

in Ps

Interest in this recent by av ora stud s urt r ound t atw n acd wt soc a vva uat vt r rants part c pants tnd to vva uat t s vvs n onr att r n ways o s and H at rton? vanD n t a ? Brown? ? B r t a ? Hu s and B r n? und r soc a r rct on or n at v soc a vva uat on cond t onr part c pants vva uat t r p rsona t s or ab t s or r d s rab y and s und s rab y n co par son wt nont r r t n n cond t onr s arc r s r ard t s p no n on as a unda nta s r protect on strat y w c s usd to protect t s r o t r ar pursuant to t s soc a t r at Hu s and B r n? Ho r r t a ? n r a n ruro a n stud s av a so r vva d t n rura und r p n n s o t s unda nta process y ound t at s vva uat onr ad n r r s onr to soc a vva uat vt r r at n r as d act vat on n so r r r onr suc as t orb to ronta cort r FC n d a p r r ronta cort r FC n and a y da a Furt r onr t s stud s urt r ound t at t n r as d d s rab ty und r soc a vva uat vt r r at was s n cant y corr at d wt t r d a FC act v ty F a an and B r n? Hu s and B r n? In n r a n r s b v ora and n ruro a n stud s av robust y d onstrat d t at part c pants r spond to soc a vva uat vt r r at by p as z n t r own d s rab ty n y t os w o su r r o w s r s r or d r s on r r spond to soc a t r at by vva uat n t s vvs as or r und s rab r o s and H at rton? vanD n t a ?

Dispt t s nd n s n t r a ns unc r ar w r t r t p no n on o t t r r t n n st u n r as n d s rab ty s cu tura y un v r sa or sp c c to s r r n part c pants A t ou t r abov av r a r r ct as b n obs r v d n bot popu af onr o s r r n r s and East As ans r r at r t a . Ac r and Duc n r n r a p r v o us stud s av ound t at East As ans av d r r n t p r r n s o s r n anc r n t r o s r r n r s K taya a r t a . H n r t a ? H n r and Ha a ura ?

Interest in previous stud s av a so ound so d r r n c s n p r r n s o s r r at d process n b r w n East As ans and s r r n r s w n t r y ar r acd wt soc a t r at or n r at v st u For r a p r stud s av ound t at European A r cans s ow a s r acd advanta r r ct dur n t s soc a r arc ca t r at cond t onr w r C n r s part c pants s ow d a r v r sa r r ct Ma and Han? . L w r t a ?

For t s r rason w s p c u at d t at East As ans ay av d r r n t s vva uat on p r r n s w n acd wt soc a vva uat vt r r at

In add t on r v o us stud s av ound t at s r r n r d r r n c s and s r r n d r r n c s s r r a on s r r n r s and East As ans n onr and r r r n r s tnd to v w t r s r as an autonou s n t ty t at s s r r at r o r o t r s n r n d r r n t s r r n r on t r ot r and t r a r ty o East As ans tnd to v w t r s r as a soc a y r b d d n t ty wt stron n r r n r n r s wt ot r s n r n r d r r n t s r r n r Mar us and K taya a r r n r ?

At ou n so r r r r r r r ard t p no n on o r spond n to soc a t r at by p as z n on r own d s rab ty as a unda nta s r protect on strat y r p w t an n r d r r n t s r r n r p as z n t at au n t n t r d s rab ty w r und r t r at s not a

w s s r protect on strat y b r c a s t d n r s o t r r n r at v r vva uat onr about t s r by p as z n on r own d s rab ty and b r a n t r n r r n r n r s wt ot r s Mor r v n so r stud s av ound t at t s r r n r s r r n r s As ans r r or anc s o s r r at d r d n t r r n r t a ? . C ao r t a ? K r t a ? Bas d on t s r r s u t s w s p c u at d t at s r r n r d r r n c s ay r odu at s vva uat on r spond s und r soc a t r at A so n r v o us stud s av ound t r East r s t d r r n c s n s r s r r n r East As ans r r r d ow r s r r r co par d to European A r cans n r t and A r n ? C u and Hon r ? In s u r r y n t s r s t at t r p o n t a cu tura d r r n c s ay b r c a s d by t d r r n t vva s o s r s r r n r r r n r s n r s r r n r on r soc a vva uat on und r soc a vva uat vt r r at b yond t r r r ac r o cu tura d r r n c s

In t r r r n t stud y w a d t ad r s s t r r qu s t onr s p r c a y r stud y us d soc a vva uat vt r r at an pu at on and s r r n r s p r r n s w n acd wt soc a t r at and w r t r t s r d r r n t p r r n s w r r c a s d by d r r n t ty p s o s r r n r r r n r o bta n East As ans r r n r s p r r n s w r us d a ty p ca soc a vva uat vt r r at an pu at on w c as b n us d n p r v o us s r r n r stud s r r n r B r t a ? Hu s and B r n? an pu at d t r soc a vva uat vt r r at by prov d n part c pants wt avorab r or un avorab r soc a vva uat vt r r r r n r and t r n co ct d t r s vva uat on r spond s r n a n tud r o abov av r a r r ct r us d t r sa r soc a vva uat vt r r at an pu at on and s r r n r vva uat on p r r d r r s or obs r v n t r p r r n d r r n c s b r w n East As ans and s r r n r s as

w us w d r y us s r r n r r n r s

social desirability and independent self-construal and independent self-construal.

EXPERIMENT 1

In order to determine whether East Asians avoid negative response patterns when faced with social evaluation, we conducted a 2 (participating in the study and not) x 2 (independent self-construal and interdependent self-construal) experiment.

Materials and Methods

Participants

Forty-six undergraduate students participated in the study. They were randomly assigned to either an independent self-construal condition or an interdependent self-construal condition. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Michigan.

Procedures and Stimulus Materials

A within-subject design was used to manipulate social evaluation. Participants completed a series of tasks that were designed to elicit social evaluation. The tasks included a personality trait rating task, a word fluency task, and a math test. Participants were informed that their performance would be evaluated by others. The study was conducted in a laboratory setting.

Across the experiment, participants were randomly assigned to either an independent self-construal condition or an interdependent self-construal condition. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Michigan.

personality traits and to evaluate a total of personality trait words randomly presented and counterbalanced across social evaluation conditions. The words were selected from a list of personality trait words used in previous studies (Zuckerman, 1996; Hu and Buss, 2000). The experiment was conducted in a laboratory setting with participants seated at computers. The experiment was controlled using a computer program. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Michigan.

Results

The descriptive statistics of the measures are shown in Table 1. Consistent with the previous studies, participants with an independent self-construal showed higher scores on the personality trait rating task.

t cross-sections of social interaction and self-construction on self-evaluation. Experiment 1 did not draw on Experiment 2 procedures used in Experiment 1 and a widely used manipulation of self-construction procedure.

Materials and Methods

Participants

Eighty-one college students participated in a 2 (actors) × 2 (tasks) × 2 (self-construction) × 2 (pronouns) × 2 (practices) experiment. Participants were randomly assigned to an independent procedure condition. Independent procedure condition or a neutral procedure condition. Participants did not receive feedback or corrections on accuracy. None of the data is reported in this study or published elsewhere because participants expressed suspicion about the interaction manipulation at the end of the experiment.

Procedures and Stimulus Materials

Experiment 2 had a self-construction independent procedure condition or neutral procedure condition × social evaluation interaction manipulation or noninteraction feedback condition. The independent procedure condition for Experiment 2 was so additional steps. Before the target experiment on social evaluation interaction and self-evaluation, participants were first asked to complete a self-construction task (M and Han). In the independent procedure condition, participants were asked to read two stories about countries that contain independent pronouns (*I*, *mine*) and to count the number of pronouns that appeared. In the independent procedure condition, participants were asked to read the same two stories with independent pronouns (*I*, *we*, *ours*) and count the number of pronouns that appeared. In addition, we also set a neutral procedure condition where participants read two stories about the countries that did not contain independent or non-independent pronouns. In the neutral condition, participants were asked to count the number of certain nouns that appeared in the stories.

After completing the self-construction task, the participants received a standard social evaluation interaction and completed a self-evaluation task used in Experiment 1. Participants received the interaction or noninteraction feedback in a 2 × 2 × 2 × 2 factorial design. Across the experiment, the interaction and noninteraction practices of feedback in a randomly presented. A feedback assessment was a block of personality traits that needed to be evaluated. As in Experiment 1, the end of the experiment, the dependent variable was the self-evaluation score. Moreover, participants were received the same dependent procedure used in the previous study. We conducted the self-construction task before the social evaluation interaction and had no suspicion about the experiment.

Results

A one-way ANOVA was applied to the scores on the self-evaluation scale data of the Experiment 1. It showed no significant differences in the scores of the self-evaluation scale across the self-construction conditions. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$.

Table 1

In addition, the above average effect of the independent procedure condition on personality traits was calculated. For social evaluation task was calculated for six experimental conditions and was submitted to a self-construction procedure independent procedure condition or neutral procedure condition × social evaluation interaction manipulation or noninteraction feedback condition ANOVA. The interaction between subjects and the self-construction procedure results showed no interaction effects of self-construction or social evaluation interaction manipulation. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. However, we found a significant self-construction × social evaluation interaction on two-way interaction. $F(1, 78) = 11.18, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.124$. Table 1. A two-factorial analysis showed a significant effect of social evaluation interaction on the independent self-construction procedure and neutral conditions. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. $F(1, 78) = 11.18, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.124$. The effect of the interaction of procedure and social evaluation interaction on the independent self-construction procedure condition was significant. $F(1, 78) = 11.18, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.124$. However, the interaction on the independent self-construction procedure condition was not significant. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. The interaction of the independent self-construction procedure and neutral conditions was not significant. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. The interaction of the independent self-construction procedure and neutral conditions was not significant. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. However, the interaction of the independent self-construction procedure and neutral conditions was not significant. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. The interaction of the independent self-construction procedure and neutral conditions was not significant. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. However, the interaction of the independent self-construction procedure and neutral conditions was not significant. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. The interaction of the independent self-construction procedure and neutral conditions was not significant. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$. However, the interaction of the independent self-construction procedure and neutral conditions was not significant. $F(1, 78) = 1.27, p = 0.26, \eta_p^2 = 0.016$.

DISCUSSION

The current study aimed to observe whether East Asians avoid a downward response pattern when asked with social threat and the interaction with threat and the downward pattern was caused by different types of social construals. The observed results were crucial for Chinese participants to prefer social evaluation and social construal patterns with the above-mentioned independent variables. The positive results on the social evaluation and non-relationship feedback conditions during a social evaluation task and discovered that the Chinese participants rated the social values as very high relative to the above-mentioned interaction. Exploratory factor analysis found an interaction between social construal and the type of social evaluation that is an important explanation. Exploratory factor analysis found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation. Exploratory factor analysis found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation.

Consistent with previous research, the current study used an independent variable of social evaluation and the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation. Exploratory factor analysis found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation. Exploratory factor analysis found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation. Exploratory factor analysis found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation.

particular, the current study found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation. Exploratory factor analysis found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation. Exploratory factor analysis found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation. Exploratory factor analysis found that the interaction between social evaluation and the type of social evaluation is an important explanation.

do *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* *do*

Lo bardo B and B an ? o o d a prionta cortex and orb to ronta cortex n sva uat on *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* *do*

Bouc H C N an K M and an ? Cu turu and p ct s C n s ar Good and Bad att t sa t *J. Cross Cult. Psychol.* *do*

Brown D ? Understand n t b t t an avra t t ot v s t att *Person. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* *do*

Ca H B Brown D and C a n a s M A ? and cu turu d n c n co n t v s sva uat ons or a t v s s rard *Asian J. Soc. Psychol.* *do*

C a b s and ndsc t D ? B as n soc a co parat v ud nts t r o o non ot vat d actors n abov avra and co parat v opt s t s *Psychol. Bull.* *do*

C a o Y Harada K o d a n H L Z M a n o Y n d to d a ? Dyna c cu turu n un d on nura r p r t at ons o t s *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* *do*

C u S Y and H o n Y ? *Social Psychology of Culture* N w Y o r N Y s y c o o y r s s

F a n and B M ? n ways n w c d n r s on s contr but to sva uat on *Front. Hum. Neurosci.* *do*

H n M J ? as cu turu product an exa nat on o East As an and Nort A r can s v s *J. Pers.* *do*

H n M J and H a a u r a l ? In s arc o East As an s n an d n t *Person. Social Psychol. Rev.* *do*

H n M J K t a y a and L and L ? Cu turu d n c n s sva uat on Japan r ad y accpt n t at v s r v a n t n or at on *J. Cross Cult. Psychol.* *do*

H o n A t n s t d n C o r c o r a n K E b n F and I s c ? Cop n w t s t r t at and t sva uat on o s r at d t r a t s an M t s t u y *PLoS ONE* *do*

H u B L and B M ? r b to ronta cortex and an t or c n u at cortex ar d odu at d by ot vat d soc a co n t on *Cereb. Cortex* *do*

H u B L and B M ? r o t c t n t s t t t o t o soc a sva uat v t r at on nura r p r t at ons o s *J. Cogn. Neurosci.* *do*

K n n E and a o t o n ? E t c t s o pr n s s construa s on sva uat ons cu turu a p p a y r p s p c t v *Int. J. Psychol.* *do*

K t a y a M a r u s H M a t s u o t o H and N o r a s u n ? Ind v dua and co t c t v p r o c s s n t t construct on o t s s n an d n t n t n d n a s and s r t c s n Japan *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* *do*

K n n C and H w L a r s o n M ? c v d contro and t t opt s t c b a s a n a n a y t c r v *Psychol. Health* *do*

K r u ? L a o b o n b o n s b o w a v r a t t and t t o c n t r c n a t u r o co parat v ab t y u d n t s *J. Person. Soc. Psychol.* *do*

L w n M L M a n Y H a n M n and A z z Z a d n L ? o f a r a d o t b o s s cu turu d n c n s soc a r a r c s odu at d s a c d r o n t o n n C n s and A r c a n s *PLoS ONE* *do*

M a n Y and H a n M ? a c d a v a n t a s odu at d by soc a t r a t . B o s s t c t on s a c d r o n t on *J. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* *do*

M a n Y and H a n M ? y w r s p o n d a s t r to t s t a n to t r s An p c t p o s t v a s s o c a t on t r o y o s a d v a n t a d u r n p c t a c d r o n t on *J. Exp. Psychol.* *do*

M a r u s H and K t a y a M ? Cu turu and t s p c a t o n s or co n t on n o t on and ot vat on *Psychol. Rev.* *do*

M a r t n C ? o p s o n D and C a n d M ? An exa nat on o t t p s y c o t r c p r o p t o t t o s n b r E s t M a n M n C n s a c u t o r n a y s y n d r o A C M p a t n t s *Psychol. Health Med.* *do*

M o o n D A and C a n d M ? v r c o n d n c and u n d r c o n d n c w n and w y p o p u n d e s t a t and o v e s t a t t t c o p t o n *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* *do*

o n S C A F a r L D a v s A n o o d M and C a r n D ? ? M c a d s r a b t y n p e r s o n a t y q u e s t o n n a r s and t b a t t a n a v r a t t *Pers. Individ. Dif.* *do*

o b n s \ and B M ? o s t v u s o n s a b o u t t s s o r t t r b n t s and o n t c o s t s *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* *do*

o s n b r M ? *Society and The Adolescent Self-Image.* r n c o n n J r n c o n n v e r s t y r s s

M t t n D and A J ? M u t a n o u s a d n s t r a t o n o t t o s n b r E s t M a n n n a t o n e x p o r n t u n v r s a and cu turu s p c c n a t u r s o o b a s t *J. Person. Soc. Psychol.* *do*

n d d n C and G r n A ? n an d n t o o d o r t o u t *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.* *do*

n n and H a n M ? construa pr n odu at d nura s u b s t r a t e o s a w a r n s s *Psychol. Sci.* *do*

n n H o n Y L u n C H H u p r y s G and H a n M ? Dyna c cu turu odu at on o nura r s p o n s s to n o w n and r n d a c s *Soc. Cogn. Affect. Neurosci.* *do*

n n L u n C H and H a n M ? Cu turu d n c n nura d e a n s s o s r o n t on *Soc. Neurosci.* *do*

n n J n L o s n K and n w a r t n H L ? ? n s t r u a and co par s o n s w t t s r n d s and p r s *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* *do*

a y o n M E and B r o w n J D ? I u s o n and w b n a soc a p s y c o o c a p s p c t v o n n t a t *Psychol. Bull.* *do*

v a n D n M ? C a p b n K H o y \ H and B r a d d E K ? Co p n s a t n s t n and b r n a n a n a n a y t c n a n a t o n o r a c t o n s to s t r t r a t *Person. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* *do*

o s n K D and H a t r t o n F ? E o t r a t t c t s d n t soc a co par s o n p r o c s s a o n and o w s t r p o p p c a t o n s or n t r p e r s o n a p r c p t o n s *Soc. Cogn.* *do*

a n C M a n Y and H a n M ? a construa pr n odu at d p a n p r c p t o n v a n t r a t d p o t n t a v d n c *Cogn. Neurosci.* *do*

a n C n y s r a n d n L u n n L n H and H a n M ? b A c c e s s b c u turu n d s odu at d a u t o d a c t v t y d n c o r t c u turu y s t u a t d b r a n *Soc. Neurosci.* *do*

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests. The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests. The authors declare that they have no competing financial interests.

Copyright © 2017 Zhang, Xi, Jin and Wu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.