = .033, 90% CI [.0002, .1003]). In the autobiographical memory condition, self-concept clarity was unrelated to temporal self-continuity (*b* = -.14, *SE* = .22, *t*[118] = -.63, *p* = .53, *ηp2* = .003, 90% CI [.0000, .0408]), whereas, in the control condition, self-concept clarity was positively related to temporal self-continuity (*b* = .51, *SE* = .24, *t*[118] = 2.15, *p* = .034, *ηp2* = .038, 90% CI [.0015, .1077]).

Subsequently, we carried out a general linear model with temporal self-continuity as a dependent measure*controlling for word count and age*. *R2* = .068, 90% CI [.0125, .1570].As before, neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*b* = .14, *SE* = .18, *t*[115] = .81, *p* = .42, *ηp2* = .006, 90% CI [.0000, .0489]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .24, *SE* = .18, *t*[115] = 1.35, *p* = .18, *ηp2* = .016, 90% CI [.0000, .0714]) was significant. The interaction was marginally significant (*b* = -.32, *SE* = .16, *t*[115] = -1.92, *p* = .057, *ηp2* = .031, 90% CI [.0000, .0985]). In the autobiographical memory condition, self-concept clarity was unrelated to temporal self-continuity (*b* = -.17, *SE* = .23, *t*[115] = -.76, *p* = .45, *ηp2* = .005, 90% CI [.0000, .0467]), whereas, in the control condition, self-concept clarity tended to be positively related to temporal self-continuity (*b* = .46, *SE* = .26, *t*(115) = 1.81, *p* = .073, *ηp2* = .028, 90% CI [.0000, .0929]), though marginally.

**Personal self-continuity.** We proceeded with a general linear model analysis treating personal self-continuity as a dependent measure *controlling for word count*. *R2* = .057, 90% CI [.0082, .1404]. Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*b* = .15, *SE* = .14, *t*[118] = 1.10, *p* = .27, *ηp2* = .010, 90% CI [.0000, .0593]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .01, *SE* = .15, *t*[118] = .07, *p* = .95, *ηp2* < .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0010]) was significant. However, the interaction was significant (*b* = -.33, *SE* = .14, *t*[118] = -2.40, *p* = .018, *ηp2* = .047, 90% CI [.0043, .1209]). In the autobiographical memory condition, self-concept clarity was unrelated to personal self-continuity (*b* = -.18, *SE* = .19, *t*[118] = -.96, *p* = .34, *ηp2* = .008, 90% CI [.0000, .0536]), but, in the control condition, self-concept clarity was positively related to personal self-continuity (*b* = .49, *SE* = .21, *t*[118] = 2.39, *p* = .018, *ηp2* = .046, 90% CI [.0042, .1203]).

We also performed a general linear model analysis with personal self-continuity as a dependent measure *controlling for word count and age*. *R2* = .059, 90% CI [.0087, .1445]. Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*b* = .13, *SE* = .15, *t*[115] = .83, *p* = .41, *ηp2* = .006, 90% CI [.0000, .0498]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .01, *SE* = .15, *t*[115] = .06, *p* = .95, *ηp2* < .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0005]) was significant. The interaction, though, was significant (*b* = -.33, *SE* = .14, *t*[115] = -2.32, *p* = .022, *ηp2* = .045, 90% CI [.0034, .1190]). In the autobiographical memory condition, self-concept clarity was unrelated to personal self-continuity (*b* = -.20, *SE* = .20, *t*[115] = -1.02, *p* = .31, *ηp2* = .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0574]), whereas, in the control condition, self-concept clarity was positively related to personal self-continuity (*b* = .46, *SE* = .22, *t*[115] = 2.08, *p* = .040, *ηp2* = .036, 90% CI [.0009, .1065]).

**Analyses Involving the Revised Self-Concept Clarity Index**

As in Studies 1 and 4, we removed from the self-concept clarity scale (Campbell et al., 1996) four items that appear to assess temporal stability. We averaged the remaining eight items to index self-concept clarity (*M* = 4.84, *SD* = 1.32; α = .87).

Age was correlated with the SCC-R (*r*[123] = .39, *p* < .001). No sex differences emerged (*F*[1, 121] = .02, *p* = .89, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0131]). We present relevant statistics in Table 5.

We coded the autobiographical memory condition as 1 and the control condition as -1. We standardized scores for revised self-concept clarity, word count, and age. In subsequent analyses, we used standardized word count and age as covariates.

**Self-continuity.** We conducted a general linear model with self-continuity as dependent variable and the SCC-R as independent variable *controlling for word count*. *R2* = .060, 90% CI [.0094, .1446]. Neither the SCC-R (*b* = .18, *SE* = .14, *t*[118] = 1.26, *p* = .21, *ηp2* = .013, 90% CI [.0000, .0657]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .11, *SE* = .15, *t*[118] = .75, *p* = .46, *ηp2* = .005, 90% CI [.0000, .0453]) was significant. However, the interaction was significant (*b* = -.34, *SE* = .14, *t*[118] = -2.36, *p* = .020, *ηp2* = .045, 90% CI [.0038, .1186]). In the autobiographical memory condition, the SCC-R was unrelated to self-continuity (*b* = -.16, *SE* = .19, *t*[118] = -.82, *p* = .42, *ηp2* = .006, 90% CI [.0000, .0479]), but, in the control condition, the SCC-R was positively linked to self-continuity (*b* = .52, *SE* = .21, *t*[118] = 2.47, *p* = .015, *ηp2* = .049, 90% CI [.0052, .1244]).

We next carried out a general linear model with self-continuity as dependent variable and the SCC-R as independent variable *controlling for word count and age*. *R2* = .064, 90% CI [.0108, .1515]. Neither the SCC-R main effect (*b* = .15, *SE* = .16, *t*[115] = .95, *p* = .35, *ηp2* = .008, 90% CI [.0000, .0542]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .12, *SE* = .16, *t*[115] = .76, *p* = .45, *ηp2* = .005, 90% CI [.0000, .0469]) was significant. The interaction, however, was significant (*b* = -.33, *SE* = .15, *t*[115] = -2.29, *p* = .024, *ηp2* = .043, 90% CI [.0030, .1173]). In the autobiographical memory condition, the SCC-R was unrelated to self-continuity (*b* = -.18, *SE* = .20, *t*[115] = -.91, *p* = .37, *ηp2* = .007, 90% CI [.0000, .0527]), whereas, in the control condition, the SCC-R was positively associated with self-continuity (*b* = .48, *SE* = .23, *t*[115] = 2.13 *p* = .035, *ηp2* = .038, 90% CI [.0014, .1094]).

**Temporal self-continuity.** As a next step, we performed a general linear model with temporal self-continuity as dependent variable and the SCC-R as independent variable *controlling for word count*. *R2* = .068, 90% CI [.0112, .1502]. Neither the SCC-R (*b* = .20, *SE* = .16, *t*[118] = 1.26, *p* = .21, *ηp2* = .013, 90% CI [.0000, .0660]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .22, *SE* = .17, *t*[118] = 1.29, *p* = .20, *ηp2* = .014, 90% CI [.0000, .0672]) was significant. The interaction was significant (*b* = -.34, *SE* = .16, *t*[118] = -2.10, *p* = .038, *ηp2* = .036, 90% CI [.0010, .1049]). In the autobiographical memory condition, the SCC-R was unrelated to temporal self-continuity (*b* = -.14, *SE* = .22, *t*[118] = -.62, *p* = .54, *ηp2* = .003, 90% CI [.0000, .0402]), but, in the control condition, the SCC-R was positively related to temporal self-continuity (*b* = .55, *SE* = .24, *t*[118] = 2.29, *p* = .024, *ηp2* = .043, 90% CI [.0030, .1151]).

We subsequently carried out a general linear model with temporal self-continuity as dependent variable and the SCC-R as independent variable *controlling for word count and age*. *R2* = .072, 90% CI [.0144, .1624]. Neither the SCC-R main effect (*b* = .17, *SE* = .18, *t*[115] = .95, *p* = .35, *ηp2* = .008, 90% CI [.0000, .0542]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .23, *SE* = .18, *t*[115] = 1.31, *p* = .19, *ηp2* = .015, 90% CI [.0000, .0696]) was significant. However, the interaction was significant (*b* = -.33, *SE* = .16, *t*[115] = -2.03, *p* = .045, *ηp2* = .035, 90% CI [.0004, .1041]). In the autobiographical memory condition, the SCC-R was unassociated with temporal self-continuity (*b* = -.17, *SE* = .23, *t*[115] = -.73, *p* = .47, *ηp2* = .005, 90% CI [.0000, .0455]), but, in the control condition, the SCC-R tended to be positively associated with temporal self-continuity (*b* = .50, *SE* = .26, *t*[115] =1.97, *p* = .051, *ηp2* = .033, 90% CI [.0000, .1009]), though marginally.

**Personal self-continuity** Next, we conducted a general linear model with personal self-continuity as dependent variable and the SCC-R as independent variable *controlling for word count*. *R2* = .057, 90% CI [.0082, .1404]. Neither the SCC-R main effect (*b* = .15, *SE* = .14, *t*[118] = 1.10, *p* = .27, *ηp2* = .010, 90% CI [.0000, .0592]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .005, *SE* = .15, *t*[118] = .03, *p* = .98, *ηp2* < .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0000]) was significant. The interaction, however, was significant, *b* = -.33, *SE* = .14, *t*(118) = -2.39, *p* = .019, *ηp2* = .046, 90% CI [.0041, .1200]. In the autobiographical memory condition, the SCC-R was unrelated to personal self-continuity (*b* = -.18, *SE* = .19, *t*[118] = -.95, *p* = .34, *ηp2* = .008, 90% CI [.0000, .0531]), whereas, in the control condition, the SCC-R was positively related to personal self-continuity (*b* = .49, *SE* = .21, *t*[118] = 2.38, *p* = .019, *ηp2* = .046, 90% CI [.0040, .1196]).

Finally, we carried out a general linear model with personal self-continuity as dependent variable and the SCC-R as independent variable *controlling for word count and age*. *R2* = .059, 90% CI [.0087, .1445]. Neither the SCC-R main effect (*b* = .13, *SE* = .15, *t*[115] = .83, *p* = .41, *ηp2* = .006, 90% CI [.0000, .0498]) nor the autobiographical memory main effect (*b* = .006, *SE* = .15, *t*[115] = .04, *p* = .97, *ηp2* < .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0000]) was significant. However, the interaction was so (*b* = -.33, *SE* = .14, *t*[115] = -2.31, *p* = .023, *ηp2* = .044, 90% CI [.0033, .1185]). In the autobiographical memory condition, the SCC-R was unrelated to personal self-continuity (*b* = -.20, *SE* = .20, *t*[115] = -1.01, *p* = .31, *ηp2* = .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0568]), but, in the control condition, the SCC-R was positively related to personal self-continuity (*b* = .46, *SE* = .22, *t*[115] = 2.07, *p* = .041, *ηp2* = .036, 90% CI [.0008, .1061]).

# Study 6

**Temporal and Personal Self-Continuity**

Similar with Studies 1, 2, 4, and 5, we averaged the four temporal self-continuity items and the four personal self-continuity items to index temporal self-continuity (*M* = 4.58, *SD* = 1.23; α = .85) and personal self-continuity (*M* = 5.06, *SD* = 1.13; α = .81), respectively.

**Participant Age**

Age was uncorrelated with the self-concept clarity manipulation check index (*r*[182] = .09, *p* = .23), self-continuity (*r*[182] = -.02, *p* = .84), temporal self-continuity (*r*[182] = -.06, *p* = .46), or personal self-continuity (*r*([182] = .03, *p* = .66).

**Participant Sex**

We found no sex differences in self-continuity (*F*[1, 180] = .12, *p* = .73, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0189]), temporal self-continuity (*F*[1, 180] = .93, *p* = .34, *ηp2*= .005, 90% CI [.0000, .0360]), personal self-continuity (*F*[1, 180] = .15, *p* = .70, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0203]), and the self-concept clarity manipulation check index (*F*[1, 180] = .02, *p* = .89, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0089]). We display Means and SDs in Table 6.

Table 6. Sex Differences (Means and SDs) in Study 6

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SCC manipulation check index | SC | TSC | PSC |
|  | *M*4.124.09 |  *SD* 1.50 1.38 | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Women | 4.79 | 1.10 | 4.50 | 1.22 | 5.09 | 1.19 |
| Men | 4.85 | 1.08 | 4.68 | 1.25 | 5.02 | 1.06 |

SCC manipulation check index: the self-concept clarity manipulation check index; SC: self-continuity; TSC: temporal self-continuity; PSC: personal self-continuity.

**Self-Continuity**

We conducted a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on self-continuity*controlling for age and word count*(in regards to both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). The analysis yielded no significant main effect of self-concept clarity (*F*[1, 175] = .40, *p* = .53, *ηp2*= .002, 95% CI [.0000, .0280]) or memory (*F*[1, 175] = 2.06, *p* = .15, *ηp2*= .012, 90% CI [.0000, .0510]). However, it yielded a significant interaction (*F*[1, 175] = 4.19, *p* = .042, *ηp2*= .023, 90% CI [.0004, .0717]). In the memory condition, there was no significant difference in self-continuitybetween participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.88, *SD* = 1.06) versus the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 5.06, *SD* = 1.11), *F*(1, 175) = .93, *p* = .34, *ηp2*= .005, 90% CI [.0000, .0370], whereas, in the control condition, participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.88, *SD* = 1.07) tended to report greater self-continuity than those who engaged in the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.44, *SD* = 1.04), *F*(1, 175) = 3.82, *p* = .052, *ηp2* = .021, 90% CI [.0000, .0684], though marginally significant.

**Temporal Self-Continuity**

We conducted a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on temporal self-continuity *controlling for word count*(of both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). The self-concept clarity (*F*[1, 176] = 1.65, *p* = .20, *ηp2*= .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0460]) and memory (*F*[1, 176] = 2.83, *p* = .094, *ηp2*= .016, 90% CI [.0000, .0587]) main effects were not significant. However, the interaction was so (*F*(1, 176) = 4.51, *p* = .035, *ηp2*= .025, 90% CI [.0009, .0742]). In the memory condition, there was no significant difference in temporal self-continuitybetween participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.67, *SD* = 1.18) versus the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.83, *SD* = 1.26), *F*(1, 176) = .32, *p* = .57, *ηp2*= .002, 90% CI [.0000, .0260], but, in the control condition, participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.72, *SD* = 1.15) reported higher temporal self-continuity than those who engaged in the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.10, *SD* = 1.23), *F*(1, 176) = 6.18, *p* = .014, *ηp2* = .034, 90% CI [.0037, .0879].

We then carried out a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on temporal self-continuity *controlling for age and word count*(of both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*F*[1, 175] = 1.67, *p* = .20, *ηp2*= .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0465]) nor the memory main effect (*F*[1, 175] = 2.52, *p* = .11, *ηp2*= .014, 90% CI [.0000, .0559]) was significant. The interaction, though, was significant, *F*(1, 175) = 4.69, *p* = .032 *ηp2*= .026, 90% CI [.0012, .0761]. In the memory condition, no significant difference in temporal self-continuity emergedbetween participants who got involved in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.67, *SD* = 1.18) versus the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.83, *SD* = 1.26), *F*(1, 175) = .35, *p* = .55, *ηp2*= .002, 90% CI [.0000, .0269], but, in the control condition, participants who got involved in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.72, *SD* = 1.15) reported higher temporal self-continuity than their low self-concept clarity task counterparts (*M* = 4.10, *SD* = 1.23), *F*(1, 175) = 6.34, *p* = .013, *ηp2* = .035, 90% CI [.0041, .0896].

**Personal Self-Continuity**

We conducted a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on personal self-continuity *controlling for word count* (of both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*F*[1, 176] = .03, *p* = .86, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0113]) nor the memory main effect (*F*[1, 176] = 1.00, *p* = .32, *ηp2*= .006, 90% CI [.0000, .0378]) or the interaction (*F*[1, 176] = 2.62, *p* = .11, *ηp2*= .015, 90% CI [.0000, .0566] was significant.

Finally, we performed a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on personal self-continuity *controlling for age and word count* (of both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). Again, neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*F*[1, 175] =.03, *p* = .86, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0114]) nor the memory main effect (*F*[1, 175] = 1.07, *p* = .30, *ηp2*= .006, 90% CI [.0000, .0390]) or the interaction (*F*[1, 175] = 2.51, *p* = .12, *ηp2*= .014, 90% CI [.0000, .0558] was significant.

# Study 7

**Temporal and Personal Self-Continuity**

Similar with Studies 1, 2, 4, and 5, we averaged the four temporal self-continuity items and the four personal self-continuity items to index temporal self-continuity (*M* = 4.88, *SD* = 1.27; α = .93) and personal self-continuity (*M* = 5.13, *SD* = 1.19; α = .90), respectively.

**Participant Age**

Age tended to be related to the self-concept clarity manipulation check index (*r*[155] = .14, *p* = .077), but was related to self-continuity (*r*[155] = .30, *p* < .001), temporal self-continuity (*r*[155] = .26, *p* = .001), and personal self-continuity (*r*[155] = .31, *p* < .001).

**Participant Sex**

We found no sex differences in self-continuity (*F*[1, 153] = .13, *p* = .72, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0227]), temporal self-continuity (*F*[1, 153] = .05, *p* = .82, *ηp2*< .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0163]), personal self-continuity (*F*[1, 153] = .22, *p* = .64, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0267]), and the self-concept clarity manipulation check index (*F*[1, 153] = 1.45, *p* = .23, *ηp2*= .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0498]). We present Means and SDs in Table 7.

Table 7. Sex Differences (Means and SDs) in Study 7

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | SCC manipulation check index | SC | TSC | PSC |
|  | *M*4.384.07 |  *SD* 1.58 1.32 | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| Women | 5.03 | 1.18 | 4.90 | 1.27 | 5.16 | 1.20 |
| Men | 4.96 | 1.19 | 4.85 | 1.29 | 5.07 | 1.17 |

SCC manipulation check index: the self-concept clarity manipulation check index; SC: self-continuity; TSC: temporal self-continuity; PSC: personal self-continuity.

**Self-Continuity**

We carried out a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on self-continuity *controlling for age and word count*(in regards to both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*F*[1, 148] = 2.29, *p* = .13, *ηp2*= .015, 90% CI [.0000, .0625]) nor the memory main effect (*F*[1, 148] = 2.58, *p* = .11, *ηp2*= .017, 90% CI [.0000, .0660]) was significant. The interaction, though, was marginally significant, *F*(1, 148) = 3.81, *p* = .053, *ηp2*= .025, 90% CI [.0000, .0797]. In the memory condition, there was no significant difference in self-continuitybetween participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 5.10, *SD* = 1.30) versus the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 5.16, *SD* = 1.24), *F*(1, 148) = .10, *p* = .76, *ηp2*= .001, 90% CI [.0000, .0216]. However, in the control condition, participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 5.18, *SD* = 1.04) reported greater self-continuity than those who engaged in the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.59, *SD* = 1.05), *F*(1, 148) = 6.14, *p* = .014, *ηp2* = .040, 90% CI [.0043, .1023].

**Temporal Self-Continuity**

We carried out a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on temporal self-continuity *controlling for word count*(of both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*F*[1, 149] = 1.35, *p* = .25, *ηp2*= .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0496]) nor the memory main effect (*F*[1, 149] = .98, *p* = .33, *ηp2*= .007, 90% CI [.0000, .0439]) was significant. The interaction, though, was significant, *F*(1, 149) = 3.93, *p* = .049, *ηp2*= .026, 90% CI [.0000, .0805]. In the memory condition, no significant difference in temporal self-continuity emergedbetween participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.89, *SD* = 1.45) versus the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 5.04, *SD* = 1.28), *F*(1, 149) = .34, *p* = .56, *ηp2*= .002, 90% CI [.0000, .0311]. However, in the control condition, participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 5.11, *SD* = 1.16) reported higher temporal self-continuity than those who engaged in the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.47, *SD* = 1.12), *F*(1, 149) = 5.05, *p* = .026, *ηp2* = .033, 90% CI [.0021, .0916].

We proceeded to conduct a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on temporal self-continuity *controlling for age and word count* (of both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). Again, neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*F*[1, 148] = 1.43, *p* = .23, *ηp2*= .010, 90% CI [.0000, .0511]) nor the memory main effect (*F*[1, 148] = 1.40, *p* = .24, *ηp2*= .009, 90% CI [.0000, .0507]) was significant. The interaction, though, was so, *F*(1, 148) = 4.59, *p* = .034, *ηp2*= .030, 90% CI [.0012, .0877]. In the memory condition, there was no significant difference in temporal self-continuitybetween participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.89, *SD* = 1.45) and those who engaged in the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 5.04, *SD* = 1.28), *F*(1, 148) = .45, *p* = .51, *ηp2*= .003, 90% CI [.0000, .0341]. However, in the control condition, participants who engaged in the high self-concept clarity task (*M* = 5.11, *SD* = 1.16) reported more temporal self-continuity than those who engaged in the low self-concept clarity task (*M* = 4.47, *SD* = 1.12), *F*(1, 148) = 5.69, *p* = .018, *ηp2* = .037, 90% CI [.0033, .0982].

**Personal Self-Continuity**

We performed a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on personal self-continuity *controlling for word count* (of both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). Neither the self-concept clarity main effect (*F*[1, 149] = 2.68, *p* = .10, *ηp2*= .018, 90% CI [.0000, .0667]) nor the memory main effect (*F*[1, 149] = 2.67, *p* = .11, *ηp2*= .018, 90% CI [.0000, .0666]) or the interaction (*F*[1, 149] = 1.88, *p* = .17, *ηp2*= .012, 90% CI [.0000, .0569]) was significant.

Lastly, we conducted a 2 x 2 ANCOVA on personal self-continuity *controlling for age and word count*(of both the self-concept clarity and memory manipulations). The self-concept clarity (*F*[1, 148] = 2.94, *p* = .089, *ηp2*= .019, 90% CI [.0000, .0702]) and memory (*F*[1, 148] = 3.66, *p* = .058, *ηp2*= .024, 90% CI [.0000, .0781]) main effects were marginal. The interaction was not significant (*F*[1, 148] = 2.42, *p* = .12, *ηp2*= .016, 90% CI [.0000, .0641]).

# Mini Meta-Analysis for Studies 6 and 7

In Studies 6-7, the interaction between self-concept clarity and autobiographical memory on personal self-continuity was not significant. We further tested whether autobiographical memory moderates the relation between self-concept clarity and personal self-continuity by conducting a mini meta-analysis (McShane & Böckenholt, 2017) in which we combined the results of personal self-continuity in Studies 6-7. The meta-analysis revealed a significant moderating effect of autobiographical memory, *Estimate* = *-*.43, *SE* =.22, *Z* =-1.97, *p* =.049. These results show that as we expected, autobiographical memory did moderate the relation between self-concept clarity and self-continuity.