Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology

Relational Self Versus Collective Self: A Cross-Cultural Study in Interdependent Self-Construal Between Han and Uyghur in China

Marhaba Mamat, Wei Huang, Rui Shang, Tianyang Zhang, Hao Li, Yao Wang, Wei Luo and Yanhong Wu

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

http://www.sagepublications.com

On behalf of:

IACCP

International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology

Additional services and information for **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology** can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://jcc.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://jcc.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://jcc.sagepub.com/content/45/6/959.refs.html

>> Version of Record - May 27, 2014

OnlineFirst Version of Record - Apr 13, 2014

What is This?

Relational Self Versus Collective Self: A Cross-Cultural Study in Interdependent Self-Construal Between Han and Uyghur in China

Marhaba Mamat[1], Wei Huang[1], Rui Shang[1], Tianyang Zhang[1], Hao Li[1], Yao Wang[1], Wei Luo[2], and Yanhong Wu[1,3]

Abstract
Although differences between independent and interdependent self-construals have been extensively investigated, few studies have considered intra-cultural variability in self-construal in China. In the present research, we aimed at exploring ethnic group differences in interdependent self-construal. We first compared self-reported importance of the private self, relational self, and collective self between the Uyghur and the Han—two ethnic groups in China. The results show that the Han viewed the collective self to be less important than the private self and the relational self, while the Uyghur exhibited a different pattern, rating the collective self as more important than the private self and the relational self (Study 1). Three follow-up self-referential memory experiments provided further support for the difference in interdependent self-construal between the Han and the Uyghur. Specifically, only the Han participants exhibited significantly better memories of mother-referenced information than famous-person-referenced information (Study 2). In contrast, only the Uyghur participants exhibited significantly better memories of group-referenced information (Studies 3 and 4). These marked ethnic differences in interdependent self-construal suggest that the Han privilege the relational self and the Uyghur the collective self, thus highlighting the intra-cultural variability of interdependent self-construal in Chinese populations.

Keywords
relational self, collective self, Han, Uyghur

(& , 1 1).
56

[1]Peking University, Beijing, China
[2]Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing, China
[3]Capital Normal University, Beijing, China

Corresponding Author:
Yanhong Wu, Professor, Department of Psychology, Peking University, 5 Yiheyuan Road, Haidian, Beijing, 10087, China.
Email: wuyh@pku.edu.cn

Relational Self Versus Collective Self

Current Studies

1,
(2001) Ħ

Ħ

2
4, ( ) (, , & , 1).

( ) (,).

(& , 1).

(R) (

, K , 1). . (2002)

( ),

/ (R/K) 2, 3, 4,

Ħ Ħ

(

).

Ħ

.

Study 1

Method

Participants.

(1)

24 (1) Ħ

(SD) Ħ

21.42 1.61 1 .5 0. ,

Procedure. (. .,),

1 ,

Results and Discussion

1

.

, , .80,
.66, .61, , H .63, .64, .64, -

Table 2. Means (Standard Deviation) of Rate of Recognition and *R/K* Judgment as a Function of Ethnic Category and Reference.

	Self		Other		Mother		Father		False alarm	
	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur
Recognition	0.81 (0.13)	0.79 (0.14)	0.65 (0.20)	0.74 (0.15)	0.73 (0.15)	0.75 (0.15)	0.71 (0.17)	0.78 (0.15)	0.09 (0.04)	0.38 (0.20)
R	0.56 (0.21)	0.60 (0.19)	0.41 (0.19)	0.49 (0.20)	0.50 (0.19)	0.57 (0.19)	0.51 (0.21)	0.57 (0.20)	0.03 (0.03)	0.22 (0.17)
K	0.25 (0.22)	0.19 (0.11)	0.24 (0.17)	0.25 (0.15)	0.23 (0.20)	0.18 (0.13)	0.20 (0.19)	0.21 (0.15)	0.06 (0.04)	0.17 (0.10)

Note. Recognition = the number of words participants reported have seen/number of total words in each reference condition; false alarm = the number of words participants reported have seen/number of new words, and calculations are the same in the following studies.

),   (   ).   ),
  (   ). H
 ,   .
5-   -   ,   1   *not fitting at all*   5   *extremely fitting.*   -
                                                                      .

                                 .

  Study phase.   ,
                                                                              5,000   .
          30   (. ., 30   ).   500-
      .   ,   1,000   .   ,
                                                        2,000   .
                                              .   500-   -   .
      -        ,   120   .

  Test phase.   15-   ,
            .   120   ,
      120   .   ,
        (   )   .   ,
        .   .   240
                                    (.   ,   , &   , 1   )   -
                                          .

Results and Discussion

                              20 H   20   .   2.
                    4   2   *corrected recognition score* (
                              ),   -
                  -                    [1]
                        , *F*(1, 39) 33.31, *p* .001, 2 .4 *F*(3, 39) .44, *p* .001,
    2 .18,   , *F*(3, 39) 2.5 , *p* .058, 2 .06,   -

4 2

R ^{2} ( ) ,
, $F(3, 36) = 10.51, p < .001, \eta^2 = .22.$,
- - *corrected recognition score*

. .

H
, $F(3, 1) = 5.31, p < .001,$
$\eta^2 = .30.$
($M = 0. 2, SD = 0.14$) ($M = 0.56, SD = 0.20$), - -
($M = 0.64, SD = 0.14$), - ($M = 0.62, SD = 0.15$), $t(1) =$
$6.22, p < .001,$ ' $d = 0.$ $t(1) = 2.2 , p < .05,$ ' $d = 0.5$ $t(1) = 3.3 , p < .05,$
' $d = 0.63.$
, $t(1) = 2.1 , p < .05,$ ' $d = 0.50.$,

H H -

(& , 2002 & , 2002 ., 200).

, - , -

· H ,
R .
-
- , 3,
H
.

Study 3

Method

Participants. . (10
) ,
- . 20 (10) H .
(SD) H 21.25
1.66 21.6 2.52, .

Procedure. 2 4 - . H .
, - (H /),
- (/H), . H
- , . 2,
.

Results and Discussion

20 H 20 3.
2, 4 2 *corrected recognition score,*
- - -
. , $F(1, 36) = 12.2 ,$
$p < .05, \eta^2 = .24$ $F(3, 36) = 26.66, p < .001, \eta^2 = .41.$ H , -
. 4 2 R
, $F(3, 36) = 13.61, p < .001, \eta^2 = .26$ $F(3, 36) = 24.03, p < .001, \eta^2 = .66,$

Table 3. Means (Standard Deviation) of Rate of Recognition and *R*/*K* Judgment as a Function of Ethnic Category and Reference.

	Self		Other		In-group		Out-group		False alarm	
	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur
Recognition	0.84	0.82	0.68	0.70	0.73	0.76	0.63	0.68	0.23	0.44
	(0.14)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.16)	(0.14)	(0.17)	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.22)	(0.17)
R	0.69	0.58	0.49	0.48	0.53	0.56	0.43	0.45	0.10	0.26
	(0.17)	(0.24)	(0.20)	(0.20)	(0.18)	(0.22)	(0.17)	(0.20)	(0.11)	(0.16)
K	0.16	0.24	0.19	0.22	0.19	0.22	0.20	0.23	0.13	0.18
	(0.15)	(0.21)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.15)	(0.16)	(0.15)	(0.18)	(0.12)	(0.13)

, $F(3, 3) = 3.1$, $p = .03$, $^2 = .0$,

R

(, - , - ,)

R

, $F(3, 1) = 1.0$, p .001, $^2 = .4$. ($M = 0.5$, $SD = 0.1$) ($M = 0.3$, $SD = 0.23$), - ($M = 0.43$, $SD = 0.1$), - ($M = 0.33$, $SD = 0.1$), $t(1) = 4.2$, $p = .001$, ' $d = 0.1$ $t(1) = 4.6$, $p = .001$, ' $d = 0.8$ $t(1) = 0.00$, $p = .001$, ' $d = 1.36$. - - , $t(1) = 2.5$, $p = .05$, ' $d = 0.56$.

, $F(3, 1) = 54$, $p = .001$, $^2 = .31$. ($M = 0.32$, $SD = 0.20$) ($M = 0.21$, $SD = 0.15$) - - ($M = 0.1$, $SD = 0.13$), $t(1) = 3.40$, $p = .05$, ' $d = 0.60$ $t(1) = 3.2$, $p = .05$, ' $d = 0$. . - - ($M = 0.30$, $SD = 16$) - - , $t(1) = 3.62$, $p = .05$, ' $d = 0.6$ $t(1) = 2.6$, $p = .05$, ' $d = 0.54$.

R , -

, ℍ , *R*

, -

, -

ℍ (ℍ & ℍ , 200 , 200 . Y , , & ℍ , 200). ℍ , (, , , , & , 1), , - 4, , ,

.

Table 4. Means (Standard Deviation) of Rate of Recognition and *R/K* Judgment as a Function of Ethnic Category and Reference.

	Self		Other		In-group		Out-group		False alarm	
	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur	Han	Uyghur
Recognition	0.74	0.79	0.53	0.68	0.64	0.71	0.60	0.62	0.13	0.24
	(0.13)	(0.17)	(0.16)	(0.17)	(0.18)	(0.18)	(0.15)	(0.20)	(0.08)	(0.12)
R	0.59	0.65	0.37	0.53	0.47	0.56	0.44	0.46	0.07	0.15
	(0.15)	(0.24)	(0.17)	(0.20)	(0.19)	(0.22)	(0.18)	(0.23)	(0.05)	(0.09)
K	0.15	0.13	0.15	0.15	0.17	0.15	0.15	0.16	0.06	0.09
	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.08)	(0.13)	(0.12)	(0.14)	(0.07)	(0.12)	(0.05)	(0.08)

Study 4

Method

Participants. (10)
- 20 (10) H
(*SD*) H 21.
1.1 21.65 1.6 , .

Procedure. 2 4 - . H .
, - ( ),
- ( ),
- - H
2 3,
.

Results and Discussion

20 H 20 4.
, 4 2 *corrected recognition score* R ,
- *Recognition: F*(3, 36) 24.61, *p* .001, 2 .3 *F*(3, 36) 3.56, *p* .02, 2 .0 *R: F*(3, 36) 26.03, *p* .001, 2 .41 *F*(3, 36) 3.23, *p* .025, 2 .06, .

- (, - , - ,)
- H ,
corrected recognition score R *Recognition: F*(3, 1) 16.63, *p* .001, 2 .4 *R: F*(3, 1) 16.44, *p* .001, 2 .4 .
(*Recognition: M* 0.61, *SD* 0.14 *R: M* 0.52, *SD* 0.15) (*Recognition: M* 0.40, *SD* 0.13 *R: M* 0.30, *SD* 0.16), - - (*Recognition: M* 0.50, *SD* 0.16 *R: M* 0.40, *SD* 0.18) - - (*M* 0.46, *SD* 0.12) *Recognition: t*(1) .0 , *p* .001, ’ *d* 3.25 *t*(1) 3.41, *p* .003, ’ *d* 0. 3 *t*(1) 4.3 , *p* .001, ’ *d* 2.01 *R: t*(1) .6 , *p* .001, ’ *d* 1.42 *t*(1) 5.31, *p* .001, ’ *d* 0. 3 *t*(1) 4.5 , *p* .001, ’ *d* 0. .

Recognition: $t(1\ )\ 3.$, p .001, ' d 1. 4 $t(1\ )$ 2.02, p
.05 , ' d 0.1 R: $t(1\ )$ 3.44, p .03, ' d 0.5 $t(1\ )$ 1. , p .06, '
d 0.44.

cor-
rected recognition score R *Recognition:* $F(3, 1\ )$ 10. , p .001, ^{2} .3 R:
$F(3, 1\ )$ 11.52, p .001, ^{2} .3 .

(Recognition: M 0.54, *SD* 0.1 R: *M* 0.51, *SD* 0.21)
(Recognition: M 0.44, *SD* 0.14 R: *M* 0.3 , *SD* 0.16),
(Recognition: M 0.4 , *SD* 0.1 R: *M* 0.41, *SD* 0.1),
(Recognition: M 0.3 , *SD* 0.16 R: *M* 0.32, *SD*
0.1) *Recognition:* $t(1\ )$ 3.5 , p .002, ' d 1.65 $t(1\ )$ 3.0 , p .006, ' d
1.42 $t(1\ )$ 5.0 , p .001, ' d 2.33 R: $t(1\ )$ 3.55, p .002, ' d 0. 0 $t(1\ )$
2. 3, p .01, ' d 0.53 $t(1\ )$ 5.4 , p .001, ' d 1.00.

Recognition: $t(1\ )$ 3.21, p .005, ' d 1.4 R: $t(1\ )$
2. , p .01, ' d 0.53.

R , $t(1\ )$ 2.00, p .06, ' d 0.36.
, H · H ,

,

, . 4 1

H . .

General Discussion

H -
(, , - & , 1 1). H ,

, 1, H

. , -

. 2, H

, -

.

3, .
, 4 -

. ,

H ,

.

- -

,

(, 2004), -

- (& , 2002, &
, 2002 ., 200).

(& , 200 & , 200).
(200),

,

(., 2010). ,
,[3]

(, 2001). ,
, (., 2010
., 200).

R , 3 4
2. , *R*
, *K*
(& , 1 5 , 1). ,
(, , & , 200) *R/K*

(, 2004) *R/K*

R/K , .

(, , , & , 2010 ., 200).

Acknowledgments

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

Funding

Notes

1.
   2, 3   4.   ,   .
2.   *K*   ,   2, 3   4.
3.   H
                        R   2, 3,   4   2 $t(38)$ 6.36, p .001,   ' *d*   2.06
   $t(38)$ 4. , p .001,   ' *d*   1.55   3 $t(38)$ 3.36, p .002,   ' *d*   1.10 $t(38)$ 3.61,
   p .001,   ' *d*   1.1   4 $t(38)$ 3.46, p .001,   ' *d*   1.13 $t(38)$ 3.15, p .003,
      ' *d*   1.02.

References

      , . ., &   , . . (1 66).   . . .   & .
   . H   (.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition* (. 145-164).   Y   , Y
      .
   , . ., &   Y   . (200).   ( )   .
                                       . *Psychological Review, 114*, 133-151.
   , . ., &   , . (1 6).   -
      . *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71,* 63- 3.
   , ., & H   , . (200).   .
   Culture & Psychology, 15, 3-62.
         , . ., &   , . . (1 5).   . *Applied Cognitive
   Psychology, 9,* 1-1 .
      , . . (2004).   -   . *Psychological Review, 111,* 524-542.
   , . (1 8). *Rural China.*   ,   .
   , . (2002).   -   -
         (   ). *Journal of Gansu Lianhe University (Social Sciences Edition), 18,* 1 -23.
         , . ., &   , . . (1 4). *The self.* . . .   & . . .   (.), *Handbook of
   social cognition* (. 1,   . 12 -1 5). H   ,   .
H , .,   , ., . .,   Y   .,   , ., &   Y . (200).   -
                              . *Social Neuroscience, 3,* 1-15.
H , . (1 5).   ,   ,   ,   H   -
         . *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 25,* 115-13 .
H , . (2000).   -   -   H   -
         (   ). *Journal of Qinghai Nationalities Institute (Social Sciences), 26,* 11 -122.
         , .,   , .,   , .,   , .,   , ., &   , . (2002).   -
      .   -   . *European Journal of Social Psychology,
   32,* 261-2 4.

, . (2004).   (   ). *Chinese Muslim*,
6, 22-23.

, . (2003).   (   ). *China Muslim, 5*, 16-1 .

, H. ., &   , . (1   1).   ,   ,   -
. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

, . H., H   , .,   , ., &   , . . (2010).
. *Asian Journal of*
Social Psychology, 13, 3- 1.

, . (2001).   -   . *Social Behavior*
and Personality, 29,   33- 42.

, . (200).   ,   ,   ,
(   ). *China Religion, 10*, 62-64.

, ., &   . (2002).   -   (   ). *Psychological*
Science, 25, 2 5-2 0.

, . .,   , . ., &   , . . (1   ).   -
. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 6   -6 .

, . .,   , . ., &   , . . (200).   . *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 8*, 2- 3.

, . ., &   , . . (1   ).   -   . *Psychological Bulletin, 121*,
3 1-3 4.

, . (200).   (   ). *Journal of Ningxia Normal University*
(Social Science), 1,   1- .

, ., &   , . . (2001).   . *European*
Journal of Social Psychology, 31, 3 -43.

, H . (1   ).   . *Psychological Review,*
96, 506-520.

, . (1   ).   . .   & H . .   (.),
Cognitive neuroscience of memory (. 11-42).   ,   H   H   .

, . .,   , . H.,   , . .,   , . ., &   , . . (1   ). *Rediscovering the*
social group: A self-categorization theory.   ,   .

, . . (2003).   ,   ,   -
. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 39*, 46 -4 5.

, .,   , ., H , ., , ., &   , . (2010).
-                             . *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 5*, 324-331.

, H ., & H   , . (200).   -   -   (   ).
Psychological Science, 39, 235-241.

, H ., & H   , . (200).   -   (   ). *Acta Psychologica Sinica,*
32, 12 -12 0.

, H ·,   , . ., & H   , . . (200).
-                            . *Memory, 16*,   10- 1 .

, . (2005). *An introduction to philosophy.*   ,   .

, .,   , ., &   , . (1   ).
(   ). *Acta Psychologica Sinica,*
30, 5- 2.

, ., &   , . (2002).   -   . *Science in China (Series*
C), 45(2), 120-12 .

, ·,   , ·,   , ., & H   , . (200).   -   .
NeuroImage, 34, 1310-1316.