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Summary

The theory of Individualism and Collectivism (I-C) has been pervasively used in the cross-cultural investigation as a dimension, making a typology of culture. In this project, cross-cultural differences were investigated in how people talk about their society and how the meanings of self are constructed among British and Japanese nationals, from the perspective of Social Representation Theory (Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001). Moreover, how individualistic and collectivistic characteristics are reflected in such representations was investigated. The approach to identity, proposed by Chryssochoou (2003), which assumes a cyclical relationship among Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition to construct the sense of self, was used to investigate social representation of identity.

Three empirical studies were conducted in order to investigate representation of society and identity. The first study investigated the social context in which the meaning of self is constructed and the ‘Self-knowledge’. A series of semi-structured interviews were performed with British and Japanese women in order to elicit the belief about the society and success. Data was analysed by Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (Smith, 1996), in order to understand participants' subjective experience of their society and success.

The second study investigated the ‘Self-claim’ and the social norms reflected in the way people describe themselves in different contexts.
Twenty Statement Test (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954) was used to elicit 10 self-expressions from 106 British and 151 Japanese women university students. Half of the participants were asked to present themselves to their close friends, and the others, to their co-workers. Self-expressions were categorised into Idiocentric, Allocentric, and Group self-references (Bochner, 1994) and positive, negative and neutral self-evaluations (Watkins and Gerong, 1997) in order to identify I-C elements in their self-expressions and to study cross-cultural differences in Self-claims.

The third study investigated social representation of a person and how people conventionally recognise other people among 169 British and 288 Japanese women university students. Participants were presented with 4 self-expressions of a hypothetical person. Self-expressions were manipulated by Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references (Bochner, 1994) in order to elicit the representation of an ‘individualistic’ or a ‘collectivistic’ person. Participants were asked to make judgment about this person in a series of questions. The evaluation of the fictitious person was expected to reveal the social norm which regulated the way an individualistic or a collectivistic person was accepted in British and Japanese societies.

Results from three empirical studies showed consistent meanings given to society and self and cyclical relationships between Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition to construct the sense of self. These studies also identified both individualistic and collectivistic properties in British
and Japanese society to uniquely characterise their cultures. The findings from this thesis supported the importance of meanings given to the social world and the ability of SRT to advance the knowledge in the area of cross-cultural study.
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Chapter 1: Overview of the thesis

This thesis investigates the common sense theory of society and self and how individualistic and collectivistic elements are reflected in it, among British and Japanese nationals.

Since Hofstede’s seminal work (1980, 1984), a large part of cross-cultural research has focused on studying the dimension of Individualism-Collectivism (I-C) as a cultural orientation (Hui & Triandis, 1986; Kim, 1994; Triandis, 1989). The I-C dimension is supposed to determine cultural variation and to produce a framework for a typology of cultures. Individualistic societies are supposed to prioritise the individual over the group and value autonomy, self-reliance and independence, whereas collectivistic societies prioritise social relationships and value social harmony and interdependence (Yamaguchi, 1994). Within this theoretical framework, Great Britain is generally considered as an individualistic country, while Japan, a collectivistic one (Kim, 1994).

The theory of I-C has contributed a great deal to advance the knowledge of cross-cultural differences. However, there have also been criticisms concerning the use of I-C to explain cultural and individual variation. For example, it has been suggested that these orientations may coexist within cultures (Raeff, 1997) and be elicited in accordance with situational demands (Arikawa and Templer, 1998). In I-C theory, there is an assumption that the cultural ideology shapes the psychological functioning of individuals. Such an assumption reflects a confounding of individual
and social level analysis and represents a methodological 'fallacy' (Hofstede, 1980, 1984). Moreover, the studies that confuse cultural orientation of individuals with that of society tend to overlook cultural variation within societies (Dien, 1999; Oyserman et al., 2002), cultural dynamics (Kashima, 2000; Stephen et al., 1998; Xie, 1996), and different forms of expressions that I·C could take (Noordin et al., 2002; Oyserman et al., 2002; Vignoles et al., 2000).

In order to overcome the problems within the cross-cultural research based on I·C theory, this thesis investigates cultural differences from the perspective of Social Representation Theory (SRT) (Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001). SRT is a theory of common sense knowledge and explains the development and the function of common sense knowledge. Under SRT, people construct the socially shared beliefs about the world, which, in turn, constrain their psychological functioning and behaviour in a specific way. Thus, the theory depicts a cyclical influence between society and the individual. Moreover, the theory suggests that people create the socially shared knowledge through socialisation. As different communities have a different socialisation process, people are expected to construct a different understanding of the surroundings between societies. In this respect, SRT shares the theoretical assumption in the cross-cultural psychology which expects a different psychological functioning between people who have a different geographical boundary.

Thus, from the perspective of SRT, the cultural differences are reflected in
the different ways in which people construct socially shared knowledge about their surroundings. If I·C represents a cultural orientation, such elements should be reflected in the common sense understanding of their social world. Farr (1991) argues that I·C is a collective representation. In SRT, it is explained that scientific knowledge is transformed into social knowledge through objectification and anchoring in order to conquer the sense of unfamiliarity. Hence, if I·C is a socially shared representation as Farr suggested, the cultural dichotomy reflected in the theory (scientific knowledge) should be represented into the social knowledge about their society, to a certain extent. At the same time, how scientific knowledge is anchored into social knowledge is different depending on the relevant meta-system operating in that society. SRT explains that a meta-system is one of the cognitive systems that form a representation. A meta-system functions according to rules and assists the 'System', which operates cognitive functions. The rules governing the meta-system reflect social relationships and regulations. Hence, the common sense about the social world, which should reflect a different norm between societies, may not necessarily be consistent with I·C dichotomy.

In this thesis, identity is considered as a social representation and a key concept for cross-cultural differences, linking the social and the individual aspects. There has been an attempt to view identity as SR (Breakwell, 2001; Chryssochoou, 2003; Doise, 1998; Duveen and Lloyd, 1986; Duveen, 2001; Elejabarrieta, 1994; Oyserman and Markus, 1998). For example, Doise (1998) argues the way people conceptualise and describe themselves
reflects social regulations. Moreover, Markus and colleagues (Kitayama and Markus, 1999; Markus and Kitayama, 1998; Markus, Mullaly, and Kitayama, 1997) argue that the concept of identity links the cultural ideology and individual's psychological functioning. It is argued that the idea of self is a part of representation of the social world and thus consistently formed with cultural ideology and influences the specific way that people behave and think in society. Hence, the representation of self seems to link cultural ideology and the individual's psychological functioning and behaviour, which vary between societies.

If identity is a social representation, meanings given to self are constructed in the process of socialisation among the people within a community. If it is the case, it is important to investigate the social context, in which the meanings of self are constructed. Moreover, the meaning of self cannot exist in a social vacuum. That other people should recognise it is an essential aspect for self (Mead, 1934). Further, for others to recognise the self, the meanings given to self need to be publicly claimed. Thus, the ways in which the self is claimed in different contexts also have an important implication to the sense of self. Thus, in order to investigate social representation of self, the social context, in which people construct the meanings of self, how people recognise other people's claim and how people claim about themselves need to be studied.

As an entry point to study representation of self, this study employs the identity perspective by Chryssochoou (2003). Chryssochoou (2003)
believes the identity is a socially shared construction and thus, reflects cultural ideology. In her perspective, identity is comprised of three components, 'Self-knowledge', 'Self-claim' and 'Recognition' which interact with each other to construct the meaning of self. The interactive relationships among these three components reflect dynamic relationships between society and self. These three components in this identity perspective provide a theoretical underpinning to investigate social context in which Self-knowledge is constructed, how self is claimed to others and how others recognise other people's claim. Therefore, it will be used to investigate the meanings given to identity among British and Japanese participants in this thesis.

The first study investigates how the meaning of society is constructed among the British and Japanese participants in order to study social context in which Self-knowledge is formed. Semi-structured interviews were conducted, which included topics, eliciting I-C orientations. The perception of success was regarded particularly important for the representation of society as it reflects the interface between society and the individual. As discussed, the meaning given to society was investigated in this thesis to study the context in which the idea of self is constructed. Thus, the belief about society is expected to be indicative of a culturally specific way in which Self-knowledge is formed in British and Japanese societies.

The second study investigates the social norms that are reflected in the
way people make claims about themselves among the British and Japanese students. The Twenty Statement Test (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954) was used to elicit the self-descriptions. The aim of this study is to find out different social norms that are applied to the self-presentations in different contexts among these cultural groups. Hence, half of the participants from each cultural group were asked to express themselves to a close friend, which represents private interpersonal relationships and others to a co-worker, which represents public interpersonal relationships. The investigation of self-expressions in these specific contexts was expected to elicit different social rules that are applied to self-presentations within the culture.

The third study investigates 'Recognition'. In this study, British and Japanese university students are presented with a fictitious person who was described by Idiocentric, Allocentric, and Group self-references, or mixture of these (Bochner, 1994). The respondents are then asked to make some judgments about this person, such as agreeableness of this person, similarity of this person to themselves and the level of acceptance of this person in British and Japanese society etc. The results of this study inform us how British and Japanese people recognise an 'individualistic' or a 'collectivistic' person and how I-C elements are reflected in such recognition.
Chapter 2: Individualism and Collectivism

This thesis investigates the representations of self and society among British and Japanese nationals and the aim of this chapter is to discuss the theory of Individualism and Collectivism (I-C). I-C is the dimension commonly used in the cross-cultural research. Assuming I-C as a dimension to make cultural typologies, this thesis will investigate how cultural philosophies of I-C are present in a way people talk and understand the society and construct the meaning of self within the British and Japanese society.

According to Kagitçibasi and Berry (1989), the aim of cross-cultural research is

‘to discover systematic relationships between (a) psychological variables at the individual level, and (b) cultural, social, economic, ecological, and biological variables at the population level’ (p.494).

Thus, within cross-cultural perspectives, psychological functions vary systematically between populations living in different cultures. People’s mental activity is influenced by ecological (social and geographical) factors, and thus under the impact of cultural diversity. This perspective is vital in the study of psychology, as it poses a question to the traditional psychological approach, attempting to find a rule that can be universally applied to the psychological processes of all humans (Chrysssochoou, 2004;
Lyons and Chryssochoou, 2000). Assumption of universality reflected in psychological discipline was claimed to reflect the philosophy of Individualism, and thus to be biased towards Western scientific representation (Kagitçibasi and Berry, 1989; Turner and Oaks, 1986).

This thesis aims to investigate how people construct the meaning of society and self, prevailing in British and Japanese societies. This project reflects that part of the social psychological approach, which believes in the dynamic interaction between 'individual' and 'social' aspects. Recently, Chryssochoou (2004) claimed that the aim of social psychology was to uncover the process of *how people are transformed by society and how they transform society* (p.xvii). In this claim, the cyclical relationship between individual and social is reflected. It has been argued elsewhere that individual and social aspects are conceptually inseparable and they construct the meanings of each other (Marková, 1987, 2000a, 2000b). Moreover, Moscovici (1988) argued that social psychology investigates the relationship between the individual and the social object through psychological representation of the social object. For example, it was argued that the shared understandings of events and phenomena among people made the presence of 'society' possible (Moscovici, 1988, 1998, 2001). Socially shared knowledge creates the sense of belonging to the community as well as enabling communication among people by allowing them to have the same frame of reference. Moscovici's claim reflects the interactive relationship between the individual and the social, because common sense knowledge
that is socially shared is represented in the individual’s mind. According to Moscovici’s assertion, how people give meaning to their society is unique from society to society. Moreover, as the meaning of society and the meaning of self dynamically interact with each other, the latter should also vary between societies. This expectation reflects the cross-cultural perspective, as it assumes that individual’s psychological function is bounded by ecological factors. In other words, norms and values and ideologies that are reflected in the common sense of society and self are uniquely determined within a geographical boundary and depend on historical and social background. Hence, as the first step to investigate similarities and differences reflected in the symbolic meanings given to society and self among British and Japanese people, it is important to look at social psychological literature in cross-cultural studies.

Theory of Individualism and Collectivism

Within the cross-cultural literatures, I-C is the most frequently used dimension to measure cultural differences. Even though the concept of Individualism has been present in history for a long time (de Tocqueville, 1969; Lukes, 1973; Tönnies, 1963), it is only since Hofstede’s (1980) seminal work that a large part of cross-cultural research has started to focus on studying the dimension of I-C as cultural orientation (Bond, 1994; Kagitçibasi, 1994; Kagitçibasi and Berry, 1989; Kim et al., 1994). In his work, Hofstede used 4 dimensions to measure cultural orientations of 40
different countries: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism and Masculinity. Within these 4 dimensions, the dimension of Individualism later attracted the most attention. Individualism was defined as the 'relationship between the individual and the collectivity which prevails in a given society' (Hofstede, 1984, p.148). Thus, the concept of Individualism entails the different pattern of relationship between individual and society that is present in societies. Some societies prioritise the individual aspect over social aspects, and others, the other way around. In his study, it was found that the U.S. scored the highest (most individualistic) and Western European countries also scored high in the Individualism index. On the other hand, many Asian, Latin American, and Southern European countries scored low in this index. Moreover, the Individualism index was negatively correlated with the Power Distance index and highly and positively correlated with country level GNP per capita.

The cultural study by Hofstede was highly influential. Soon, the I-C was conceptualised as a dimension that determined cultural variation and produced a framework for a typology of cultures. Individualistic societies prioritise the individual over the group and value autonomy, self-reliance and independence, whereas collectivistic societies prioritise social relationships and value social harmony, personal relationships, and interdependence (Kim 1994, 1997; Schwartz 1990; Yamaguchi, 1994). The North American and Western European societies are often considered to be 'individualistic' societies, and Asian, African, Latin American, and
Southern European societies to be ‘collectivistic’ societies (Markus and Kitayama, 1991).

Moreover, people assumed a direct link between cultural orientation, psychological phenomena (self) and behaviour. Many studies have been conducted in order to measure I-C orientations among those living in ‘individualistic’ and in ‘collectivistic’ societies. For example, the relationship between I-C and self esteem (Feather and McKee, 1993; Tafarodi and Walters, 1999; Tafarodi et al., 1999), self-efficacy (Earley, 1994; Earley et al., 1999; Schaubroeck et al., 2000), values (Oishi et al., 1998; Schwartz, 1990; Schwartz and Bilsky, 1987), emotions (Stephen et al., 1998; Suh et al., 1999), self-descriptions, personality traits, moods (Grimm et al., 1999), interpersonal behaviour (Adamopoulos, 1999), social interaction (Wheeler et al., 1989), norm violations (Verma, 1986), moral judgment (Miller and Bersoff, 1992), deviance (Crystal, 1999, 2000a, 2000b; Crystal et al., 1998), co-operation in social dilemmas (Probst et al., 1999), conflict resolution (Leung, 1987; Leung et al., 1992), attitude towards affirmative action (Ozawa et al., 1996), social sanctioning system (Yamagishi, 1988a, 1988b), personal control (Sastray and Ross, 1998), attribution in parenting (Bornstein et al., 1998) and socio-psychological adjustment (Watson et al., 1998) have been investigated. Regardless of whether the study finds results that are consistent with the I-C theory, the comparison of psychological functions between populations from individualistic and collectivistic societies examines the assumption that individuals in individualistic society should have individualistic and those
from collectivistic society should have collectivistic mental processes.

The links between cultural orientation and psychological phenomena are also reflected in theories. For example, Markus and Kitayama (1991) argued that people in Western countries and non-Western countries had different self-construals, being influenced by cultural philosophical differences. The normative imperative in Western society is 'to become independent from others and to discover and express one's unique attributes' (p.226), which makes people try to become or view themselves as an independent entity. The independent self-construal is characterised by a clear boundary between self and others, and self is defined by internal attributes, which are constant across time and space. On the contrary, the normative imperative in non-Western countries is to 'maintain interdependence among individuals' (p.227), which makes people view themselves as an interdependent entity. The interdependent self-construal is characterised by a fuzzy self-boundary between self and others. The individuals are expected to adjust their internal attributes to maintain harmony. Thus, self-definition or self-perception changes between times and situations and there is no universal self which remains constant. Thus, the theory suggested that people's self-construals were shaped according to cultural philosophy.

Some experimental studies (Jetten et al., 2002; McAuliffe et al., 2003) have investigated the relationship between the individualistic and the collectivistic norm to an individual's psychological functioning. For
example, in a study by Jetten et al. (2002), students at an Australian university were randomly allocated to either an 'individualistic' organisation or a 'collectivistic' organisation. The result has shown that the students who related highly with the individualistic group norm of the organisation showed a higher tendency to 'individualistic' self-stereotyping than those who related lower with the group norm. On the other hand, the students who related highly with the collectivistic group norm of an organisation showed a higher tendency to 'collectivistic' self-stereotyping than those who related lower with the group norm. The result concluded that the group norm could encourage individualistic and collectivistic behaviour in the people within the group. To be specific, individualistic and collectivistic organisational norms encouraged behaviour and attitudes that are consistent with the ideology. This study has found a link between I-C group norm and behaviour that is consistent with the group norm.

Recently, Takano and Osaka (1999) documented the effect of social structural change on an individual's I-C orientation. They discussed the change in cultural orientation among the Japanese in the course of an historical incident. It has been argued that the collectivistic behaviours among the Japanese were striking during the establishment of Meiji government in 1800s and after the defeat in the WWII. Before Meiji era, Japan was governed by the military and was under an isolation policy, whereby the country was closed off from the influence of foreign countries. The establishment of Meiji government represented a shift of political power from the military organisation to the imperial family and the
exposure to cultural influences from foreign countries. The policies undertaken by the Meiji government were influenced by Western politics and Western culture flooded into Japanese society. Thus, Japan was under the threat of outside influence during this period. Similarly, after the defeat in WWII, Japanese society went through a dramatic social transformation. The political ideology of imperialism was replaced by Western democracy. Moreover, economical restoration was on the priority agenda throughout 1970's. In the replacement of pre-existing political ideology with a Western political ideology coupled with instability in its economic system, Japan was again facing a 'threat'. During the dramatic social transformation of these two periods, Takano and Osaka argued that the Japanese has shown the most collectivistic tendencies. They argued that collectivistic behaviour was a natural reaction to the outside threat. When society is going through transformation, society is unstable and there is a threat to cultural heritage. In such chaotic process of social construction, a sense of unity naturally arose among the population from the need to act together and to head towards the same goal. Once Japan achieved the stability in the political system and similar economic status to comparable developed societies, the collectivistic behaviour weakened and people began to focus more on individual interests. The discussion presented by Takano and Osaka reflected the impact of historical changes on an individual's psychological functioning. The possible effect of historical background to I-C orientation (Kemmelmeier et al., 2003) and the link between social structure and psychological function (Crystal et al., 1998; Kagitçibasi, 1994; Triandis, 1994) has been argued elsewhere. Even
though these arguments reflect the effect of social change on people's behaviour or attitude, and in this sense, they challenged the notion of I-C as stable national characteristics, there still is an assumption that I-C orientation is directly linked to the psychological functioning of people in the community.

In addition to the expectation that cultural imperatives should shape the individuals in society, there is also an assumption in I-C theory that individualistic and collectivistic defining characteristics are mutually exclusive to each other. As discussed, the individualistic orientation of societies was represented by scores in the original Hofstede's study. Thus initially, it was not conceived to divide societies into two exclusive categories. However, it was later used in cultural typology, to classify societies into either individualistic or collectivistic groups (Hui & Triandis, 1986; Kim, 1994; Triandis, 1989). Furthermore, as it is assumed that the individuals in society were shaped according to social norms, people's psychological functions were also presumed to be either individualistic or collectivistic. Such conceptualisation has been criticised as rather stereotypical (Killen, 1997) and it has been suggested that both individualistic and collectivistic elements are a part of human nature and should be present in every society (Azuma, 2000; Harrington and Liu, 2002; Kagitçibasi, 1990, 1994; Pilgrim and Rueda-Riedle, 2002; Raeff, 1997; Schwartz, 1990; Shimizu, 2000). The studies investigating child-rearing values found co-existence of two orientations among the Japanese (Ujiie, 1997) and Taiwanese, and American (Wang and Tamis-Lemonda, 2003)
samples, which advocated the idea that both elements were important for human nature regardless of differences in cultural imperatives. Thus, it may not be appropriate to conceptualise I-C as a solid 'either/or' phenomenon that characterises the cultural orientation of one society.

In order to validate the link between cultural orientation and psychological function, many scales measuring the I-C dimension at an individual level have been constructed (Gudykunst et al., 1996; Hui, 1988; Matsumoto et al., 1997; Uleman et al., 2000; Yamaguchi, 1994). Although many of these applied to the original conceptualisation by Hofstede, in which I-C has been regarded as “a single, bipolar, dimension” (1994, p.xi), some incorporated more dimensions to measure cultural orientation. For example, Singelis and colleagues incorporated the dimension of social hierarchy into the dimensions of I-C (Singelis, 1994; Singelis et al., 1995). This measurement introduced the dimension of ‘vertical vs. horizontal’, which is orthogonal to the dimensions of I-C. The dimension of V-H is related to the perception of acceptance of inequality (Singelis et al., 1995). Acceptance of inequality is present in the ‘vertical’ society, whereas rejection of inequality and emphasis on equality is present in the ‘horizontal’ society. Thus, ‘horizontal individualism (H-I)’ refers to the cultural pattern in which people perceive themselves as an independent entity, and individuals are perceived as equal to each other. The ‘horizontal collectivism (H-O)’, on the other hand, refers to the society in which people perceive themselves as a group but equality among individuals is believed to be part of society. The ‘vertical individualism
(V·I)' refers to the cultural pattern in which people perceive themselves as an independent entity, but they accept inequality. Finally, the 'vertical collectivism (V·C)' refers to cultural orientation in which people perceive themselves as a part of a group and inequality is accepted.

The scale by Kashima and Hardie (2000) also measured I·C orientation at the individual level. Instead of assuming that individuals have either an 'individualistic' or a 'collectivistic' self-concept, this scale measured three distinctive aspects of self, 'individual', 'relational', and 'collective' self within individuals. Hence, the development of scales like these challenged the conventional dichotomous concept of I·C and in this respect, contributed to the advancement of knowledge within cross-cultural psychology.

Even though the assumption of a direct link between cultural and individual orientation became prevalent in cross-cultural studies, Hofstede himself observed that the confusion of social and individual analysis was a fallacy. Initially in Hofstede's work (1980, 1984), the dimension of Individualism was conceived as a cultural variation strictly at the societal level (Bond, 1994; Hofstede, 1980, 1994; Kagitçibasi, 1994; Kim, 1994; Kim et al., 1994; Oyserman et al., 2002). Hofstede (1994) commented that the four dimensions (Power Distance, Individualism, Uncertainty Avoidance, and Masculinity) that he used in his analysis were sociological, but not psychological in origin. They are supposed to measure social contexts, but not personality, attitude and values. In the introduction to his work (1980,
Hofstede introduced the concept of 'reverse ecological fallacy'. The 'reverse ecological fallacy' is the fallacy which arises, when data collected at the individual level is used to explain differences at the social level. Hofstede (1994) argued that after his original work, the concept of Individualism tended to be used to measure 'king-size personality' (p.xi) in terms that the psychological data was used to estimate cultural characteristics. Thus, Hofstede argued that the reverse ecological fallacy that he warned against was often committed in cross-cultural research. Doise (1980, 1984, 1986) similarly argued that there were 4 levels of explanations, intra-personal, interpersonal, positional and ideological. He argued that it was important to be aware of the presence of 4 levels of explanations of social phenomena and that integration of the 4 levels of explanation is necessary in the theorisation of social psychological phenomena.

An example of how this fallacy can be misleading is reflected in the study, in which the data collected at the individual level did not support the relationship of cultural orientation at the societal level. In the recent study by Kemmelmeier et al. (2003), the relationship between Authoritarianism and Individualism was investigated among the participants from 7 different societies. The concept of Authoritarianism is reflected in the preservation of social hierarchy, totalitarian power, and conformity to authority (Adorno et al., 1950). In this respect, it was expected that Authoritarianism is negatively related to the concept of Individualism, in which the rejection of totalitarian power is encouraged.
However, the study produced the positive relationship between Authoritarianism and vertical individualism in most of the societies, and even with horizontal individualism among the samples from two post-communist countries. The result has shown as contradicting results from Hofstede’s study, in which the negative relationship between Individualism index and Power Distance index (relating to Authoritarianism) was found at the social level. From the result of this study, the authors warned about making an automatic inference from the individual’s data to social phenomena.

The common sense understandings of the social world and individualistic and collectivistic orientation

Is there a link between cultural and individual orientations? There is no intention in this thesis to disclaim ecological factors influencing the psychological function of individuals who live in a society. As discussed earlier, this thesis follows the social psychological approach where individual and social aspects are believed to interact with each other. If the individual’s psychological phenomena and society dynamically influence and make up each other’s meanings, there is no doubt that the cultural ideologies are reflected within the people who live in a society. However, the question in this project is specifically HOW the cultural orientation has an influence on the individual’s psychological activities.

The question about the link between cultural and individual orientation is also related to how we think about culture. Triandis (1972) claimed that
culture was 'the shared perceptions of social environment'. This definition
reminds us of Moscovici's assertion that was presented earlier. The
common sense understanding of surroundings and events produce the
sense of belonging to the collectivity and make the existence of society
possible. Both of these reflect the idea that the socially shared beliefs
about surroundings are the essential element for the presence of society
and culture. Similarly, Chryssochoou (2004) recently argued that culture
was ‘the outcome of the relationship between the individual and the social’
(p.xxi), including 'common meanings, understandings, and practices among
people in culture' (p.xxi). Here, culture is the product of interaction
between self and society and reflected in commonality in everyday practices
and understanding of the world. These assertions suggest that the
concepts of culture are historically and geographically bounded and are
based upon socially shared understanding of the environment and practice
among the people. Moscovici (2000) further claimed that the target of
study in social psychology was composed of social subjects and the social
reality, which is created by them. Ideologies, values and norms were
produced in the process of making social reality, and thus reflected in, the
social realities. Here, it has been argued that individuals create social
realities or common sense knowledge about their surroundings that reflects
ideologies, and social norms. As a culture represents 'the shared
perceptions of social environment', it is, in a sense, a 'social reality', created
among people in the community. Therefore culture should reflect the
ideologies and social norms reflected in the social reality. If culture
represents the social reality that is created by people in the community,
and ideologies, values and norms are reflected in such a social belief, it is plausible to expect that individualistic and collectivistic cultural ideologies are reflected in common sense knowledge and how people make sense of the world in a particular society.

Further, Chryssochoou (2000, 2004) argued that commonality in common sense knowledge and social practice did not mean that everyone of the same culture has exactly the same understanding of the world. Instead, it reflects people’s belief about others in the community and understanding or behaving likewise. The common sense knowledge reflects the socially shared understanding of how the world works, which exists naturally among the people living in a same community. However, the presence of common sense knowledge is not based on the statistical fact that everyone understands and behaves in the same way, but on the beliefs among people that it is the way others make sense of the world. Considering this point, the commonality reflected in the lay perception is substantially different from the function of the aggregated data collected at the individual level to imply social characteristics. The cross-cultural studies that assumed a direct link between cultural and individual orientation and tried to measure the cultural orientation by the scales measuring individual’s orientation expected that the society was the sum of the individuals that composed it. This assumption is also criticised in the classic social psychological theories of social influence and norm formation (Asch, 1951, 1952; Sherif, 1936), where the group norm was created in order to avoid uncertainty. Norm represents an average position and functions as a
frame of reference for people to behave appropriately. Because norm only reflects an average position, it does not reflect the individual's position within a group. In this respect, the standpoint by Sherif and Asch represents Gestalt approach, where it is believed that the whole cannot be understood by studying its part. As it has been argued, the treatment of individual data for social level analysis is neither methodologically correct nor empirically supported. Thus, instead of the aggregation of individual's behaviours or other psychological functions, it is expected that the commonality in the lay belief that others in the community believe or behave in a same manner as himself/herself, reflects cultural orientation.

Recently, Sampson (2000) argued that the religious philosophy reflected in Protestant Christianity was related to the prevalence of Individualism in Western society. Sampson argued that Protestant Christianity put individuals at the centre of focus and encouraged freedom from traditional social constraints. Protestant Christianity also promoted the philosophy of 'the classical dualisms' (p.1428). In its teaching, mind and body was considered as separate entities and the former was regarded as superior to the latter. Thus, the philosophy of dualism reflects the division of concepts and priority in one of the aspects over the other. In individualistic ideology, self is clearly separated from others and the former has higher priority than the latter. Under the individualistic philosophy, others simply represent instrumental value to the self. In this respect, the philosophical framework in Christianity reflects the philosophy of Individualism. Sampson further argued that the prioritisation of
Individualism was accelerated by the antipathy toward Judaism, in which mind and body was taught to be integrated parts of a person. Within the Jewish religious belief, the sense of self is constructed in a dialogue between self and others. This conceptualisation of self seems to reflect the self-construal prevailing in collectivistic societies (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). Thus, the prevalence of Protestant Christianity and attitude of anti-Semitism were claimed to be responsible for prevalence of and prioritisation of Individualism over Collectivism in the Western societies. Sampson's argument suggests that religious beliefs provided people a framework of what the self should be in relation to others. The teaching in Protestant Christianity emphasised the concept of individuals, which then provided a foundation of how people commonly understand the selfhood in Western societies. This common sense understanding of selfhood reflects individualistic ideology. Thus, this study shows how social reality shared by people reflects cultural philosophy.

Equivalent to the relationship between Christianity and Individualism, the Asian Collectivism was often considered to be a product of the religious ideology of Confucianism (Kim, 1994, 1997). In Confucianism, individuals are considered to be interrelated to others. Individuals are considered to be embedded in the relationship with others and a specific context. Thus, it is a virtue to maintain a harmonious relationship with others and to control behaviours that fulfil the individual's desire and pleasure. The meaning of the individual is bounded to the social role and obligations attached to it (Su et al., 1999). Thus, social positions and ascribed status
were important in terms of making sense of self and interpersonal relationship with others. Confucianism also teaches that the social order reflects a manifested natural order. Thus, it encourages the respect and maintenance of social hierarchy. The Confucian teaching seems to reflect the interdependent self (Markus and Kitayama, 1991) that is supposed to prevail in collectivistic societies and some defining collectivistic characteristics, such as value of harmony, social order and ascribed status (Kim, 1994). Here, Confucianism provides a framework for common sense understanding of what individuals are in relation to others and to society. Thus, the link between common sense understanding of selfhood that originates from religious teachings and values is also apparent in the context of collectivistic societies.

The transformation of the political and economic system also influences the common sense understanding of selfhood and thus, the values and norms reflected in such social realities. Baumeister (1986, 1997) stated that political and economic change in Western society enabled people to become individualistic. In the Western European history, the political power shifted from local to central authority beginning around the 15th century. Under the old political system, the clan and the extended family was the central unit of the power and wealth. A shift of power to a central authority required a shift in the unit of power from the clan to 'individual citizens'. This transformed the focus of value from ascribed interpersonal relationship to individual's autonomy. Around the same time, there was a transformation in the economic system in Western societies. The Feudal
system collapsed which afforded people geographical mobility and gave them the freedom to build interpersonal relationships of their own choosing. This paper shows how the meanings given to self can be transformed in the process of social change. The meaning changed from the self embedded in the context of family and local interpersonal relationship to 'individual' self who has freedom to build his own economic status and interpersonal relationships. The new 'self' reflects an individualistic cultural philosophy. Thus, Baumeister argued that Individualism has emerged out of political and economical change in the Western society.

Hence, there may be a link between cultural and individual orientation. However, the relationship that is argued here is present within the ideologies, values and norms that are reflected in the common sense understandings of surroundings (including the relationship between society and self), instead of as a direct link between cultural ideology and an individual's psychological functioning. This issue will be discussed further in Chapters 3 and 4.

Issues overlooked in the theory of Individualism and Collectivism

The issue of variation among societies categorised either as individualistic or as collectivistic societies

Furthermore, the studies that confounded the individual level with social levels overlooked the variability within societies. Oyserman et al. (2002) found that even though Latin Americans tended to be higher in
Collectivism, they were also as high as the European Americans in Individualism. Furthermore, Indonesians and Singaporeans were equivalent to European Americans in the individualistic orientations. European Americans were lower in Collectivism than Mainland Chinese, but not less collectivistic than Japanese or Korean. Theoretically, Latin Americans and East Asians are categorised uniformly as 'collectivistic' societies, where it is expected they are lower in individualistic and higher in collectivistic orientations than European Americans. However, their levels of individualistic and collectivistic orientations were distinctive from each other in relation to European American counterparts. The study shows the variability in the cultural orientation among collectivistic societies. Moreover, it shows variability in the expression of Collectivism. For instance, both Latin American societies and some Asian societies, such as Indonesians and Singaporeans have shown high individualistic orientations as well as, as high collectivistic orientations as European Americans. However, Latin American culture and Asian culture do not share any similarity at all. They share nothing with regard to historical or geographical background. If both are regarded as 'collectivistic' societies, the way Collectivism is present should be different in these societies.

The similar point was put forward by Dien (1999) who claimed that there are different forms of Collectivism present within Chinese and Japanese societies. It has been argued that even though Chinese people emphasised reciprocal relationships, their form of interdependence was regarded as
between 'distinct individuals'. Thus, Chinese interdependence maintains the concept of 'individuality'. On the other hand, Dien argued that Japanese interpersonal relationships had its roots in the cooperative relationship of the village community. Within the village organization, harmony between the other members within the village was essential, and the obedience to the social norm was absolute priority over individuality. Thus, it was suggested that there is variability in cultural orientation among the 'collectivistic' societies, which is reinforced through social institutions, unique to the society. Moreover as discussed earlier, the study shows a different expression of Collectivism between Chinese and Japanese societies. In China, Collectivism is expressed in the maintenance and respect of social order, whereas in Japan, it is expressed in the group interpersonal relationship. If there is variability in cultural orientation within individualistic and collectivistic societies, it does not seem plausible to talk about cultures in the context of a clear dichotomous concept.

The issue of social change

Moreover, the studies that assumed a direct link between individual and cultural orientation has also overlooked cultural dynamics (Kashima, 2000). Stephen et al. (1998) found that the Japanese students showed less concern for in-group members and stronger tendency for self-reliance than the American students. The result was attributed to the social change within the Japanese society. It was argued that the Japanese are becoming more
individualistic by being exposed to and influenced by individualistic cultures. Xie (1996) also found the personal control as a factor in increasing the sense of job satisfaction and in reducing stress levels among the Chinese participants. As personal control was not traditionally encouraged in the Chinese society, Xie attributed the result to individualistic change within Chinese society and criticised the I-C concept for not reflecting the dynamic aspects of culture.

Arikawa and Templer (1998) found higher collectivistic tendencies among the American students than among the Japanese counterparts. A similar trend was found in a study by Jackson et al., (2000), who investigated the shyness of American and Japanese students. They found no relationship between participants' country of origin and shyness and in addition, the American students scored higher on the Collectivism scale (Hui, 1988). The recent meta-analysis by Takano and Osaka (1999) has also found weak support for the common view of I-C, where Americans were supposed to be more individualistic and the Japanese, to be more collectivistic. They have reviewed 15 empirical studies, which investigated cross-cultural differences between American and Japanese participants and found that only one study produced the outcome that was consistent with the common view of I-C. In 5 studies, the Japanese were in fact more individualistic than the Americans, and in 10 studies, there were no differences between two cultural groups. The results from these studies seem to indicate the effect of social change. I-C characteristics do not seem to be fixed to represent national characteristics, but change depending on the context.
The penetration of individualistic or liberal ideas into collectivistic societies was also proposed by others (Cha, 1994; Gjerde and Onishi, 2000; Ho and Chiu, 1994; Kim, 1994; Miyanaga, 1993).

Recent empirical studies have also shown the effect of social change on I-C orientation. Shafiro et al. (2003) found that Ukrainian women showed more individualistic tendencies than the American women. The authors argued that young Ukrainians became more independent as a result of Western influence after the collapse of U.S.S.R. Moreover, the introduction of the Western economic system caused instability and increased unemployment. This social condition inevitably made Ukrainian women more self-reliant and autonomous, in order to survive in society.

Similarly, Santiago and Tarantino (2002) found that Puerto Ricans scored less in the items representing 'external control' than the Americans and there were no differences in moral accountability in these samples. These results were inconsistent with I-C theory. People from individualistic societies have a tendency to attribute to internal factors, whereas those from collectivistic societies tend to attribute to external factors (Shweder and Bourne, 1984). Moreover, people from individualistic societies tend to view helping others as a personal choice, whereas those from collectivistic societies tend to view it as a social moral (Miller and Bersoff, 1992). Thus, attribution of events to morality was considered to be a tendency found in the collectivistic societies. The inconsistent results were explained as the
effect of individualistic social change within Puerto Ricans, through the gradual transformation of social institutions. Considering these results, the I-C orientation seems to be transformable with social structural change. Thus, the concept of I-C needs to be able to accommodate the 'change', instead of being considered as a permanent variable of cultural and national characteristics (Green Staerklé, 2002).

The issue of meaning given to surroundings

Finally, the studies that assume a direct link between cultural and individual orientation overlook the meanings that I-C can assume in different societies. In the recent meta-analyses, Oyserman et al. (2002) found that the items used to measure the defining characteristics of I-C influenced the result. For example, when 'personal uniqueness' 'value privacy' and 'direct communication' were included in the measurement of Individualism, Americans were more individualistic than the Japanese. On the other hand, when personal uniqueness was not included, Japanese were more individualistic than the Americans. Similarly, when 'group harmony' 'value hierarchy and group goal' and 'define self in the context' were included, Americans were low in Collectivism. However, when 'group harmony', 'value hierarchy and group goal' were not included, Americans were more collectivistic than Hong Kong participants. Thus, contingent on the items of measurement, the observed differences between individualistic and collectivistic societies changed. Assuming that I-C elements co-exist within a society, this effect was rather natural. The
results indicated that Americans were individualistic in terms of personal uniqueness and privacy but also collectivistic in terms of, for example, relationality.

These results were also important, as it showed culture can be uniquely characterised by understanding WHICH defining characteristics of I·C are present in society. Americans were individualistic, because they value personal uniqueness, and privacy. Further, authors discussed elsewhere that when 'sense of belonging to ingroup' and 'seeking advice' were included in the items to measure Collectivism, Americans were more collectivistic than those from the collectivistic counterpart, such as samples from Hong Kong. This showed Americans were individualistic in terms of personal boundaries, but also valued the collectivistic value of relationality. On the other hand, the Japanese can be collectivistic in terms of interpersonal relationship with others, but individualistic in terms of competitiveness (Crystal et al., 1998). Moreover, Chinese Collectivism could be represented in honouring traditional hierarchy and family obligation. However, they are individualistic in the way that they maintain the concept of individuality in interpersonal relationships, which is absent in the interpersonal relationships among the Japanese (Dien, 1999). Thus, revealing which defining characteristics of I·C is present in society gives us deeper understanding of culture beyond I·C categorisation and helps in distinguishing and comparing societies from each other (between and within I·C categories).
Oyserman et al. (2002) further suggested being cautious in the treatment of data that clearly shows individualistic and collectivistic defining characteristics. Even though they did not deny the fact that I-C orientations co-exist within society, they argued that the higher collectivistic tendency in 'sense of belonging to ingroup' and 'seek advice from others' among the American people may not necessarily indicate collectivistic orientation. For the American people, 'ingroup' could represent the group of people that they have 'personally' chosen. Moreover, 'seeking advice from others' may represent 'pleasure in relating to others' (p.20), instead of representing the cultural obligation of maintaining personal relationships. Thus a high score in these collectivistic items may in fact represent an individualistic orientation among the Americans.

Similar proposal has been made in other recent studies. In the occupational setting, Noordin et al. (2002) found both collectivistic and vertically individualistic orientations among Malaysian managers. Compared to their Australian counterparts, they scored higher in vertical collectivism items, which represented 'self-sacrifice' and 'maintenance of harmonious relationship with family' and 'obligations to family'. They also scored high in vertical individualism items, which represented 'competition'. The authors suggested that in Malaysia, children were often trained to identify individual achievement with collective achievement. It is common for parents to push children to work hard to achieve favourable outcomes. Thus, competition does not necessarily represent individualistic characteristics within Malaysian society.
Sinha et al. (2001) also found individualistic and collectivistic orientations among Indian samples. The authors suggested that even though Indian people were generally collectivistic in the situation with family, they could behave in an individualistic manner, when individualistic goals and family demands were in conflict. Moreover, it was quite common among Indians to have inconsistent behavioural intention and observed behaviour in terms of cultural orientation. In this case, individualistic observed behaviours, serving collectivistic intention was a more popular pattern than the other way around. Thus, the authors suggested that even though Indians were generally collectivistic in family situations, they also have the wish to achieve individualistic goals. At the same time, even though the observed behaviours were individualistic, the intention behind the behaviour could be collectivistic.

Takahashi et al. (2002) also found individualistic and collectivistic characteristics among American and Japanese samples in the social relationships. They measured three dimensions of social relationships, affective, instrumental and conflict with different target groups, such as parents, close friends etc. Even though both samples have affection towards family members, the Japanese were reluctant to ask for help from them (high in affective relationship and low in instrumental relationship). On the other hand, Americans were willing to seek help from those who have positive affect (high in affective and instrumental relationship). The difference seems to have revealed a different expression of Collectivism.
The Americans and the Japanese were similar in a way they feel the sense of affect towards the family members (showing defining characteristics of Collectivism: interdependence and connectedness to others). However, the Japanese were reluctant to ask for help from ingroup members, possibly from the fear of being a burden to others, which could interfere with a harmonious relationship. On the other hand, asking for help from family members does not seem to interfere with the harmonious relationship with family members among Americans. Thus the pattern of Collectivism varies between Japanese and American societies.

These recent studies have shown the various meanings of individualistic and collectivistic elements that are present in individualistic and collectivistic societies. As discussed, understanding of which I-C characteristics are present in society would contribute to the better understanding of social characteristics. Moreover, the orientation reflected in observed behaviours did not simply indicate the cultural orientation of the population. Individualistic behaviour may be based on collectivistic intention or attitude, and vice versa. Depending on how meaning is given to the concept of 'ingroup' (Oyserman et al., 2002, Takahashi et al., 2002), or 'competition' (Noordin et al., 2002) in society, it could represent either individualistic or collectivistic orientation. Moreover, Sinha et al.'s study has shown that individualistic behaviour may represent collectivistic intentions. Thus, in order to understand I-C orientations in society, it is important to investigate HOW I-C elements are present in society, as well as WHICH I-C elements are present in society.
The investigation of how people give meaning to their surrounding is important, as it reveals which and how I-C elements are present in society, which contributes to an understanding of the complicated nature of cultural orientation.

**Investigation of the common sense knowledge about social world and self**

To summarise the arguments presented here, the research that confounds the individual and social level of analysis is methodologically incorrect. Moreover, the assumption of a direct link between cultural orientation and individual orientation theoretically overlooked the issues such as, the variability between societies, the effect of social change and how the meanings given to the surroundings show unique expression of I-C characteristics. In order to compensate for these issues, this thesis investigates a common sense understanding of society and self among British and Japanese nationals. As discussed earlier, this project assumes that society and individuals interact in defining the meaning of each other. Society is present in the commonality of understandings and practice among the people. Such commonality is present in the representation within individuals, based on a belief that others in the community behave and interpret the events in the similar way. Hence, the I-C characteristics reflected in social reality are expected to be present in individuals. However, the link does not represent interchangeable meaning between cultural orientation and individual orientation in his/her psychological activity. Instead, cultural orientation of I-C has influence on individuals
in terms that it constitutes the representation of the social world. Moreover, the investigation of common sense beliefs about surroundings does not involve the methodological fallacy that Hofstede (1980) warned against. Finally, the investigation of how people give meaning to society and self should clarify the variability between societies and how I-C uniquely exists within societies. The approach taken in this study also does not treat I-C as stable national characteristics shaped by cultural ideologies. In this sense, it can accommodate the effect of social changes.

Farr (1991) argued that Individualism (as opposed to Collectivism) is a collective representation and a social phenomenon that prevails in Western societies. The ideologies in Individualism are reflected in the common sense understanding of the relationship between self and others. For example, the individual is believed to be an agent who is responsible for his action. Such belief about the nature of individual is then reflected in common practices, such as attribution style, idea of meritocracy and inequality etc. Thus, Farr argued that Individualism should be studied as social representation. Farr's argument supports the idea in this thesis that Individualism is reflected in the common sense knowledge. Thus, this study incorporates his theoretical stand of Individualism as social representation.

Assuming I-C dimensions to reflect cultural typology, it is expected in this thesis that such dimensions are reflected in how people make sense of society and self. Some I-C elements are expected to be present in the
representation of society and self among the British and Japanese, consistent with the theory. According to social representation theory (SRT) (Moscovici, 1988, 1998, 2001), scientific knowledge is transformed into common sense knowledge in order for people to make sense of their world around them. I-C is a concept of scientific origin that produces a cultural typology to understand cross-cultural differences. It is plausible that the concept of I-C was transformed into common sense knowledge for people to understand the differences between the society they live in and others. Specifically, Japanese people may perceive Japanese society as collectivistic, and British may perceive British society as individualistic, as academic concept predicts.

Even though understanding of society and self is expected to reflect I-C characteristics that are consistent with the theory among the British and Japanese participants, there is no assumption in this project that British and Japanese individuals will be shaped accordingly to the cultural imperatives. For example, with the effect of social change, it is possible that individualistic ideologies are reflected in Japanese representation of society and self. Moreover, as discussed, empirical research in the past has shown unique patterns of individualistic and collectivistic ideologies in a single culture. In this respect, investigation of how people give meaning to their surrounding is vital to exploring the issue of social change and the meaning that I-C takes in a society. The purpose of this project is not to validate or confirm whether British and Japanese people are individualistic or collectivistic. Instead, the aim of this project is to find
out which and how I·C characteristics are reflected in the meaning given to society and self among the British and Japanese participants. Hence, this project is expected to find some consistencies with I·C theory, within their common sense theory of society, as a concept making typology of culture. At the same time, it is expected to show how these two characteristics make up the unique orientation of each society and are present naturally in their common understanding of their surroundings.

Investigation of the symbolic meaning is important, as it reveals the complicated configuration of I·C orientation among the population in society. Finding out how and which I·C orientation is present in their society and self should give us deeper comprehension of British and Japanese culture and its differences. In investigating the I·C orientation reflected in common sense understandings of society and identity, this project employs a theoretical framework of social representation (Moscovici, 1988, 1998, 2001). In the following chapter, the social representation theory will be discussed in order to justify its selection as a theoretical framework to study I·C dimensions between British and Japanese nationals.
Chapter 3: Social Representation Theory

The aim of this chapter is to introduce the Social Representation Theory (SRT) (Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001) and to justify the use of this theory as a theoretical framework to investigate cross-cultural differences between British and Japanese nationals. The SRT is a theory of common sense knowledge, which emphasises the importance of social knowledge. The theory reflects the dynamic relationships between society and the individual, by explaining how individuals construct the common sense knowledge about their social world and how such knowledge, in turn, influences their psychological functioning and behaviours. Moreover, in SRT, the common sense theory is constructed via socialisation among the people in the community. Further, the theory reflects normative regulations in the function of meta-system. In these respects, SRT depicts the local boundary and shares a principle with cross-cultural psychology, which expects variability, instead of universality, of human nature between societies. Thus, SRT provides a theoretical framework to investigate the meanings given to the surroundings that differ cross-culturally.

Social representation theory

Social Representations (SR) represents the social knowledge that is shared by lay persons as opposed to scientific knowledge that is shared by experts in the field. Moscovici stated

'Social representations...concern the contents of everyday thinking
and the stock of ideas that gives coherence to our religious beliefs, political ideas and the connections we create as spontaneously as we breathe.’ (1988, p.214)

As suggested here, SR is the knowledge that is naturally present in everyday life. Further, Moscovici (1984, 1988, 1998, 2001) argued that such social knowledge was often treated as inferior to scientific knowledge, as it is considered to represent “primitive”, “irrational” and “illogical” knowledge. This assumption is rejected in SRT and it is considered to be important for social scientists to understand its influence on people. For example, the act of a person who worshiped the representation of god is not irrational or absurd, because of the trust s/he holds (Moscovici, 2001). Such a belief creates a ‘social reality’ and thus becomes meaningful way for this person to understand his world. The importance of trust and social knowledge is also reflected in his explanation for the presence of society (Moscovici, 1998). Moscovici suggested that society is not a mere collection of individuals. Rather, it exists within people’s beliefs about society, including rules, norms, ideologies and values that are reflected in it. This belief becomes social reality and makes the presence of society possible. Hence, SRT emphasises the importance of social knowledge and social reality, as opposed to scientific knowledge and physical reality.

Importance of social knowledge was empirically supported. For example, the study by Moloney and Walker (2002) showed how social knowledge could place a normative impact on people. In this study, the SR of organ
donation was investigated among Australian nationals. Two representations of organ donations were found; 'the gift of life' and 'removal and replacement of body parts'. These representations explained the social phenomenon in Australia, which is characterised by pro-attitude towards organ donations and low-rate of actual organ donation. Thus, this study showed that the investigation of socially shared representations contributes to the understandings of social behaviours and advocated the SRT in terms of confirming the importance of social knowledge.

Even though Moscovici (1988) states that his theory was inspired by the idea of 'collective representation' (Durkheim, 1898), there are distinctive differences between collective and social representations. In collective representation, the idea of a clear duality between the 'individual and collective, person and society, stable and unstable' (Moscovici, 1988, p.218) was apparent. For instance, in Durkheim's theory, collective representation was a pre-made collective consciousness, as opposed to personal consciousness. This idea of representations is rather static and reflects a duality between individual and collective representations. Moscovici (1988) argued that SRT avoided the approach in social psychology which contains the separation between individual and collective aspects. A duality tended to represent methodological Individualism, and thus a bias towards the Western philosophy of Individualism (Billig, 1993; Marková, 1996; Wagner et al., 1999). In SRT, individual representations are constantly transformed into collective representations and collective representations are constantly transformed into individual representations.
The aspects of individual and collective share the same ground and are not mutually exclusive. Moreover, constant transformation of representations advocates the dynamic characteristics in the theory. Thus, SRT reflects dynamic and interactive relationships, instead of separation, between individual and collective representations.

According to Moscovici, the function of SR is to conquer strangeness by transforming it to something familiar. Even though the knowledge of strangeness and unfamiliarity itself may not be a threat to human beings, the novelty is always coupled with the feeling of uncertainty and fear of potential risk it causes. SR functions to take under control of those feelings of threat by transforming novelty into familiarity.

This function of SR also enables the existence of society (Moscovici, 1998). In the process of domestication of the unfamiliar, people come to share the common way of understanding phenomenon and events (social reality), which then creates a sense of solidarity and belonging to a community. Moreover, it also makes communication possible among people within a community. The specific way that the unfamiliar event is domesticated makes a unique frame of reference in the social talk within a community. It has been argued the problems in the communication among people between different groups, such as between medical professionals and their patients, is not due to the lack of information or to the lack of rationality in one part, but to the discrepancy in social representations (Moscovici, 1988). Thus, the domestication of the unfamiliar produces the specificity in the
representation between communities, which makes communication possible only among those who share, at least, a part of the representations. This nature of representations shares the commonality with the assumptions reflected in the cross-cultural psychology. As discussed in the previous Chapter, cross-cultural psychology expects the different psychological functioning between people with a different social and geographical boundary (Kagitçibasi and Berry, 1989). The way common sense is created reflects a variety in representations among different communities and thus, relates to theoretical assumptions in cross-cultural psychology.

In order to domesticate strangeness and take control over unfamiliarity, people 'anchor' and 'objectify' the new objects. In SRT, most of the unfamiliar knowledge is supposed to come from reified world. A new idea originates from the scientific world and is then transferred to the social world through anchoring and objectification. Anchoring involves the transformation of unfamiliar knowledge into knowledge that is already familiar (Doise, 1993; Moscovici, 1988). An example that illustrates the anchoring process is how AIDS became socially shared knowledge. When AIDS was first found in the medical science and the symptoms of AIDS were first known to the public, it was compared to the existing sexually transmitted illness, and people believed that it prevailed only among the homosexual people (Joffe, 1996a, 1996b). This shows the attempt to classify the new idea into something familiar in order to take control over the fear arisen from unfamiliarity. Objectification represents the process
in which the abstract becomes the concrete image. Through objectification, the abstract knowledge becomes 'physical and accessible' (Moscovici, 1984, p.38). As an example, Moscovici argued that people compare God, which is invisible and inaccessible, to a father. By giving a clear physical image, the abstract concept becomes manageable. Thus, through anchoring and objectification, the strange idea becomes familiar knowledge, and people can talk about in everyday life.

In SRT, communication is not a secondary concept. Moscovici argues that 'communication and representation are considered to be the twin phenomenal of social knowledge' (2001, p.28). It is argued that representation is constantly made and its contents are constantly changing in the process of communication. Thus, the nature of representation is changeable in the communication and anchoring process. For example, the study by Wagner et al. (1995) showed the common sense understanding of sperm and ovum contained the sex stereotype which was not apparent in the functioning of these within the scientific discourse. This study showed that the SR can be formed differently from scientific knowledge, and supported a dynamic aspect of representations.

Objectification and anchoring follow the principle of the 'normative meta-system' (Moscovici, 1976). It is argued that thinking involves the operation of two cognitive systems: 'system' and 'meta-system'. The function of 'system' is to operate the cognitive mechanisms and the function of 'meta-system' is to assist the function of 'system' by selecting the
materials according to the rules. The rules reflect norms and social relationships. Thus, common sense theory reflects normative regulations. Hence, function of meta-system creates the variability of representations between societies. This also advocates the assumption in the cross-cultural psychology (Kagitçibasi and Berry, 1989), which expects variability in human nature.

SRT also explains variations in the common sense knowledge (Doise, 1993). For example, Moscovici (1976) identified 3 different representations of psychoanalysis in publications in France: 'diffusion', 'propagation', and 'propaganda'. Depending on the purpose of the publication, psychoanalysis was conveyed either in a neutral (diffusion), an instrumental (propagation) or a negative (propaganda) manner, to create the different representations among the readers (Doise, 1993; Wagner et al. 1999).

Further, Doise (1992-3) proposed three different types of anchoring, which constructed individual variations in representations. The analysis of the psychological level of individuals shows the different representations depending on general beliefs and values that individuals hold (psychological anchoring). The analysis of the social and psychological level provides the individual variations created due to the way people represent the relations and positions of different social categories (social psychological anchoring). Finally, the analysis of sociological aspect presents how variations are produced due to the particular social
memberships to which a person belongs (sociological anchoring). Variations in representations via these types of anchoring have also been empirically supported. For example, representation of new food was differently constructed among people of different age, gender and level of education (Bäckström et al., 2003), showing the effect of sociological anchoring. People who have different level of contact with drugs constructed different representations of drug use behaviour (social psychological anchoring) (Echebarria Echabe et al., 1992). Finally, the studies of Human Rights (Doise et al., 1994;; Spini and Doise, 1998; Staerklé et al., 1998) showed that a group of people with different values tended to hold a distinctive degree of faith in the governmental efficiency and in personal effect with regard to the enforcement of HR (psychological anchoring). Hence, even though socially shared, the concept of SR also reflects the variations.

Application of Social Representation Theory to this thesis

The issue of variety within societies

So far, the theory of SR has been described. Now we need to discuss why this particular theory was chosen as a framework for this study. As discussed in Chapter 2, the issues of variability within a society, social change, and meanings given to the social world were often neglected in the cross-cultural research of I-C. SRT provides a theoretical framework for investigating these aspects overlooked in the cross-cultural research.
In terms of the first aspect, variation in the representations is explained in the SRT. As discussed, SRT explains that representation is formed in the process of socialisation and reflects the social regulations by the function of meta-system. Thus, different representations are expected among people from different societies. From the perspective of SRT, it is unlikely that all the 'individualistic' societies, such as Western European and North American societies and all the 'collectivistic' societies, such as Eastern and Southern European, Latin American, African, and Asian societies, hold exactly the same understanding of their surroundings. The representation of their surrounding should vary between societies within individualistic and collectivistic categories, as each society has a unique socialisation process within its different geographical boundary. In this respect, SRT allows us to study the cross-cultural differences between 'British' and 'Japanese' societies, instead of between one of the 'individualistic' and 'collectivistic' societies.

Recent study by Coon and Kemmelmeier (2001) has shown the variability in I-C orientation among the minorities in the U.S. They have found higher collectivistic tendencies among the Asian and African Americans than did European Americans. This tendency was not found among the Latinos in the U.S. Moreover, African Americans showed highest individualistic tendencies. Thus, this study revealed the different expressions of I-C among ethnic minorities in the U.S. The cultural orientation of African Americans, high individualistic and collectivistic orientations, was analysed as the result of their need to incorporate the
mainstream values of individual uniqueness, as well as their need for coherence to their group identity in order to fight against the continuous prejudice that they face in everyday life. Thus, the sense of self and I-C orientation reflected in it are differently formed even among the ethnic minorities in the same society, depending on social and historical factors. The SRT could explain this kind of differences in I-C orientation as a type of anchoring and thus affords variability in cultural orientation.

The issue of social change

Secondly, the SRT reflects the concept of social change. As discussed, SRT reflects the dynamic social aspects and explains the constant change of representations via the process of communication. The papers by Philogene (1994, 2001) and Oyserman and Harrison (1998) showed how the social representation of African Americans has changed in the course of the history. Philogene (1994, 2001), for instance, argued that the increasing popularity of the term 'African American' changed the social representation of black people in American society. The term, 'African American' represented cultural origin, instead of ethnic origin, and thus contributed to decreasing the negative connotations that are attached to ethnic representations, such as the history of slavery and racial discrimination. Moreover, 'African American' was particularly preferred and used among younger African Americans with higher educations. This has also improved the SR of African Americans, as the iconic image of an African American came to contain highly educated successful people. This
argument by Philogene shows how representation of African Americans fluctuated in the communication process. Thus, social change can be explained in SRT, as it expects dynamic aspects of society.

In terms of I-C research, SRT allows us to conceptualise I-C as a dynamic changing content, instead of stable national characteristics. The SRT perspective provides us with an explanation for transformation in the individualistic or collectivistic orientation of people within a society. As discussed in Chapter 2, Takano and Osaka (1999) argued that the Japanese tended to show the collectivistic tendencies, when society was under the threat from the foreign influences and its political and economical structure was unstable. Once they have achieved the stability in the social structure and the financial security, the Japanese people came to prioritise self-interests. This analysis showed the fluctuating property of I-C orientation in the course of social and historical change. The SRT can explain such a social change in cultural orientation, and thus, is a useful tool to investigate cross-cultural differences.

The issue of meaning given to the social world

Most importantly, SRT provides a theoretical framework that allows us to study the meaning given to the environment. As discussed in Chapter 2, seemingly individualistic and collectivistic defining characteristics could represent different meanings. Collectivistic characteristics, ‘seeking advice’ and ‘sense of belonging’ could represent individualistic
characteristics in the American context (Oyserman et al., 2002), and individualistic characteristic, such as 'competitiveness', could represent a collectivistic characteristic in the Malaysian context (Noordin et al., 2002). Moreover, Vignoles et al., (2000) recently argued that distinctiveness is universally important for the identity process, even though the meaning given to distinctiveness is different between cultures. In the Western societies, distinctiveness is important in terms of establishing a unique quality from other people. On the other hand, distinctiveness has an important meaning in terms of separating one's social position in Asian societies. Thus, even though the attached meaning is different, 'distinctiveness' is an important element for identity structure across cultures. This study showed an importance of investigation of the meaning in the cross-cultural studies, as a similar psychological mechanism can be attached with a very distinctive meaning in a different social context.

Moreover, it has been argued that I-C defining characteristics can represent an asymmetrical relationship between different social groups. It has been argued that the emphasis on distinctiveness and personal uniqueness was a feature found in the dominant social group whereas the emphasis on collectivity was found in the subordinate social group (Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1988, 2001; Lorenzi-Cioldi and Clémence, 2003). Lorenzi-Cioldi and Clémence (2003), for example, distinguished three types of mental representation of group: Aristotelian, prototypical, and exemplar types. The Aristotelian type of mental representation represents
homogeneous and interchangeable group membership. The prototypical type of mental representation of a group consists of a prototype and examples that share a certain amount of defining characteristics with the prototype. Thus, in the prototypical group type, examples are not interchangeable, but at the same time, not distinctive from each other. The mental representation of an exemplar-based type group does not contain an abstract image of a group and it is computed later from the various members of the group. Thus, each element was considered to be unique and not to be replaceable by the others. A series of empirical studies have shown that the dominant social group tended to have a mental representation of a group based on exemplar type, whereas the subordinate group tended to have a group representation based on either the prototypical or Aristotelian type. Lorenzi-Cioldi (1988) for example, found that the people in the subordinate social group tended to perceive their group as an aggregation of individuals, whereas those in the dominant group tended to perceive their group as a collection of unique individuals. Jackman and Senters (1980) similarly found that the aggregation type of group representation was more apparent among women, African Americans and the lower social economical status groups. These results show that the emphasis on distinctiveness is a phenomenon among the powerful group. Uniqueness of individuals makes their existence more special and irreplaceable. On the other hand, the emphasis on the group characteristics places less importance on individuals, conceptualising that they are meaningless and interchangeable. Thus, defining characteristics reflected in I-C could represent a power relationship between social groups.
The investigation of meanings given to the surrounding should reveal whether the social norm relating to prioritisation of individual uniqueness or collective benefit represents asymmetrical power relationships or other I-C characteristics. For example, even though Japan is still considered to be one of the collectivistic societies, it is a society that has established the similar standard of living and social power to the Western counterparts. Thus, if the Japanese people show the trend to prioritise collective benefit over the individual uniqueness, it is unlikely that this tendency represents the asymmetrical power relationship. It is more plausible that it represents the other meanings reflected in the I-C theory, such as importance of social harmony.

Thus, the investigation of meaning has a lot to offer for cross-cultural studies. The distinctive ways that British and Japanese nationals create common sense knowledge about their social world should reveal specific expressions of individualistic and collectivistic characteristics. In this respect, the SRT approach to the cross-cultural studies should give detailed understanding of cultural orientation and thus contributes to the knowledge in cross-cultural psychology.

The theoretical framework to investigate social norm in identity

Finally, SRT perspective provides a theoretical framework to investigate the social norm reflected in identity. Identity or self is the concept, which
seemingly represents distinctiveness or uniqueness from other people. It is usually conceived as an idea that is free from normative social influence and that is contained within individuals as private psychological functions. However, as discussed, SRT rejects a dichotomy between the concept of the individual and the social. Under this theoretical framework, identity is not exceptional of other ideas, whose meaning is constructed within a community. In this respect, the self-concept is socially made and the sense of self is under the influence of the social norm.

In what specific way does SRT explain the normative influence on identity? As discussed, SRT stipulates a function of the normative meta-system, which reflects social regulations. If identity is a social representation, the way self is understood and described to others should be specific within a community and reflect social norm. For example, Makris-Botsaris and Robinson (1991) found physical appearance was highly correlated with self-worth among both American and Greek youths. The study shows that physical attractiveness is an important dimension in the sense of self for adolescents and thus indicates normative influence reflected in the concept of identity.

Jodelet (1993) studied the representation of physical appearance between different social classes. Upper class people believed that physical appearance indicated psychological characteristics, such as personal characteristics, and intelligence. On the other hand, lower-middle class people believed that the physical appearance indicated the social class, but
not the other psychological characteristics of a person. This study showed the different meanings given to physical appearance between social classes, which can influence the sense of self of people belonging to these social groups.

This thesis aims to investigate cross-cultural differences in how people construct the meaning of self among British and Japanese nationals. Moreover, it studies how I-C elements were reflected in such meaning of identity in these societies. By applying the perspective of SRT, and conceptualising identity as SR, it becomes possible to investigate the socially shared meaning of and the norms reflected in identity among British and Japanese people. Therefore, SRT was chosen as a theoretical framework in this thesis. How identity is conceived as SR will be discussed further in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4: The meaning given to self and identity

Cross-cultural research of identity between individualistic and collectivistic societies

In the previous chapters, it was argued that there was an assumption that cultural imperatives shaped psychological functioning and in particular, self-conception. Many cross-cultural studies have been conducted in the past between individualistic and collectivistic societies, trying to reveal how social and cultural imperatives shaped the different selves (Baumeister, 1986; Bochner, 1994; Cousins, 1989; Eaton and Louw, 2000; Greenwald and Pratkanis, 1984; Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Ma and Schoeneman, 1997; Rhee et al., 1995; Sampson, 1988; Trafimow et al., 1991; Triandis, 1989; Watkins and Gerong, 1997; Watkins et al., 1998).

Some theorised the differences in self-concept prevailing among individualistic and collectivistic societies, such as ‘independent’ vs. ‘interdependent’ self construals (Markus and Kitayama, 1991), and ‘self-contained individualism’ (Sampson, 1977). For example, Markus and Kitayama (1991) argue that the normative imperatives of Western cultures are ‘to become independent from others and to discover and express one’s unique attributes’ (p. 226). In order to achieve this cultural goal, the self in Western societies is constructed as clearly separated from others and the references for an individual’s behaviours are in the internal feelings and thoughts of his/her own. Thus ‘independent’ self-construal that prevails in Western societies is characterised by a clear self-other boundary and stable
internal attributes. The self is an abstract construct that is defined by internal attributes that are independent of context. On the other hand, the normative imperatives of non-Western cultures are ‘to maintain...interdependence among individuals’ (p.227). Within this cultural goal, others are essential in defining the self and the references for an individual’s behaviours are in the feelings and thoughts of others. Thus, the ‘interdependent’ self-construal that prevails in non-Western societies is characterised by a fuzzy self-other boundary and context-specific internal attributes. The self is a concrete construct that is defined by internal attributes that are specific to the situation or in relation to others.

Some empirical studies confirmed the theory of self by Markus and Kitayama (1991). For example, Cousins (1989) carried out a ‘Twenty Statement Test’ (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954) to compare the self-concepts of American and Japanese students. Participants were asked to describe themselves either free of any specific context, or within a specific context such as ‘at home’ or ‘with your close friends’. It was found that American students described themselves by internal attributes more than Japanese students in the former test, whereas they used more ‘qualified’ attributes instead of internal attributes in the latter test. The ‘qualified’ attributes such as ‘I am often lazy at home’ implied that the respondent was lazy in a particular situation, but not in the other situations. The use of ‘qualified’ attributes in the context-specific condition indicates needs of Americans to emphasise the presence of internal attributes outside the influence of the
situational restriction. In this respect, the results seem to support the self-construal theory by Markus and Kitayama (1991). Hence, the result implied the existence of an 'independent self-construal', which is shaped by individualistic cultural ideology among the Americans.

Others explained the cross-cultural differences in the self-concept by the relative salience of distinctive aspects of selves: private, public, collective selves (Triandis, 1989), personal and collective selves (Greenwald and Breckler, 1985; Reid and Deaux, 1996; Trafimow et al., 1991, 1997), and individual, relational and collective selves (Kashima et al, 1995; Kashima and Hardie, 2000). For example, Triandis (1989) argued that the sense of self consisted of three aspects of self: private, public and collective selves. Private self represents 'cognitions that involve traits, states, or behaviors of the person' (p.507). Public self represents 'cognitions concerning the generalized other's view of the self' (p.507). Collective self represents 'cognitions concerning a view of self that is found in some collective (e.g. family, co-workers, tribe, scientific society)' (p.507). Triandis argues that the complexity, the probability, and sampling of these aspects vary in different cultural contexts, depending on: the complexity of society, tight vs. loose social structures and Individualism and Collectivism. Social complexity represents the number of ingroups to which a person can belong in a society. When there are many ingroups that a person can belong to, the feeling of obligation and loyalty to one specific group becomes less intense. Tight vs. loose social structure represents the degree of rigidity for ingroup members to act accordingly to the ingroup norms. Tight social
structure is often found among the homogeneous cultures, where ingroup members feel strong force to behave accordingly to the social norm. On the other hand, loose social structure is often found in the heterogeneous cultures. Heterogeneous cultures contain many different ingroup norms within a society. In such societies, the force to obey the specific ingroup norm becomes less intense. The final dimension of Individualism and Collectivism represents prioritisation of self or others.

According to Triandis, Western societies tend to be characterised by a complex and loose structure and individualistic orientation. A complex social structure allows individuals freedom to choose the ingroups of which a person becomes a member, making them less dependent on the others or the group. A loose social structure obliges individuals to act accordingly less to the specific ingroup norm. Finally individualistic philosophy emphasises the aspect of self over the others or a group. All these aspects contribute to make a complex structure of private self, which becomes so salient for people that they sample this aspect more often than other aspects. On the contrary, non-Western societies tend to have less complexity, a tighter structure and collectivistic orientation. They tend to have a few ingroups to which a person can belong, which makes individuals more dependent on the ingroups they do belong to. A tight social structure forces individuals to obey rigidly to the ingroup norms. Finally, collectivistic philosophy emphasises others and collectives over the individual. All these aspects contribute to making more complex structures of public and collective selves, which become salient to people, so
that they sample these aspects more often than they do the private self. Hence, Triandis explains a variation in the self-concept prevailing in Western and non-Western societies by the difference in complexity and in the probability of the three self-aspects to be sampled by individuals that are determined by the type of social structure and cultural ideology.

There is no doubt that these theories and empirical research in I-C contributed a great deal to the understanding of the cross-cultural differences in identity. However, the assumption that cultural imperatives shape self-related psychological functions reflects a kind of social determinism. Moreover, as already discussed in Chapter 2, this approach tends to overlook the importance of meaning. Within the assumption reflected in I-C research, social imperatives are conceived as uniform and concrete. Moreover, the direction of influence is conceptualised as in one direction, from the social to the individual. For example, in the above study by Cousins (1989), the social imperatives, such as priority of self and a clear separation between self and others, are expected to be present uniformly within the American culture. Moreover, such social norms are assumed to have shaped the conception of self as an abstract entity, which was reflected in the self-descriptions among American students. Similarly, Triandis’s theory assumes that the Western societies have a complex, and loose social structure with individualistic orientation, whereas non-Western societies have a less complex with a tight social structure and collectivistic orientation. This expectation represents uniform representations prevailing among Western and non-Western
societies. Moreover, such social characteristics are assumed to shape the self accordingly. This reflects the unidirectional influence from social to individuals.

Application of the theoretical perspectives of Social Representation to the investigation of identity

Instead of viewing identity in a rather socially deterministic way, this study investigates how the meanings of identity are constructed differently between societies, from the SRT perspective. As discussed in the previous chapter, the theory of SR provides a theoretical framework to investigate the social norm within the concept of identity. As Doise (1998) argues, identity can be conceived as a 'cognitive organization, oriented by a meta-system of social regulations' (p.14). There are certain commonalities in how people describe (what language is used) and conceptualise the self within a society. For example, Doise and Lorenzi-Cioldi (1991) found that there was a similarity in the way Swiss students described themselves and their friends. This highlights a socially shared organised principle within the group which specifies the way people think about and describe the self or other people. Moreover, Doise argues that people can answer personality questionnaires only when there is a common sense theory of identity that reflects social regulations. When people describe their personal qualities, they have to refer to a common frame of reference. For example, people can only decide whether they are 'shy' or 'extravert', compared to the common reference of the average 'shyness' and the average 'extravertness'. This common frame of reference represents a norm or an
average tendency of a person, which is shared in a specific community. In this respect, he argues that personal identity is only possible as long as there are socially shared dimensions upon which individuals can position themselves. Thus, personal identity reflects normative regulations within the community and is 'a social representation, an organizing principle of individual positioning in a field of symbolic relationships between individuals and groups.' (1998, p.23). If identity can be conceptualised as a social representation, the meanings given to identity should be differently constructed in the socialisation among people between different societies. Therefore, the SRT perspective can be applied to the cross-cultural investigation of identity.

There are other identity theories, of course, which considered the social influence on the sense of identity. For example, the theory of 'Symbolic Interactionism' (Blumer, 1969; Cooley, 1902; Mead, 1934) and Role theories (McCall and Simmons, 1978; Stryker, 1987; Stryker and Statham, 1985) also reflect the link between individual and society. Mead (1934) argues that individuals form the sense of self in the interaction between their mental activity as an agent, 'I' and social norms, values and rules, represented in 'Me'. Moreover, role theorists argue that people construct their identities from the multiple roles they play in their lives and the symbolic meaning attached to them. Thus, both in Symbolic Interactionism and Role theory, 'social' aspects are an essential part of the sense of self.
However, unlike SRT, these theories do not provide a theoretical framework to investigate how the meanings of identity are differently constructed among people between in different societies. As discussed, SRT can be applied to investigate cross-cultural differences, as it theorises the development of common sense knowledge that has an important implication to cultural differences. The different meanings given to surroundings would form a different way of conceptualising the self, as well as a different psychological process, such as a specific way to rationalise the event. Even though Symbolic Interactionism and Role theory capture social influences on the sense of identity, they are not intended to explain and thus do not theorise how cultural variation came about to construct a different sense of self between societies. In other words, cultural differences are expected to be 'there' to create a different sense of self. Thus, in this study, identity is investigated from the SRT perspective instead of a perspective of other identity theories, such as Symbolic Interactionism.

The SRT perspective on identity was also taken on board by other cross-cultural social psychologists. For example, in the recent thinking of Markus and colleagues (Kitayama and Markus, 1999; Markus and Kitayama, 1998; Markus, Mullally and Kitayama, 1997), a framework for meaning given to a person is provided by the social contexts in which people participate. The way the person is understood in a specific community is embedded in the cultural icons, images, symbols and narratives. Moreover, a specific understanding of the person provides a
specific pattern of behaviour. Hence, they proposed an interactive relationship between a specific meaning attached to the social world and a pattern of behaviour and psychological activity, mediated by personhood.

This cyclical link between culture, personhood and individual's psychological activity is illustrated in their discussion regarding cross-cultural differences in personality coherence between Western and Eastern societies (Kitayama and Markus, 1999). In the West, the cultural ideologies reflect an individual-focus, such as the free will of individuals and natural rights (instead of natural order) as a human. In order to be coherent with such cultural meanings, the personality coherence is achieved by 'consistency'. A person is believed to be an 'independent' and 'autonomous' entity, which is defined by a clear boundary and by internal attributes that are consistent across situations. Within this belief about the person, situational factors to the self are not emphasised and behaviour is conceived as an outcome of the internal elements of self. This view of the person determines a specific pattern of psychological mechanisms, such as a tendency to attribute the reason for behaviour to the elements of the actor, as reflected in the theory of 'fundamental attribution error' (Ross, 1977) and the norm of consistency between attitude and behaviour, as reflected in the 'theory of reasoned action' (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1974; Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980), the 'theory of planned behavior' (Ajzen and Fishbein, 1980) and the theory of 'cognitive dissonance' (Festinger, 1957). Hence, personality coherence is achieved in 'consistency' in the Western view of personhood, which mediates psychological activities and cultural
For the Eastern world view, authors specifically gave the example of how personality coherence was achieved within the Japanese society. In Japan, the cultural ideology is characterised by a mixture of various social elements. In order to be coherent with such mixed characteristics in the cultural meanings, personality coherence is achieved in the 'balance' between seemingly antagonistic elements: the official frame and the personal frame. The official frame is characterised by rigid and rule-based interpersonal relationships reflecting the Confucian philosophy, and when in this frame, people try to maintain the social order and to fulfil duties prescribed by the social role. On the other hand, the personal frame is characterised by the importance of empathy, compassion and self-transcendence, reflecting Jodo Buddhism philosophy. When in this frame, people try to be considerate to each other and to internalise other people's feelings and thoughts. Kitayama and Markus (1999) argue that within Japanese personhood official and personal frames co-exist together across time and situations and people are expected to be able to switch between them and behave appropriately, as the situation demands. Thus, the personal coherence in Japanese society is maintained by 'balance' and this belief about a person is consistent with cultural ideology and creates a specific psychological pattern.

Thus, recent thinking by Markus and colleagues reflect how the meanings of identity are constructed differently between individualistic and
collectivistic societies and depict an interactive link between cultural ideology and an individual's psychological functioning through the meanings given to personhood.

Oyserman and Markus (1998) also conceptualised identity as SR and discussed the differences between philosophy of Individualism and Collectivism and how it influenced the meaning and sense of self in different societies. Drawing upon Lebra (1992) and Markus and Kitayama (1991), they argue that the Western personhood represents an independent and autonomous entity, which has a clear separation between mind and body, reflecting the Cartesian cultural ideology. Focus on the individual in the Western personhood enforces the value of self-control and the belief of an innate potentiality for success. Because of the belief in innate potentiality, people try out different things to investigate their potentiality for success. On the other hand, the Eastern self represents an interdependent entity, reflecting Eastern religious philosophies, such as Shintoism, Buddhism, and Confucianism. In Eastern religious philosophies, the self is embedded in the context, submerged in the natural environment and represents an interaction between the mind and body. Such context-embedded self in Eastern societies enforces the value of interpersonal harmony and social order. Within this belief about personhood, people need to fulfil their obligations and live up to the required social standard in order to achieve success, which can only be accomplished by persistent effort. Under this belief system one can achieve, as long as one makes an effort. The argument by Oyserman and
Markus (1998) reflects the link between the different meanings given to personhood and a specific psychological and behavioural pattern (such as the value and meaning of success) in the Western and Eastern societies.

How are the cross-cultural differences in the meanings given to identity between British and Japanese society investigated in this thesis: the Approach to identity: Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition (Chryssochoou, 2003)

Investigation of social context, recognition, and claim about the self to study meanings given to identity in different societies

So far, the problems in the cross-cultural study of identity have been discussed. We introduced, then, the idea of identity from the SRT perspective, which is taken on board as a theoretical framework for this thesis. It is now necessary to argue specifically how this thesis investigates the social representation of identity in British and Japanese societies.

As discussed in Chapter 3, people in a community hold a shared understanding of the social world. Such shared understandings, i.e. the common sense theory about the world they live in, are developed through the socialisation among the members of the community. As Markus and colleagues and Oyserman and Markus (1998) argued, the sense of self, whose concept links cultural ideology and individual's psychological functioning, is a part of a shared understanding of the social world. If this is the case, the meanings given to self are also constructed through the socialisation among the people in the community.
For instance, in the research on the social representations of gender identities among children, Smith and Lloyd (1978) found that female adults tended to select gender-consistent toys to play with newborns. Even though babies are neutral in terms of how they look or what they do, adults still projected representation of gender to a baby in its interaction. Thus, children seem to learn the meaning of gender, which is shared in a community, partly through socialisation with adults and incorporate it in their identity to become a member of society (Duveen and Lloyd, 1986; Duveen, 2001). The research on gender identity shows how meanings of identity come to be shared through social interaction with others and are incorporated in the sense of self.

If the meaning of self, i.e. the knowledge about self, is constructed through socialisation with others within the community, people from different communities should construct different meanings of self. If this is the case, in order to understand the cross-cultural differences of identity, it is important to investigate the social context within which people talk and construct the meanings of identity. Doise (1998) argued that social regulations were reflected in personal identity. Arguments presented by Markus and colleagues and Oyserman and Markus (1998) reflected how the social context intervened in the construction of meaning given to personhood in different societies. Following these arguments, investigation of social context, i.e. how people give meaning to their society, should show the specific way that people construct the knowledge about
themselves in society.

Moreover, knowledge about self cannot be present without having people to recognise the self and the self-claim. Marková (2000b) argues that within human sciences all cognitions and communications that are studied are dialogical. Unlike natural sciences, human and social sciences do not deal with objective knowledge. An individual's cognition does not represent solely and purely the product and property of the 'individual' but the product of its interaction with others. Hence, Marková argues that self-consciousness can only be achieved when one recognises others. Moreover, in order for self-knowledge to be recognised by others, it needs to be publicly claimed. It is possible that the different context may require different normative regulations with regard to how self needs to be presented to others. Hence, in order to investigate differences in the meanings given to identity, it is important to study how people make claims about themselves and how people recognise other people's claims, as well as the social context where Self-knowledge is constructed.

**Self as a social representation in the approach to identity by Chryssochoou (2003)**

In the previous section, it was argued that investigation of social context, self-claim, and recognition of others was important to study cross-cultural differences in the meanings given to identity. As an entry point to study these aspects of identity, this study employs the identity perspective proposed by Chryssochoou (2003) as a theoretical framework.
Chryssochoou conceives identity as a particular form of SR, which links the social world and psychological functions. She argues that identity has become a framework for people to explain their actions and motivations. People use socially shared knowledge about self in order to understand themselves and explain their and other people's behaviour. Thus, identity is a concept that links the social world and psychological functions. As a socially shared knowledge, identity should not be considered as an 'individual property' (p.227), but it 'encapsulates... the way we think about ourselves and about the world in which we live'. This assertion shares similarity with the proposition made by Markus and Kitayama (1998) who argue that the meaning of personhood constitutes a part of the meaning given to their social world. Thus, this identity approach is based on the assumption of a dynamic interaction between society and individuals and expects coherent understanding of the social world and the self.

This identity perspective also encompasses the different normative regulations reflected in the idea of identity. Chryssochoou argues that as people talk about identity in the social context, it is more than a scientific concept and is anchored into common sense knowledge. Chryssochoou stated that 'the concept of identity is ... part of the public domain and discourse and the principles that organize the way people think of themselves are shared with those who are part of the same culture' (p.227). In this comment, it is asserted that the meaning of a personhood is shared among people who live in the same culture through socialisation. This implies that the meaning given to personhood is socially shared among the
people within the culture but is different from other cultures which have their own socialisation process. Thus, Chryssochoou's identity perspective assumes different normative regulations applied to construct the sense of self.

In her identity perspective, Chryssochoou proposes three aspects that compose identity: Self-knowledge, Self-claim, and Recognition of self by others. These three aspects of self represent the answers to the 3 main questions, which comprise the concept of identity: 'Who am I?', 'Who are they?' and 'What is our relationship?'. Self-knowledge represents the knowledge about self, i.e. what one knows about self. In this respect it answers the 'Who am I?' question. Self-claim represents how self is claimed in public. As people claim themselves in a way it is allowed by others, it reflects and answers the 'Who are they?' question. Recognition represents one's perception of social representation of personhood and how others accept Self-claims. In this respect, this aspect of self answers the 'What is our relationship?' question. Thus, these questions reflect the questions about self and others (social) and their relationships. In this way, this identity approach captures an interactive link between the social world and the individual. As identity is expected to reflect a dynamic relationship between the social and the individuals, this identity model expects that the sense of self is achieved by a cyclical interaction of these three aspects: Self-knowledge, Self-claim, and Recognition by others.

To summarise the above discussion, this identity perspective reflects the
dynamic interaction between society and the individual and assumes different normative regulations that are applied to the construction of identity between societies. Moreover, it theorises the interactive relationship between Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition for people to achieve the sense of self. As argued earlier, this project attempts to investigate how meanings of the identity are constructed among British and Japanese people. Further, it is discussed in order to investigate the different meanings given to identity, it is important to investigate the social context in which people talk about identity, as well as how one perceives other people recognise the self and how one claims about the self. The identity perspective by Chryssochoou (2003), which proposes interactive relationship between Self-knowledge (meaning given to self), Self-claim and Recognition, provides a theoretical framework to investigate those aspects which constitute the meanings given to identity and thus, is a suitable entry point for us to investigate the cross-cultural difference of society and self among the British and Japanese nationals. In the next chapter, based on theoretical reviews, the research question of this thesis will be proposed and how it will be investigated in empirical studies will be discussed.
Chapter 5: Rationale

In Chapter 2, it is argued that even though I-C theory has contributed to the understanding of cross-cultural differences, the assumptions underlying the theory that expect a direct link between cultural ideology and the individual orientation of people in society, can be theoretically and methodologically misleading. The research that confounded individual and social aspects tends to overlook the variability within societies, the issue of social change and the different forms of expressions which I-C could take in order to characterise the culture of society. Therefore, instead of perceiving I-C as a dichotomous cultural typology, which shapes stable national characteristics, this thesis aims to investigate the different meanings given to society and self among the British and Japanese nationals and to study how I-C elements are reflected in such meanings.

In Chapter 3, the theory of Social Representation (Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001), which is the theoretical framework in this project, was introduced and the use of this theory to investigate the cross-cultural differences was justified. It is argued that SRT is a theory of common sense knowledge and explicates the importance of social knowledge for its influence on behaviour. It theorises a dynamic link between society and the individual, in which individuals construct a shared meaning of the social world, which, in turn influences their psychological and behavioural functions in a specific way. The theory further explains the social regulations reflected in the common sense theory in the function of a 'meta-system'. Hence, in the perspective of SRT, the cultural specificity is
identified in the common sense knowledge and in the way people talk about their society. Thus, SRT provides a framework to investigate cross-cultural differences in meanings attached to society among 'British' and 'Japanese' nationals.

In Chapter 4, how identity could be conceptualised as SR was discussed. It is argued that the way people conceptualise and describe themselves reflects the social norms (Doise, 1988), and the meanings given to self link cultural ideology and psychological and behavioural tendencies (Kitayama and Markus, 1999; Markus and Kitayama, 1998; Markus, Mullally and Kitayama, 1997; Oyserman and Markus, 1998). Thus, the concept of identity reflects different social norms and is an important concept to understand cross-cultural differences between societies.

If identity is conceptualised as a socially shared knowledge, the way people give meaning to self is constructed in the socialisation process among people in the community. Thus, in order to understand cross-cultural differences in identity, it is important to investigate social context, in which people construct the meanings of identity. Moreover, the meanings of self cannot exist without recognition of self by others (Mead, 1934; Marková, 2000b). Further, self needs to be claimed for others to recognise it and the way it is claimed can also be influenced by the specific norms that are applied to contexts. Thus, what people claim about themselves in the different contexts and the way people recognise others influence the way Self-knowledge is constructed. Therefore, in order to investigate the
meanings given to identity, it is important to investigate the social context, Self-claim and Recognition of self by others. In investigating these issues, this study uses the identity perspective proposed by Chrysochoou (2003). This approach to identity conceptualises the self as a social representation and describes the interactive relationship between Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition for the representation of identity. Thus, it provides a suitable entry point to investigate the social context, Self-claim in the different contexts, and Recognition to study the meanings given to identity among the British and Japanese nationals.

In this study, cultural differences are expected to be reflected in the way the meaning of society and self is constructed. If I-C is the academic concept that makes cultural typology, these elements should be reflected in such representations. Thus, instead of attempting to confirm the dichotomy reflected in the I-C theory within British and Japanese societies, this study investigates how differently I-C elements are reflected in the way people understand their society and self.

Three empirical studies will be performed to investigate the representation of society and self. The first empirical study will investigate the representation of society and success, as well as the aspect of 'Self-knowledge'. Semi-structured interviews which investigate the common sense understanding of their society will be performed with Japanese and British women. The topics for the interview are selected to elicit the I-C characteristics, such as values, beliefs about social mobility, and beliefs about interpersonal relationships etc. Success is considered to
be a key topic in this study, as the concept of success represents the interface between society (the beliefs about cultural ideal) and the individual (the way individuals adapt themselves to achieving socially valued status). The investigation of the social context is expected to be indicative of how self should be conceptualised in society. Thus, the first study investigates the meaning attached to society and success and the social imperatives that shape Self-knowledge among the British and the Japanese women.

The second study investigates the aspect of ‘Self-claim’ and the social norm, regulating self-presentation. A 'Twenty Statement Test (TST)' (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954) will be used to elicit self-descriptions among British and Japanese women university students. In addition to cross-cultural differences in self-presentations, this study also investigates the social norms, which are applied to different contexts. Participants will be asked to describe themselves either to their friends (casual social context) or to their work colleagues (formal social context). This manipulation will show whether there is a variation in social norms with regard to how the self should be presented to others within the cultures. Thus, the study will investigate the normative regulations reflected in self-presentations in the casual and formal interpersonal relationships between British and Japanese participants.

In the third study, how people recognise others will be investigated. Recognition represents the perception concerning how people accept other people’s Self-claims and social norms regarding how self should be
conceptualised and presented to others. In order to investigate how British and Japanese accept other people's claim, participants will be presented with one fictitious person, who is described either in an 'individualistic' or in a 'collectivistic' manner. Participants are then asked to make various judgments about this person, such as country of origin, personality (warm/cold), competency, similarity and success etc. These questions were intended to measure how the British and the Japanese make the general impression and evaluation about an 'individualistic' or a 'collectivistic' person. Hence, this study investigates social regulations in how people accept others' Self-claims and how I-C characteristics are reflected in this convention.
Chapter 6: Study 1: Representations of Society and Success in Individualistic and Collectivistic Countries. A Cross-cultural Qualitative Study with British and Japanese Women

Introduction

This study investigates the representation of society and success among British and Japanese women, in order to study the context in which Self-knowledge is constructed. It tries to find out how people give meaning to their society and success and how I-C elements are reflected in such common sense understandings. The cultural differences that are reflected in the way they give meaning to their social surroundings should show the specific way Self-knowledge is constructed in these societies.

To achieve this end, semi-structured interviews were performed. Interviews were considered to be the most appropriate approach. First of all, even though the concept of I-C has extensively been studied in the past, a qualitative approach was rarely used in these investigations. Thus, it was hoped that the interview approach would provide new insights to the understanding of I-C. Secondly, it was expected to provide information about how people, instead of researchers, construct cultural meanings. The interviews were semi-structured in order to elicit topics that are related to cultural characteristics and to cover certain topics whose contents can be compared between two cultural groups. At the same time, we also wanted to give participants an opportunity to freely expand on topics regarding society. In this respect it is hoped the data will represent people's construction of society.
The interview contained the following questions: people's description of society, social values and deviance, social mobility, social change, perception of interpersonal relationships, social success and failure. The first question, 'people's description of society' was intended to elicit a response concerning whether the individual or the social aspect was emphasised in their perception of society. The academic concept of I-C describes the idea of individual and group and prescribes which is considered to be more important in a specific society (Hofstede, 1980, 1994; Hui and Triandis, 1986; Kagitçibasi and Berry, 1989; Kim, 1994, 1997; Triandis, 1994). Thus, how people talk about their society could possibly show individualistic and collectivistic orientations of the society.

Social values and deviance was selected as one of the questions, because it reflects what people believe is prioritised within a society. Values are defined as a desirable behaviour in a society (Triandis, 1994), and as an important philosophy or principle that guide one's life (Schwartz, 1992). Thus, representations of social values should reflect consensual beliefs about what others consider desirable and important in society. On the other hand, deviance is defined as 'departure from a group's normative expectations' (Schur, 1971, p.24). Hence, the concept of deviance represents an antithesis to social norms and values. The beliefs surrounding values and deviance should reflect the I-C orientation. For example, Schwartz (1990) hypothesised that 'tradition, restrictive conformity, and interpersonal subset of prosocial values' are collectivistic
values, because they are consistent with the Confucian ideal of maintaining social order. On the other hand, ‘self-direction, stimulation and universalistic subset of prosocial values’ are individualistic values, because they are consistent with liberal ideas in terms of challenging the social order by being individually focused. Hence, representations of values and deviance should reflect whether the individual or group is prioritised in a society, and reflect an individualistic or collectivistic cultural orientation in that society.

The perception of social mobility was also included as a question. Triandis (1994) argued that social mobility was one of the antecedents to Individualism. Similarly, Kim (1997) suggested that one of the critical features of Individualism was the separation from an ascribed relationship and the emphasis on achieved status (such as job status, university graduate status etc.). On the other hand, Collectivism fosters the maintenance of ascribed status, as a manifestation of the natural order. Hence, an individualistic society may be characterised by social mobility, whereas collectivistic society, by less social mobility.

The questions on social change are aimed at investigating the effect of social and economical structural change on the national characteristics. In particular, the questions regarding social change intend to explore whether social change perceived by the participants reflects individualistic or collectivistic social change and whether such social change are believed to have an effect on national characteristics. This question reflects the dynamic aspects of culture, which tended to be neglected in past I-C
research (Kashima, 2000).

Perception of interpersonal relationships was included as a question in order to investigate the unspoken rules that are present in personal relationships. Markus and Kitayama's (1991) theory suggested that others are an essential element for defining oneself in collectivistic societies, whereas they are instrumental to the self in individualistic societies. Such a difference in the relationships between self and others reflects cultural differences in the conception of self and the meaning of interdependence that is specific to a culture. Moreover, the perceptions in interpersonal relationships reflect I-C elements in terms of the prioritisation of individual or other people (social harmony). In this respect, this question should provide information on cultural meaning attached to self and interdependence, which may reflect I-C elements.

The question of success and failure was considered a key concept for reflecting the individualistic and collectivistic beliefs within a society. Success reflects the social ideal and how people think of progression in their society. Even though the motivation for success comes from individuals, success can only be recognised within a culturally shared framework. The concept of success reflects the values prevailing in a society and individuals need to be aware of it and accommodate themselves to it in order to be recognised to be successful in a society. In other words, people construct the shared meanings of success, which in turn influences the way people try to progress in society. Thus, success (and the concept of failure, as an antithetical concept) is a useful concept to
understand the social norm prevailing in society.

The different meaning given to success was studied within the framework of Individualism and Collectivism in the past. For example, Yu and Yang (1994) argued that success in individualistic societies represented individual achievement, whereas success in collectivistic societies represented collective achievement. Triandis (1983, cited in Sinha and Verma, 1987) argued that Japan's work-oriented Collectivism, where people strive for, and work together to achieve, success for the organisation, facilitated their economic success. This assertion reflects a link between a specific meaning given to success (importance of success at the organisational level) and a specific behavioural pattern (e.g. dedication to the organisation) in Japanese society.

As it is an important concept in terms of reflecting interactive relationships between society and individuals, the concept of success was investigated on 4 different levels: success within society, success for individuals, success for family, and success for children. The investigation of success on different levels was considered to be important, as different social norms may be applied to the meaning of success at the different levels. As Doise (1980, 1984, 1986) discussed, it is important to be aware of the different levels of explanation for psychological phenomenon and to integrate them for theorisation. Following his claim, this study will investigate the meaning given to success at the different levels, in order to understand the representation of success and how I-C elements were reflected in such a
concept in British and Japanese societies.

Concerning respondents, the present study will only interview British and Japanese women. Women were chosen, as they usually play the role in a society of passing on cultural values to children. Moreover, it is generally argued that the men's self-conception is more individualistic (independent, autonomous) than women's self-conception, which is characterised by collectivistic elements, such as nurturance or interdependence (Josephs et al., 1992; Kashima et al., 1995; Triandis, 1990). Thus, even within a culture, individualistic and collectivistic tendencies vary depending on the gender. From the perspective of SRT, this represents social anchoring (Doise, 1992-3), in which the representation is uniquely formed within the social categorical group, to which individuals belong to. In order to avoid the gender effect being confounded by the cultural effect, only one gender was selected for the interview.

Each participant in the study was asked to fill in the 'Relational, Individual, and Collective self-aspects (RIC) scale' (Kashima and Hardie, 2000). This scale was designed to measure three aspects of self: 'individual', 'relational' and 'collective' at the individual level. The individual self represents the self-concept, reflecting the unique self that is clearly separated from others. 'Relational' self represents the self-concept, which derives from interrelationship with others, and reflects the quality of interdependence. 'Collective' self represents the self-concept based on social categorical membership. This test was included as a part of investigation to measure
the I-C orientation of participants at the individual level. The result of this test was used to understand the individual orientations of the British and Japanese participants, so that the differences found in the study can be attributed to cultural differences as opposed to individual differences.
Method

Participants

The participants in study were 19 women adults residing in Britain and 22 women adults, residing in Japan. Anglo-Saxons were used for the British sample, in order to assure representation of the 'individualistic' culture. The age range of the participants was 35 to 58 years old (m= 48.89) for the British and 35 to 52 years old (m= 43) for the Japanese. Each participant was given a fake name to assure confidentiality. Please refer to Appendix 1 for the detailed characteristics of participants.

Interview schedule

The semi-structured interview contained the following questions: people's description of society, social values and deviance, social mobility, social change, social success and failure and interpersonal relationships. Refer to Appendix 2 for the interview schedule used in the study.

RIC scale

This scale was devised by Kashima and Hardie, (2000) and aims to measure three aspects of self, the individual, relational and collective selves, within an individual. The individual self represents 'the conception of oneself as autonomous and unique, having a clear boundary from others' (p.20). The relational self represents 'self-definitions derived from ties with specific others, the quality of these relationships, one's
interpersonal roles, and characteristics shared with significant others’ (p.20). The collective self represents ‘the social or sociocentric self, refers to self-definitions derived from one’s memberships in groups or social categories’ (p.20). The scale consists of 10 items, each of which has three sentences measuring ‘individual’ ‘relational’ and ‘collective’ self-concepts. Respondents are asked to indicate how much each sentence describes themselves using a scale ranging from 1 (not like me, not true of me) to 7 (like me, very true of me).

Procedure

Participants were either personally approached by the researcher or recruited through the local newspaper. Participation to the interview was voluntarily and the anonymity and confidentiality were assured prior to the interview. The participants were informed that the aim of the interview was to study social attitudes at the turning of the century. This introduction was intended to deemphasise the cultural aspects of society. The location of the interview was selected by interviewees for their convenience. Most of the interviews were conducted at the participants’ home, at university, or at a public restaurant. Prior to the interview, participants were explained their right of withdrawal from the study and were asked whether they agreed to let the researcher to record the interview. Only upon agreement was the interview taped for the subsequent transcription. Before the interview began, participants were asked to fill in the Relational, Individual, and Collective self-aspects (RIC)
scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000). Interviews of British participants were conducted by a native English speaker with British nationality and Japanese participants were interviewed by a native Japanese speaker with Japanese nationality. Thus, the participants were not particularly aware of cultural aspects as they described their society. After the interviews, contents were fully transcribed for analysis.

Analysis

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) and epistemology

Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) (Smith, 1996; Smith, Flowers, and Osborn, 1997; Smith, Jarman, and Osborn, 1999) was used to analyse the data. IPA analysis tries to analyse the individual's perception of the world and elicit the respondent's own beliefs and experience of events. Thus, IPA is concerned with the underlying cognition of participants. In this study, IPA was selected as a method of analysis, as this thesis is concerned with understanding how people believe and construct the meaning of society and self. It is the participants' belief and experience of society and self, rather than objective information about those concepts.

This theoretical underpinning of IPA is related to the theoretical stance of phenomenological psychology (Smith, 1996; Smith, Flowers, and Osborn, 1997), which is concerned with the individual's perception, or experience of, events, instead of the 'reality' of those same events as assessed objectively by researchers. In addition, IPA is also influenced by symbolic
interactionism (Smith, 1996; Smith, Flowers, and Osborn, 1997). Symbolic interactionism explicates that the main concern of social science should be to investigate how individuals give meanings to events and the construction of meanings from events is believed to be possible via the social interaction with others. Hence, within the epistemology of IPA, the active involvement of the researcher in the interpretation of individual's cognition was expected. Thus, the outcome of the analysis is believed to provide the participant's account of society and self, (hence, phenomenological), which are interpreted (and interpretative) and thus inevitably influenced by the researcher's conception of the surroundings.

Within this epistemology, which accepts the fact that the interpretation of the analysts would be reflected in the findings, it becomes an issue as to how much of the findings actually represent the participants' own experience or their own voice. The difficulty of representing others' voice was argued elsewhere (Kitzinger and Wilkinson, 1996; Livia, 1996). Kitzinger and Wilkinson (1996) maintain their position that representation of narrative could never be a mere description of objective 'reality'. Instead, it is a 'representational realism', which becomes meaningful in the interaction with others. Coyle (1996) similarly claims that absolutely pure representation of participants is impossible, as any representations and meanings are filtered through researcher's representation within the academic research or other people's interpretation, in the real life. Because of this property, Coyle (1996) claims that the findings of analysis contribute to the understanding of the world when the active involvement
of the researcher in interpretation is acknowledged and the author's positions and expectation of the world are explicitly explained within the research. Following this suggestion by Coyle, the cultural background and research interest as social psychologies of two researchers involved in the process of the analysis will be explained below.

Analysts' position

All of the analysis for this thesis was conducted by the author (YK). YK was born in, and grew up in, Japan before moving to the U.K. eight years ago at the age of 25. After she obtained a degree in undergraduate psychology, she trained in postgraduate research in social psychology, and her research concerned cross-cultural differences in the social representation of society and self between British and Japanese nationals. Thus, YK is familiar with both British and Japanese culture and has an academic background in psychology within the Western context. A great deal of attention was taken during the analysis phase, to give as an unbiased analysis as possible to both societies. In order to assure validity, the process of finding and clustering the themes, selection of extracts and interpretation of them was closely monitored by YK's primary supervisor (XC). XC was born in Greece and obtained the first undergraduate degree in Athens and the second undergraduate and Masters Degrees and PhD in Paris. She taught in a university in France, before teaching at the university in England, since 1997. Thus, she is familiar with Greek, French and British cultures. XC's main research interests are in the field
of social identity, national and European identity and citizenship, social representations, and intergroup relationships, etc.

Analytic Procedure

Even though IPA is concerned with the individual's perception and experience of the world, it can also be used to elicit 'shared' experiences among a group of participants (Smith, Jarman, and Osborn, 1999). In this study, the 'shared' experience' among the participants from each society was of interest, in addition to the individual's idiosyncratic experience of the world. In order to find out about people's subjective experiences of the society and identity among the British and Japanese nationals, each transcript was firstly repeatedly read by YK to attempt to gain familiarity with the participants' beliefs about society and self. As transcripts were read, notes were made for summaries of participants' statements, themes, key concepts and connections between concepts. This process was performed for each interview. Even though each interview was analysed independently, it is possible that the previous analysis may have influenced the analysis of the subsequent interviews. Moreover, as this interview was semi-structured, the contents inevitably represent the topics that are included in the questions, even though the great care was taken not to lead the responses from the participants during the interview. Then, the themes of each interview were compared and master themes were selected that contained sub-themes. The master themes were selected not only on the basis of prevalence. The themes that represented important meanings
and supported other interpretations about individual's beliefs about society and self were also selected. In order to insure that analysis represented the participants' own perception and their subjective meanings given to the social world, great attention was taken to ensure that all the analysis was appropriately supported by the participants' own statements. Selected extracts were revisited a number of times in order to ensure that what a respondent meant was properly reflected in the analysis. All the Japanese transcripts were analysed in this manner first. The Japanese data was analysed in Japanese and the quotes were translated later for the extracts. Subsequent to this, the British data was analysed. Then, the topics that elicited the themes that reflected important cross-cultural differences in their belief about society and self was selected and master themes for each topic from each cultural group were compared and discussed.
Analysis and Discussion

Topics and Themes found for each cultural group

Through IPA analysis, the following points were regarded as important and closely looked at: how people talked about their society, important qualities in close interpersonal relationships, perception of success, perception of failure, social mobility, representation of deviance and anticipation for social change. For each topic, a theme was found, which represented people's belief about their surroundings. The following are the themes that were found in topics for each cultural group.

Topic: 'how people talked about their society'

Themes

- Division between public and private spheres (Japanese)
- Division between social classes (British)

Topic: 'important qualities in close interpersonal relationships'

Themes

- The emphasis on harmony empathy and internalisation of others perceptions (Japanese)
- The importance of interdependence and the priority of others in the context of family values (British)
- The importance of communication, acceptance of individual differences and personal space in interpersonal relationships among family members (British)
Topic: 'perception of success'

Themes

- The interpersonal network (Japanese)
- Compatibility to social needs (Japanese)
- Social recognition (Japanese)
- Money (Japanese)
- Personal effort (British)
- Innate ability (British)
- Money (British)
- Realisation of one's dream (British)
- Independence (British)

Topic: 'perception of failure'

Themes

- How homelessness represents a lack of financial independence and lack of effort (Japanese)
- Social failure as lower class people and asylum seekers (British)

Topic: 'social mobility'

Themes

- Social mobility, in terms of changing social position in general (Japanese)
- The difficulty of changing position within and between organisations (Japanese)
The difficulty of social mobility due to the class system (British)

**Topic: 'representation of deviance'**

**Themes**

- The lack of consideration to others (Japanese)
- Serious social problems and lack of independence (British)

**Topic: 'anticipation for social change'**

**Themes**

- Individualistic social change (Japanese)
- Link between social structural change and psychological function (Japanese)
- Multiculturalism and loss of consideration for others (British)

**How people talked about their society**

**Japanese: Division between public and private spheres**

When talking about their society, a division between public and private spheres is reflected in the Japanese discourse. The public sphere was described as the situation when a person needs to conform to the social norms.

In the public sphere, people are expected to refrain from making a different remark than others.
Kiyo: ‘...Being unique is not necessarily bad, but it comes with an unfavourable image...People are not used to accepting those who have different opinions from themselves... The bigger the group is, the more strongly there is such an atmosphere’

Kiyo suggests that a person cannot assert a different opinion, because others are not used to accepting differences. People feel comfortable when sharing the same opinions. This atmosphere of needing to blend in with others becomes stronger as the group becomes bigger.

Distinctiveness is forbidden not only in the expression, but also in behaviour.

Sachiko: ‘Japanese people care too much about what people around them do. “We have to do it because our neighbour has done this. We have to be the same, we cannot be separated too much from them...”’

This comment shows how people try to minimise the differences in their behaviour in order to blend in with others within a group or a community. It is described how important it is for people to be aware of what others do. Sachiko comments that Japanese people worry about other people in order to avoid being ‘separated’ from them. This implies that being different leaves the feeling of isolation among the Japanese people. It reflects a link between a specific psychological pattern and the belief about society.
Even though expression of individual distinctiveness is not allowed in public, this does not mean that it is non-existent within the Japanese society.

Eri: 'In Japan...individuality exists inside, without expression. You can't express...you can't see from outside, but it exists inside. Individuality is reflected when people live or do things just the way you are...'

This quote suggests that there is a concept of individuality and uniqueness in Japanese society. Because of the prevailing social norm, individual distinctiveness and true self are not asserted publicly, but exist inside the individuals, without expression. This perhaps is the way in which the individuality is achieved in the Japanese society, where public expression of distinctiveness is forbidden.

The true self is not only believed to exist inside of self, but also to be apparent in the close interpersonal relationships.

Setsuko: 'Family members know the most relaxed condition of each other...because we...talk without worrying about how it appears; talk as the way you are.'

Hiromi: 'naturally the way you are at school and at work should be
different from the way you are at home... the place you can relax and need not think about anything...

Setsuko mentions that people are relaxed about what they say because they can reveal the 'true self' to family members. This comment shows a contrast in people's behaviour between public and private relationships. Hiromi's comment also reveals a division between public and private spheres. In the latter context, people 'can relax and need not think about anything', whereas in the former context it is implied that people do need to be vigilant in what they say.

To summarise, a division between public and private spheres is reflected in their perception of society. This division is also reflected in a culturally specific 'Self-knowledge' among the Japanese people. There is a convention among the Japanese to accept 'Tatemae', representing what people say in public and 'Honne', representing actual intention or the true opinion of the individuals. It is socially accepted that people publicly claim 'Tatemae', that are not consistent with 'Honne', in order to maintain public relationships. This duality acknowledged within the Japanese society is reflected in the recent argument by Kitayama and Markus (1999). They argued that personal coherence in the Japanese society is achieved by the balance between antagonistic elements of official and personal frame. As these two elements co-exist in the same context and people behave appropriately as the role requires at any specific moment, what a person says in the official frame is expected to be different from what he/she says
in the personal frame. Thus, people are expected to have a 'public self' where they make an effort to suppress distinctiveness and say 'Tatemae' to maintain personal relationships, and a 'private self' where they can have and show individuality and speak from 'Honne'. Hence, the duality between public and private is also reflected in the common sense understanding of self in Japanese society.

*British: Division between social classes*

Many British participants described a societal division between classes, when talking about their society.

Jane: 'Sadly, I'd say it's a class-ridden, bigoted society....'

Phoebe: 'It's a society that has a wide range of cultures within it and has a strong class structure still.'

Both Jane and Phoebe suggest that the British society is based on a social class division. The description by Jane, 'a class-ridden, bigoted society', reflects her negative emotions towards social division. This shows that she has an unfavourable image of society based on an ascribed social order.

Not only is society perceived to be a class-based society, the social class is also believed to be a determinant of people's success in British society.
Denise: ‘And I think if you don’t have money, family money, then you don’t have a great deal of chance of actually getting to the positions of power....Because money within the family decides where people are living, which often decides the level of education. The level of expectation.’

Monica: ‘...but if you haven’t got a class you’re looked down... You need class or people will think you’re just trying, not succeeding’

Denise implied that family wealth interfered with opportunities to be successful in society. She mentioned that family money, representing socially ascribed status, determined the expectations in life. This comment shows ‘causality’ in common sense theory. In other words, social class (the functioning of social system) will determine what they can expect from their life and influences the perception of an individual’s potential (psychological process). Monica also mentioned that social class was essential for success. It was not how much one has, but which social class one belongs to that determined the success of an individual.

Hence, the description of society by the British participants reflected a division by a social class. Further, the socially ascribed status is believed to interfere with the opportunities to be successful in British society.
The important qualities in close interpersonal relationships

*Japanese: Emphasis is on harmony, empathy and internalisation of others perceptions*

When the Japanese participants were asked about close interpersonal relationships, they mentioned the importance of consideration and empathy and suggested that it was important to have an ability to read other people's mind in such a relationship.

In close personal relationships, consideration of others is implied to be important.

Sumiko: ‘since it is the relationship within which you can say anything, you have to be careful not to hurt or cause trouble to other people. There is a saying “there should be a courtesy even among close friends”

Sumiko implies that even though people are allowed to express anything in the close interpersonal relationship, it is important to be considerate to family members. As discussed in the previous section, it is believed that people are able to express their true self in the private sphere within Japanese society. Sumiko suggested that because people are allowed to be natural and be themselves, people need to be extra-careful with family not to be too ego-centric. The saying she quoted summarises her assertion. Courtesy is required even in the very close relationship.
If people need to consider 'courtesy' in close interpersonal relationships as in public interpersonal relationships, it is unclear how people believe that honest self-expression is allowed in the former. In other words, what are the qualities that distinguish close relationships from public relationships, which make it easier for them to disclose themselves?

Eri: 'because family is always together, it is easy to understand what they are thinking, and they understand how I think about things'

Here, Eri claims that the family spends a lot of time together and thus it is easy for them to "read" each other's mind. It is easy for the members of the family to understand how other members think and feel. Better understanding of other's mind facilitates the emotion of empathy and compassion. Empathetic feeling and prioritisation of others may possibly trigger the psychological process of 'Amae' (Doi, 1973, Kumagai and Kumagai, 1985), which represents total interdependence to each other. As people feel totally accepted and are consequently allowed to be dependent on each other, they may feel free to disclose how they feel. They are also expected to let other family members be dependent on them in return. Therefore, even though the close interpersonal relationship is where people achieve the freedom to express individuality, the interpersonal relationship in the private sphere is not based on principle reflected in individualistic ideology. It is based on the values of compassion, empathy, and acceptance of total interdependence of each other. The importance of reading the
other’s mind is reflected in the following definition of a successful family by Sachiko.

Sachiko: ‘successful family...Understanding of each other without explicit communication...Understanding each other’s feeling’

Here Sachiko suggests the quality that defines the family’s success is to understand each other without explicit communication. On the other hand, the lack of ability to read the other’s mind in the close interpersonal relationships causes tension in that relationship.

Noriko: ‘(tension in the close relationships) when you cannot read what others are thinking.’

Noriko’s comment shows that tension in close relationships is the result of a failure to internalise the other person’s viewpoint. Because closeness is believed to be established upon the unspoken understanding of each other, when this system fails, tension can occur in the relationship.

To summarise, empathy, compassion, and internalisation of the other’s viewpoint were emphasised as important qualities in close interpersonal relationships within Japanese society. Therefore, even though it was stated in the previous section that the close interpersonal relationship is where the individual’s true wishes can be expressed, the norm which regulates private interpersonal relationships is rather more collectivistic.
than individualistic.

**British: The importance of interdependence and the priority of others in the context of family values. The importance of communication, acceptance of individual differences and personal space in interpersonal relationships among family members**

When the British people were asked about the close interpersonal relationships, they tended to talk about the value of family.

Becky: 'I think basically the family, your own initial family are the most important, really. That's where everything starts. Basic upbringing.'

Alice: 'I think if you haven't got family values, I don't think you can exist in a comfortable way. You've got so much tension ... there is so much dog eat dog in this country'

These comments describe family is the most basic and important unit in the society. The family unit is considered to be 'where everything starts' and the source of 'comfort' and happiness. When they were asked about qualities that define a family, they mentioned love, consideration, loyalty, and respect.

Hanne: 'A community of people who love each other and put the other people's wants before anything else.'
Alice: 'To honour your mother and your father, to respect your elders, to, think of others before yourself and to, stay loyal to your family and not turn your back on them. And to respect where, what you are and where you've come from....'

Both Hanne and Alice described that a person should prioritise the wants of others before of their own. Family is described as a group of people who love each other and it is important to be loyal and respectful to other family members. Thus, similar to the Japanese, consideration of others is also an important quality in close interpersonal relationships among the British.

The family is also considered as a unit which is based upon the support and dependence of each other.

Carol: '...you always have somebody there with you who sticks through everything thick and thin. Someone you can always lean on no matter what.'

Ulrika: Family is someone who is there if you want them...if you need them...someone there in case... and you can rely on.'

Both Carol and Ulrika described family as a group of people whom you can 'rely on' no matter what the circumstances. Interdependence is a quality that was also found in Japanese close interpersonal relationships.
The characteristics identified in close interpersonal relationships in British society seem collectivistic. Consideration of others reflects the prioritisation of others over the self. Moreover, Schwartz (1990) categorised being 'helpful' as one of the collectivistic values because it aims at the 'welfare of others' instead of that of the self. From this perspective, the concept of support that is identified in the description of the family is considered to be collectivistic. Interdependence is antithetical to the concept of independence and also emphasises collectivistic aspects.

British participants also believed in the importance of communication in close interpersonal relationships.

Ellen: '(as things that cause troubles) I think if you keep things from each other. You need to be very open with each other and talk about everything, really. If there is a problem, I think it's better to bring it out in the open. Because I think it could cause problems. I think that you need to be honest to each other, really.'

Hanne: '(as characteristics of close relationships) Trust. Sharing of ideas. Love pre-eminently.'

Ellen suggests that keeping secrets from each other is considered to be detrimental to close interpersonal relationships. Honesty and being open are perceived to be the qualities that are necessary in such relationships.
and communication is the way to maintain this. Similarly, Hanne suggests sharing of ideas as the one of the qualities that characterises close relationships. Thus, both Ellen and Hanne believe being honest and open through communication is important in close interpersonal relationships.

The importance of communication is specific to the British and is different from the Japanese representation of close interpersonal relationships. Among the Japanese participants, internalisation of other's view was emphasised. Empathy and compassion was achieved through internalisation of the other's feelings that does not require explicit communication. This difference in the representation of interpersonal relationships may imply the cultural specificity in the concept of self and in how meaning of others is attached in the relation to the self. It is often argued that the self is believed to be a self-contained existence with unique internal attributes in Western societies (Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Sampson, 1977). Under this belief about self, individuals are unique from each other and thus, it is believed that the understanding between two individuals can only be achieved through an explicit exchange of ideas. On the other hand, self is believed to be defined in the relationship with others in Eastern societies (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). If we consider this belief about self, the division between self and others is fuzzy, and the sense of self is partly achieved through others. Thus, we can consider that the understanding between two individuals can be accomplished within the context of socialisation, but without the direct exchange of information. Two individuals may be able to internalise each other's feelings from the
tone of voice, or a specific gesture etc. Thus, the difference between how understanding is achieved in close interpersonal relationships between Japanese and British participants may reflect cultural specificity in the Self-knowledge and in meaning attached to others in relation to self.

It is also believed that acceptance and tolerance of others is important in a close interpersonal relationship among the British participants

Ulrika: ‘(family value)...honesty...I think accepting each other, whoever they are...support whatever you do.’

Kate: ‘(What do you think are the important family values?) Honesty, trust. Tolerance’

Ulrika’s comment shows that the acceptance of others is important in family relationships, regardless of ‘whoever they are’. By ‘whoever they are’, it is emphasised that the differences in attitude and values are assumed between members of the family. Even though their values may be very different, it is important for family members to ‘accept’ each other and to stick together. Kate’s comment also implies the importance of tolerance. The value of acceptance and tolerance within the family seems to reflect the assumption of individual differences among the members.

In addition to acceptance of individual differences, the respect of personal space was regarded as important in family relationships among the British
Gwyneth: ‘I think we are quite close family....hopefully we respect each other, I think, respect each other’s feelings and you know, if anybody needs a space, you’ll give them space.’

Suzy: ‘(the factors that cause tension to close relationships) Well I think respecting the other. Perhaps bring into the house a lot of your friends without saying someone is staying the night. I don’t mean.... Just invade other person's space. You would respect them and say bring your friends home or going out....Consider each other’

Both comments by Gwyneth and Suzy reflect respect of each other as an important quality in the relationships within a family. Moreover, both mentioned the importance of respecting personal space as a mark of respect and consideration of other family members. The personal space of each member should be respected and should not be ‘invaded’ by other members of family.

The value of acceptance and tolerance of individual differences and of personal space represents the individualistic ideology and are consistent with the idea of an ‘independent self-construal’. Oyserman et al. (2002), for example, claimed that ‘personal uniqueness’ and ‘value privacy’ are the characteristics that make American people more individualistic than the
Japanese participants. Moreover, an 'independent self-construal' is represented by a self defined by a clear boundary with unique internal attributes. Under this belief about self, individuals are believed to be unique from each other and the space within a boundary is regarded as private property. Thus, the importance of acceptance and personal space seems to reflect the individualistic ideologies and belief about the self.

Overall, the representation of family, which was mentioned mostly as an example of close interpersonal relationships, has shown collectivistic aspects, such as compassion and interdependence among the British participants. It is believed that people should prioritise welfare of the family over that of the self and the family unit is based on the mutual support and interdependence of each other. Even though the representation of family reflected many collectivistic aspects, the interpersonal relationship within the members also showed individualistic characteristics. It is believed that honesty and openness are important and explicit communication is encouraged to achieve the successful relationship. Moreover, acceptance and tolerance of individual differences and respect of personal space were considered to be important for successful family relationship. These values seem to reflect individualistic ideologies and culturally specific idea of self. Thus, representation of close interpersonal relationship in British society seems to be regulated by both individualistic and collectivistic ideology.
Perception of success

Japanese: The interpersonal network, compatibility to social needs, social recognition and money

For the Japanese, an interpersonal network was considered to be one of the important elements for success.

Kiyo: ‘...connection....Yes, I think personal network is important for social success’.

Kana: ‘(as factors that are necessary for success) talent, personal connections, and will to make it work’

Tomiko: ‘talent and supporters...the people who help you become successful...’

In Japan, people believe that interpersonal connections facilitate success. The comments by Kiyo and Kana reflect this social belief and emphasise the importance of a personal network as a contributory to success. Tomiko also suggests that support from other people is one of the elements for success. However, Tomiko’s comment focuses on the importance of others in terms of support, instead of as an access to a successful position, as she mentions others as ‘people who help you’. Hence, personal connections have an important impact on success, for maintaining a harmonious relationship with others, as well as for accessing opportunities for success.
Even though Tomiko and Kana both stated the importance of interpersonal relationships in the above comments, they also mentioned the importance of individual ability for social success. This belief in innate ability reflects the individualistic concept of personhood (Markus and Kitayama, 1991) and the individualistic attribution for success (Oyserman and Markus, 1998). However, the meaning of individual ability may not necessarily represent an individualistic orientation in Japanese society. Even though ability is considered to be an important element for success, it requires achieving a compatibility with social needs.

Taeko: 'someone who can use the social system... I think the person who can take the view of society can succeed, even though it is against your view....accommodate yourself to reality'

Miwa: 'the compatibility between what one wants to do and the social trend is ...significant for the success of people...When you have a strong luck with the right social tide, you can jump 20 meters instead of 2 meters. I think the result of a thorough research and timing as well as luck are involved in success'

Taeko says 'the person who can take the view of society can succeed'. Here, she emphasises the importance of flexibility and ability to compromise to social requirements. According to Miwa, 'a thorough research' and 'timing' are required for social success. Here, she emphasises the importance of
one's vigilance to social needs and of luck in having ability that is compatible to social needs. These extracts reflect the idea that individual ability cannot be conceptualised in a social vacuum in Japanese society. Su et al. (1999) argued that the social structure in collectivistic societies can be described as an 'individual accommodates structure model'. Under this social structure, individuals need to be flexible enough to accommodate the needs of society. This model illustrates the priority of the social structure over the individual. The belief that the ability of individuals needs to be compatible to the social needs reflects the 'individual accommodates structure model', and thus the priority on social demands over an individual's unique contribution.

Thirdly, social recognition is considered to be important for success in the Japanese society.

Setsuko: '(success is) to achieve one's purpose and to be recognised by many people around you. It is the person who achieves the purpose, but it won't be a social success unless it is recognised by other people'

Setsuko emphasises the acknowledgment of achievement by other people as an important element for success. She mentioned even though it is the individual who succeeds, it is not a success unless it is acclaimed by other people. Marková (1996, 1997) argues that the complementary concept, such as individual vs. community, individual vs. collective, are interdependent
and do not exist without the contrary concept. Setsuko's comment reflects this proposition in a way that achievement by individuals is meaningless, unless there are others to recognise it. The individual's achievement and social recognition complement each other to make up the meaning of social success.

Finally, money and wealth appear to be associated with the idea of success.

Ikue: '(What do you consider social success?) In general, to be rich'

Ai: 'at present... economical success. For example, rich people, because it is tangible'

Ikue considered rich people to be successful. According to Ai, money is associated with success because it is tangible. Money gives a figure that represents how much a person is worth, and thus, is used as a measurement to compare the level of success. The focus on the material aspect in the perception of success may be related to the level of success that Japanese society has achieved. Japan is one of the richest societies and has achieved a similar standard of living to its Western counterparts. Because a society is wealthy and politically stable, most aspects of society are monetized, for example where you live, how you live, what you eat, how you are entertained, where you are educated etc.. In such a society, money can be considered a good allegory for power and salient in the concept of success.
Overall, most of the representations of success in Japanese society seem to reflect collectivistic characteristics. The emphasis on an interpersonal network and social recognition reflect the importance of others and society in the meanings attached to success. Even though the individual’s ability is considered to be important in success, it also has to be compatible with what society requires. The importance of compatibility between ability and social needs represents the prioritisation of social needs over the individual’s contribution. Finally, the Japanese people believe that money represents the social success. This may be related to the economic success that Japanese society has achieved, where money becomes an allegory for power.

*British success: Personal effort, innate ability, money, realisation of one's dream, and independence*

When talking about social success, one of the elements that were repeatedly mentioned by the British was effort. It was believed that people who tried hard would be successful.

Denise: ‘...to try your best whatever you do, to try and do it well...to put effort in to everything you do whatever...to make it as successful as possible.’

Irene: ‘They’ve (politicians and businessman) done well....developed a name for themselves.....Worked hard too, 99% perspiration, 1%
inspiration, that’s what brings success.’

Both comments emphasise the importance of hard work to achieve success. In the literature of I-C, people in collectivistic societies tend to attribute their success to effort, whereas those in the individualistic societies, to the innate ability (Oyserman and Markus, 1998). However, the effort also reflects individualistic ideologies. For example, the Protestant work ethic (Weber, 1958) endorses effort as a mean to success. The Protestant work ethic is individualistic in the sense that success is dependent on the effort made by individuals and thus, individuals are responsible for their own success. Furthermore, idea of effort for social success reflects the concept of a meritocracy (Lerner, 1977), representing the belief that people should obtain what is equivalent to their efforts and abilities. The merit reflects the principles of equity and equality of opportunity, which are the cultural norms reflected in the philosophy of Liberalism (Kim, 1994).

Secondly, innate ability was considered to be important for success.

Laura: ‘(how unsuccessful people end up in that position?)...I think part of it has to do with ability....if you have a talent or the ability to get a good job I think you will. Those who don’t obviously don’t have those abilities’

Laura believes that an individual’s ability determines their success in society. Abilities represent innate attributes and are a typical attribution
of success found in the individualistic societies (Oyserman and Markus, 1998). Further, she stated ‘if you have a talent or the ability to get a good job I think you will. Those who don't obviously don't have those abilities’. This comment reflects the idea of a meritocracy; people get what they deserve (Lerner, 1977). In relation to this, it is considered to be important to encourage children to believe in their potential.

Denise: ‘(what could influence your child’s success?) To make them believe in themselves... to encourage them to... set their targets for themselves that are realistic. And give them as much encouragement as possible to follow the path’

Denise believed that parents could influence children by helping them to find a realistic target for their ability. This comment reflects the belief that success is an outcome of innate ability that has limitations. Because of the variety of innate ability that individuals were born with, it is important to set a realistic target to become successful. Moreover, the statement ‘believe in themselves’ shows belief in innate potential and puts emphasis on the individual: only he/she can make themselves successful by believing in their own potential.

In common with the Japanese participants, the concept of success was also linked to money among the British.

Nancy: ‘(successful group)...the rich do very well for themselves.'
(Interviewer: are they powerful as well?) Yes, without money, it's difficult to have any power.'

Nancy considers rich people as a successful and powerful in society. As discussed in the previous section, it is possible that the money becomes an allegory for success within a society where many aspects are monetized.

The British women also believe that success means the realisation of one's dream.

Suzy: '...it is important that you are not pushing them (one's children) to be the most important person in the world or the world most financially successful. They've got to do their fate...you should encourage to follow their dream really'

Suzy states that success cannot be measured objectively by wealth or social position. The realisation of one's dream, without being distracted by what others say, is considered to be a success. This view of success is individualistic in the sense that individuals, instead of others, are setting the goals of their success. Moreover, the idea of fate represents the concept of innate attributes. The concept of fate reflects the belief that people were born with a degree of potentiality. This idea also appeared in Denise's comment which was quoted earlier. Her comment reflects the belief that that innate potentiality and the importance of children to believe in themselves are key factors to achieving success. Oyserman and
Markus (1998) stated that this belief about innate potentiality encourages people in individualistic societies to keep trying out new things until they find what they are good at. Belief about innate potentiality leads to the idea that everyone has a talent, that success in a specific field can only be more readily achieved by those who have a talent for it. Thus, discovery of one's unique potential is a key to success. Oyserman and Markus argue that this approach to success is in contrast to that in Japanese society, where success is believed to be the outcome of endless effort in order to accomplish the ultimate ideal state. In this world view, everyone can achieve the success by putting in the effort. Here, perseverance, instead of the discovery of one's talent, becomes an important quality for success. The concept of fate reflects an individualistic world view, which influences the culturally specific approach to success.

Finally, being independent also means to be successful in British society.

Rachel: 'I am defining the success in terms of....being able to take care of yourself...You can take care of yourself, you know where you're going. You've got a reasonable standard of living and all that kind of thing.'

Becky: 'I think my greatest achievement is ...moving after the divorce, really...I managed to keep my job. I managed to get a mortgage for the house, and I'd like to think that I've actually tried, not on my own, but with my ex-husband's help...to keep the unit
Rachel believes that success means to be able to take care of oneself and to be in charge of his/her own life. This belief reflects individualistic values, such as self-direction and prioritisation of individual action and thought (Schwartz, 1990). Becky's comment also reflects the idea of independence in the way she believes her taking care of family life after her divorce was her success. She described how she managed to maintain her family life without being dependent on the social welfare system. These comments showed how being independent increased the sense of self-efficacy among the British women. Self efficacy was described as one of the identity principles (Breakwell, 1986) and has previously been studied in terms of I-C (Earley, 1994; Earley et al., 1999; Schaubroeck et al, 2000; Tafarodi and Walters, 1999). The concept of self-efficacy is a persons' perception of their own competence. Past research has shown how the cultural framework shapes what is ideal in society, which in turn influences how an increase in self-efficacy is achieved in a society. Here, self-efficacy increases by being independent, which is an individualistic value.

To summarise, the representations of success among the British women reflected the elements of effort, innate ability, money, realisation of fate, and independence. As discussed in this section, most of these elements represent individualistic qualities. Moreover, similar to the Japanese, money was mentioned as a symbol of success by British participants.
Perception of failure

Japanese: How homelessness represents a lack of financial independence and lack of effort ('they deserve what they get' Lerner: Just world theory)

When Japanese women were asked about what they considered to be failure in Japanese society, many people mentioned homeless people as a symbol of failure in the society.

Chie: ‘people who become homeless, they run away from reality, when I look at these people, I think they are losers in society’

Keiko: ‘the homeless people... living under the bridge...I think people can somewhat expect future. It is unlikely that everything.... their home is, all of a sudden, taken away one day. You could avoid that situation by effort and if you really have the drive to avoid it. I think you can at least secure a place to live in the present Japanese society, even though you lose your property. So I think people who are content in living under the bridge are... (unsuccessful)’

Both comments suggest homeless people are a symbol of failure in society. This representation of failure seems to confirm that money is an important dimension to measure success/failure of the individuals in Japanese society. Because money is considered to be one of the antecedents and measures of social success in Japanese society, people who do not have money, such as
homeless people, are possibly considered to represent a social ‘failure’.

Secondly, both Chie and Keiko attributed the misfortune of homeless people to a lack of effort. Chie suggested that people became homeless because they ‘run away from reality’. They do not make an effort to face the reality and to do something about it. Keiko suggested that homeless people are failures firstly because they do not have a drive to protect their property and secondly, because they do not find a place to live after their property is taken away. She describes homeless people as being content with their living conditions and not trying to change the situation. She seems to accuse homeless people of laziness, in being content with their lifestyle.

Thus, both Chie and Keiko attributed the reason people become homeless to their lack of effort. It is collectivistic in the sense that the failure was attributed to a lack of effort. As suggested earlier, Oyserman and Markus (1998) argued that perseverance was believed to be the way to succeed in Japanese society. Therefore, it seems natural that abandoning this endless effort is related to the representation of failure. On the other hand, it reflects the individualistic ideology of a meritocracy. In both comments by Chie and Keiko, the way they described the homeless people was quite negative. Chie call them ‘losers’. Keiko does not show any sympathy and directly blames their lack of motivation to save themselves for their misfortune. These negative attitudes towards people who do not make an effort show a belief that they deserve to be in the lowest position
in the society for their laziness. This is clearly the principle of meritocracy; 'people get what they deserve' (Lerner, 1977). Moreover, it is individualistic in the sense that individuals, instead of external elements, are blamed for their misfortune. Triandis (1994) speculated that fundamental attribution error (Ross, 1977) would be more prevalent in the individualistic societies, where the individual is the main focus, than in the collectivistic societies. However, the Japanese also seem to blame homeless individuals for their lack of social success.

To summarise, the representation of failure showed the importance of money as a measurement for the success/failure of individuals. Moreover, the way social failure was attributed to the lack of effort displayed some individualistic characteristics among the Japanese participants. Instead of sympathy and compassion, homeless people were blamed for not making effort. This attitude reflected a meritocratic belief and a tendency toward 'fundamental attribution error'.

British: Social failure as lower class people and asylum seekers

The representation of failure among the British participants reflected the perceived social division between classes, which was also apparent in their descriptions of society. As discussed, it was expressed that the social class of an individual had an impact on their opportunities for success in British society. When people were asked about their perception of failure, they considered lower-class people as a symbolic of failure in British society.
Hanne: ‘Well the underclass basically. The people on terrible sink estates and the poor by that I mean poor in education and materially, often the two go together.’

Francis: ‘Um... I suppose they are the people who live in the deprived areas. No jobs...... I suppose some of it is related to the area they live in. It’s hard to get work.’

Both extracts illustrate the examples of how failure is associated with the social class. As discussed in the description of society, British people believed that social class interferes with the success. It determines the opportunity and perception of what is available for success. Under-class people are regarded as social failure as they are ‘poor in education and materially’ (as Hanne claims) and are ‘deprived’ of opportunities and highly paid jobs (as Francis claims).

British people also associated social failure with asylum seekers and refugees.

Ellen: ‘I suppose the ethnic minorities could come in as well. I mean, there has a lot been improving as well for them, but I suppose it’s ... what do you call them? ... People that come in the countries, that are not suppose to be here? (I: asylum seekers?) Yeah, asylum seekers and things like that. I suppose they are
minority groups, aren't they?

Nancy: 'I think anyone different is often thought of as undesirable, the asylum seekers, the refugees'

Both Ellen and Nancy stated that asylum seekers and refugees represent social failure or socially undesirable. This may be related to the fact that the representation of asylum seekers is associated with the under-class. For example, Phoebe suggests,

'It's a society that has a wide range of cultures within it and has a strong class structure still. I would say the two are related. The lower down the society you go there are more cultures and more difference and the higher up you go, it becomes more white Anglo-Saxon, much more similar'

Here, Phoebe links the image of mixture of culture with the under-class and the image of Anglo-Saxon white and unitary culture with high social class. Thus, the representation of asylum seekers as social failure may reflect the relationship between social failure and under-class.

On the other hand, the link between social failure and asylum seekers may not come from the belief that they belong to the lower social class. When asylum seekers and refugees were mentioned, they were often negatively described in their discourse. For example, when Kate described the group
of people who are least successful, she says,

Kate: 'Oh, those who don’t integrate with the rest of the society. (I: How do you think people end up in that group, not integrating?) Probably because of their background or their religion’

Here, she mentions the people with different religion and background as least successful and they do not integrate with the rest of the society. In this comment, asylum seekers are considered as the 'outsiders' of society. It will be discussed later that asylum seekers and refugees are often regarded as a 'deviance' in the society among the British participants. The extract that will be quoted as examples of deviance shows that when people talked about asylum seekers and refugees, they often expressed the fear of losing their jobs and an anger that they are not integrating into and contributing to the society. These ideas and negative attitude towards asylum seekers and refugees reflect the ideology of a meritocracy, which may explain why asylum seekers and refugees are considered as social failures. They do not contribute to and integrate with the society. Therefore they do not deserve the success in society.

Overall, the representation of failure among British people mirrored the importance of social class in their idea of social success. In addition, asylum seekers and refugees were also perceived to be symbolic of failure. This may reflect the representation of the under-class as a social failures or the idea of a meritocracy.
Social Mobility

Japanese: Social mobility, in terms of changing social position in general. The difficulty of changing a position within and between organisations

The Japanese believed that social mobility is not necessarily difficult.

Ai: 'there is no strict class system (in Japanese society)....class can be easily changed by economic power'

Tomiko: ‘...social position is not necessarily equal to money, but generally it reflects economic elements, and those who don't have money might have difficulties in changing a place in society'.

Ai believes that the social position is easily changed by economic power. Anyone who achieves a financial success can be considered to be high in social position. Similarly, Tomiko expresses the belief that money helps social mobility. Both comments by Ai and Tomiko reflect a belief that socially ascribed status, such as family background, does not hold people back from being successful. Rather, financial status determines success in Japanese society.

Even though social mobility is believed to be possible in Japanese society, socially ascribed status may be an important issue for some people:
Kiyo: ‘...old people especially might still concern about family history and blood’

Kiyo suggested that the socially ascribed status, such as ‘family history and blood’ may be an important issue for older generations. The fact that it is believed to be still an issue for older generations implies a possibility that less importance on ascribed status may be a new social phenomenon in Japanese society. It may have been an important aspect when the people who are old now were the major workforce in Japanese society. However, it is not an issue in the modern Japanese society, as only part of the population (old people) might consider social ascribed status as important.

However, some Japanese people conceptualised social mobility in terms of social position within and between organisations. For example, Rumi believes mobility is difficult within an organisation because of the strict interpersonal relationship.

Rumi: ‘I think it is difficult (to change a place in society)... (within the present system) even though you work hard, if you don't behave according to your boss's wishes, you will be disliked and excluded’

Here, Rumi suggests that social mobility is difficult in Japanese society, because of the strict super- and sub-ordinate relationships. She mentions that if a person is disliked by their superior, it is difficult to achieve social success regardless of the ability one has or the effort one makes. It is the
ability to act according to the boss’s wishes, instead of actual skills or talent that gets people promoted. In Rumi’s extract, social mobility is conceptualised as a social position within an organisation. In this perspective, social mobility is considered to be difficult.

Sumiko: ‘organisations and groups are not used to look at the individual’s talent….they would not try to see it. Even though a person is successful in the other organisation, s/he is successful only in that particular organisation and it does not guarantee the success in their company’

Unlike Rumi who mentioned the difficulty to change positions within an organisation, Sumiko described the difficulty in changing positions between organisations. She suggested that it is not a talent or skill, per se, that would make a person successful. Ability is believed to be context-specific and not transferable. Therefore, changing jobs is difficult in Japanese society. Here, Sumiko conceptualised social mobility as changing positions between organisations. This view of the difficulty in changing jobs seems to reflect the Japanese social structure. Japan traditionally has a social system of lifetime employment and age-related promotion. Under this social structure, people are expected to be loyal to one organisation for life. In return, an organisation protects the employee by raising the salary according to the year of loyalty a person served to the company. Under this system, skill is considered to be something developed for and within a company. Skill required in the job is trained
within a company and is not necessarily transferable to the other organisations.

Under this social structure, individuals are not the agent responsible for their success. It is not the individuals who cultivate the skills and moves up the social ladder. Instead, success of individuals is contextualised within the organisation, and factors such as interpersonal relationships or the length of loyalty determine the level of success. Thus, for Japanese people, the organisation seems to play an important role when they think about social mobility. Even though social mobility is not believed to be difficult in terms of social class, it may be difficult in terms of the social position within an organisation.

_British: The difficulty of social mobility due to the class system_

Most of the participants considered social mobility to be difficult because of the social class system in British society.

Phoebe: ‘Yes, I think you can move up the ladder with a new car, a bigger house, a better income, but only in the eyes of those below you on the ladder. If you win the lottery and shoot to the top of the ladder in terms of finance, you’re still lower class to the higher class people, just lower class people with money. And a duke or earl who loses his fortune is still an aristocrat just without money’
Nancy: 'I don't think it is clear (whether it is easy to change place in a society). You can change career and income but you can't often change your class.'

Phoebe's comment suggests it is the social class, not the financial power that has an important meaning to the perception of success in British society. She articulated the view that financial power did not give much influence to people's perception of class. Nancy's comment also reflects the importance of social class over financial status. She indicates that social mobility could be difficult because it is impossible to change social class. These comments reveal the beliefs about social class and the difficulty in changing it in British society.

Even though social class is more important dimension to determine success, money seems to be believed to help social mobility to some extent.

Ellen: 'I suppose if you are ... quite wealthy ... (thinking)... better chances, I suppose, you know, people that financially better off. They might be able to ... (change a place in a society)'

Ellen's comment reflects the belief that money can help social mobility. She describes that people with money have a better chance to move up the social ladder.

However, even though money seems to be believed to help to change ones
social position in society, the idea of wealth is not free from the representation of social class.

Hanne: ‘(as a group of people who are easily change a place in a society) only within the middle class really. I think the poor cannot get out of being poor, there’s a cycle of deprivation and that’s difficult and I think the rich can quite easily stay up there.’

Jane: ‘(Are there groups that find it easier to move, or times when it’s easier to move?) Yes, I do. The more you have to start with, the easier it is to become what you want to be and the more security you have against moving downwards.’

Hanne perceives ‘a cycle of deprivation’ in the sense that lower class people are poor and therefore it is difficult for them to change their place in society. Even though Jane does not clearly mention social class, she believes that people who have more to start off with have a better chance to be secured and less chance to move downwards. A person who has money to start off with implies the person who was born in a wealthy family, which can reflect a social ascribed status. The quotes by Hanne and Jane reflect the perceived link between social class and success, which was discussed earlier. Thus, even though money is believed to help social mobility, social mobility is still believed to be difficult, as the wealth is associated with the representation of social class, which restricts social mobility.
Laura: 'I think education makes mobility easier, it gives you access to the better jobs, gives you a better start....she'd (her daughter) come out of university thousands of pounds poorer but would have had more chances to do something better. She may have more money now but in a few years time when they (her daughter's friends) get out, they'll be the ones with the better jobs and more money in the long run.'

Tracy: '(for whom it will be easier to change a place in a society) easier, again, it'll come back to education. Having an ability to I suppose just broaden horizons and develop a skill to give you an ability to be successful um.. position. I suppose that's crucial, education.'

These comments suggest that education is the key for success. Laura describes how university education is important because university graduates will end up getting better jobs and thus achieving a better life. Tracy also mentions how education will cultivate the abilities and skills that are the key element to achieving success in society. This idea of individual ability as the key element for success is one of the typical defining characteristics of Individualism (Oyserman and Markus, 1998). Because of this belief, people in individualistic societies are supposed to believe social mobility to be easy (Kim, 1997; Triandis, 1994).
However, even though education is believed to help social mobility, the opportunities for education are also believed to be restricted by social class. As reflected in the quote by Denise (in the description of society), social class determines the money, the level of education and the level of expectation. Even though education is believed to help social mobility, it depends on social class whether or not a person can have the opportunities to attain the necessary educational qualifications.

To summarise, the British people believe that social mobility is difficult because of the social class system. Even though education and money is believed to help social mobility, the opportunity for education and money is believed to be limited only to higher class people.

**Representation of Deviance**

*Japanese: The lack of consideration to others*

When the Japanese participants were asked about 'deviance' in society, many people mentioned behaviour that would be regarded as being inconsiderate to other people.

Setsuko: 'running around with a lot of noise, or any behaviour that causes trouble to other people...'

Kana: 'For example....people who sat on the ground in the train,
especially young people...who make others uncomfortable.'

These comments describe behaviours that did not think about other people's feelings. Setsuko suggested that she considered being loud and running around in public as deviant because it causes discomfort to other people. Kana considered the young people sitting around in the train as deviant, since it 'make others uncomfortable'. These comments seem to capture violation of social norm as grounds for considering other people deviant. As discussed in the close personal relationship, it was an important quality to be able to internalise other people's view and to be sympathetic to others in Japanese society. Thus the behaviours that are regarded as lack consideration may be perceived to be deviant in Japanese society.

The importance of internalisation of other people's views is reflected in how children are disciplined in Japanese society. For example, Sumiko suggests,

'I see children standing up on the seat with their shoes in the train. The way the mother discipline them is "The lady beside you is angry. Take off your shoes". It is no good. You have to teach them "wearing shoes on a seat is not a good behaviour"'

Sumiko's comment reflects how children are generally disciplined in Japanese society. Here, the mother explains her children that s/he should
not wear shoes on the public seat, because other people will be angry at the behaviour. Here, sanction for the bad behaviour is based on the fact that the child was not considerate to others, but not on the fact the child was conducting a wrong-doing. This seems to reflect how important it is in Japanese society to act accordingly to how others would perceive the behaviour.

Overall, the representation of deviance seems to have mirrored the representation of close interpersonal relationships. It emphasised the importance of consideration to others and internalisation of others' view.

*British: Serious social problems and lack of independence*

When British people were asked about deviance in society, criminal, violent behaviour and drugs are often mentioned as deviances.

Ellen: ‘.... Involved with drugs...I think a lot of people that get into violent situations, such as mugging people, things like that..’

Gwyneth: ‘anything that...behaving badly....or steal or all that sort of things. Just a...antisocial behaviour, obviously...vandalism and this sort of things, which we get now...’

Tracy: ‘Well, I suppose drug abuse is considered to be deviant or criminal activities.'
All participants above suggested that they considered criminal behaviour, violence and drugs as deviance in the society. Their representation of deviance shows a contrast to that of Japanese, who perceived any behaviour that lacked consideration to others as deviant. The behaviours that they considered to be deviant, such as behaviours that make others uncomfortable, seem to represent minor problems. On the other hand, the criminal behaviours, violence and drugs seem to represent quite serious and harmful social problems.

With regard to drug abuse, it may be perceived as deviant, as it reflects giving up the individual's responsibility to take care of themselves. As discussed in the representation of success, independence and self-reliance was perceived to represent success and was positively valued in the British society. Thus, if someone cannot control and take care of oneself, it can be perceived negatively and thus considered as deviant in society.

Moreover, when the British were asked about deviance, they also mentioned asylum seekers and refugees.

Rachel: ‘I think what this society considers as deviant are the groups that don’t contribute....I think we are going back to the old worries. Emphasis on asylum seekers and refugees...I think that’s sort of described ‘anti’ by societies. ..I think it’s fearful of dependency. People going dependent on its structures...’
Rachel talked about the fear of dependency, where asylum seekers and refugees are perceived to be dependent on the social system. This image of asylum seekers and refugees in Rachel's comments seem to represent favouritism towards independence within society. In the society, where independence is positively valued, the group of people who are believed to be dependent on the social system are negatively valued, and thus perceived to be deviant. In this respect, both drug abusers and asylum seekers are perceived to be deviant, because they are not believed to be 'independent' members of society. Moreover, the resentment towards ethnic minorities also reflects the idea of meritocracy. The idea of meritocracy represents the belief that people should get what they deserve. Thus, the group of people, who are perceived not to be contributing enough to society, do not deserve anything in return from society. When they do obtain social benefit, they are perceived to be 'deviant'.

Finally, some mentioned that a lack of consideration, respect and politeness towards other people should be considered to be deviant in society, as exemplified in Rachel's comment.

Rachel: 'consideration for others. This is the sort of the oil, if you like. Politeness and sort of..... It's the civility what we are taught as children. You will be polite to people. (Inaudible) Courtesy and consideration. Respect for others, if you like. (Inaudible) I think that's what society should value. What I think it should disvalue is the lack of
consideration and lack of respect. Sort of 'me-first' attitude. 

(Inaudible) So, that's the two core values I think every society should have consideration, politeness'

Here, the representation of deviance seems to be rather similar to what was found among the Japanese. Rachel mentioned in this comment that the lack of consideration to others should be considered to be deviant in society. In British society, consideration and respect toward others is also positively valued.

Overall, the representation of deviance among the British participants seems to reflect serious and harmful social problems. Moreover, asylum seekers and refugees were also considered to be deviant, which is based on the idea of meritocracy, and the value of 'independence' (Oyserman et al., 2002; Schwartz, 1990). Finally, in common with the Japanese, 'lack of consideration to others' was also perceived to be 'deviant'.

Anticipation for social change

Japanese: Individualistic social change. Link between social structural change and psychological function.

The Japanese anticipate an individualistic social change and believe that people are starting to express themselves more in public.

Taeko: '...I think people are starting to be able to voice their own
opinions. It wasn’t allowed before, but is becoming more acceptable these days…’

Mari: ‘…the concept of democracy came in after the WWII…when I think about my mother or grandmother, modesty…was the virtue among the Japanese women. After democracy, people became to think that you had to assert yourself to others…. Expressing and selling yourself is more of a virtue than to be patient….’

Taeko and Mari believe that expression of one’s opinion is becoming more common and to be prioritised in Japanese society. According to Mari, this trend started to appear after WWII, with the introduction of democracy into the country. Mari’s comment reflects a link between change in social system and in social values. In other words, the introduction of democracy is believed to be associated with increased individualistic attitudes among the Japanese. This link between social structure and psychological function will be discussed later in this section.

It was also mentioned that the personal life is gaining more priority than public life.

Chie: ‘the way people think is (changing to) more individualistic…many men used to devote themselves to the company and to sacrifice their family life….but from my husband’s generation, the work is considered as means for living and the
people are beginning to prioritise the family or what one wants to do’

Chie suggested that Japanese men, who traditionally devoted their whole life to the company, are now beginning to prioritise life with their family.

Moreover, the importance of development of ability and uniqueness in children was emphasised when Japanese participants talked about what they would hope for the children in future.

Sachiko: ‘children do a lot of things. Not only studying, but hobbies and club activities. A child will be successful when s/he achieved or got an award or won the game in no matter what s/he is good at. It is important to help them find what a child is good at.’

Rie: ‘appreciation and....the feeling that they like other people. I think it is important to like other people. I want them to become liking to mix with other people and to do things together. Yes, cooperativeness. But at the same time, I think you also need to be able to exercise the uniqueness. So, instead of doing things with group, I want them to do things as an individual.’

These comments emphasise the importance of the development of a unique identity and ability for the children’s future and for their happiness. Sachiko considered the achievement in anything the child is good at as
success for children. This seems to reflect the belief in innate potentiality that is an individualistic characteristic (Markus and Kitayama, 1991; Oyserman and Markus, 1998). This attitude is not reflected in the typical collectivistic ideology that everyone can achieve anything by perseverance. Even though Rie insists the importance of social relationship with others, she also hopes for her children to develop individual uniqueness and independence. Thus, the hope for the children in future seems to reflect the importance of individuality and uniqueness in society.

This importance of individual uniqueness and ability seems to be considered as social change, which is brought about by the social structural change within the Japanese society.

Chie: ‘now the system of lifetime employment is abolished and company wants talented people....the situation where you won’t be fired as long as you go to the company everyday...is changing...’

Rumi: ‘children need to have qualifications to get a job from now on, instead of going along with the rail provided for them...going to good high school, good university and good company...’

Chie and Rumi both expressed increasing needs of ability and individual uniqueness for social success. Chie stated that as lifetime employment was abolished, ability became more important than loyalty to an organisation. Rumi similarly suggested the importance of qualifications
for success in the future. In Japan, successful life conventionally meant to achieve a good academic record that guaranteed the entrance to a big organisation which guaranteed a level of security in life. Instead of following a socially established ‘successful’ path, Rumi believes that children will need to acquire concrete skills that they can contribute to the organisation in future.

Thus, a link between social structural change and change in an individual's psychological functions has been reflected when the Japanese people talked about social change. Mari indicated that the introduction of democratic government brought about the individualistic values of self-assertion among the people. Chie and Rumi asserted that the abolishment of lifetime employment and age related promotion increased the importance of ability for social success. Thus, the participants themselves stated how the change in society transformed individual's psychological functioning. This reflects a relationship between society and the individual and the functioning of a meta-system.

Overall, Japanese people anticipated individualistic social change. People perceived emerging values of self-assertion in public, of prioritisation of the private life over their public persona, and the importance of individual uniqueness. Such emerging individualistic values were also perceived to be related to social structural change.
The social changes that the British participants were anticipating focused on how their society was becoming multicultural and reflected an expressed fear of losing their national identity.

Alice: 'I'd say that there are... a lot more different nationalities, it's not English anymore..., but there's so many foreigners coming in...they're taking over the country....... People from different cultures marrying into a another culture and they're losing their identity.'

Gwyneth: 'I think we're losing our identity a little bit... Probably because we have been becoming multi-cultural...Obviously, when I was younger, we weren't so multi-cultural, and so ... You were British, you know'

Laura: 'I think there's more difference than similarity and I don't think there's a national identity to speak of.

Alice, Gwyneth and Laura all talked about how British society was becoming multicultural and people were losing their national identity. These comments show a link between the social system and psychological processes. They described how multiculturalism (social structural change) influenced their sense of self. This reflects a dynamic link
between society and the individual and the relationship between the belief about society constructed by individuals and its effect on psychological functions. In addition, multiculturalism was perceived rather negatively in all the extracts and this sense of negative feeling was explained as "invasion by foreigners". This may be related to the representation of refugees and asylum seekers, because they were considered to be deviant in the society.

The British participants also talked about a loss of consideration for others.

Gwyneth: 'But I think now the values have been changed. And perhaps people are... only thinking about themselves, not enough thinking about others anymore. What can I get out of this? What can I gain? ...Rather than...thinking, you know, sort of about helping others.'

Rachel: 'when I was young....it was like moral code... courtesy as you are growing up....There was this feeling of (inaudible) society that looks after everyone....that is ...the biggest difference as what was 30 years ago and what is today....'

Both Gwyneth and Rachel suggested that people became inconsiderate to others and putting more emphasis on self over the others. The increasing prioritisation of self was also mentioned by the Japanese. However, in the Japanese representation, this individualistic social change was mostly
described positively. With the British participants, prioritisation of self is described negatively. This difference in the attitude towards a similar phenomenon may reflect differences in how the social norm is perceived in both societies. In Japan, consideration to others is a strong social norm which people were obliged to follow. Lack of consideration is regarded as 'deviant' and prioritisation of self has been conventionally disapproved. Within this social context, social change towards a self-focus will give people a sense of personal freedom. In Britain, people are not under the obligation to prioritise others. On the other hand, consideration to others may represent the respect for other individuals, as well as for themselves. Thus, lack of consideration may mean the lack of respect to the other people's individual rights. Thus, the meaning given to the similar new phenomenon is unique between Japanese and British societies.

However, as a phenomenon, the change towards self-focus is similar as the representation of social change between Japanese and British participants. The similarity may be due to the similarity in the level of lifestyle. It was argued that highly industrialised and modern societies allow people to be independent and to prioritise individualistic values (Kagitçibasi, 1994; Triandis, 1994). In these societies, people do not need to be interdependent of each other, because they are well off enough to look after the self and their immediate family. Because both Japan and Britain are successful in achieving a high standard of living, people in these societies may prioritise individualistic values and show a tendency to prioritise self over the others. As Mari suggested, the prioritisation of self has been
apparent after WWII and the introduction of a democratic ideology. It is after WWII that the Japanese economy improved tremendously and achieved a similar standard of living to its Western counterparts. Thus, this new trend in Japan may be the result of the achievement of a modern social structure and of the interpersonal relationships in such a society.

Overall, the British participants talked about the trend of multiculturalism in British society and the fear of losing their identity as a consequence. This link between social structure and the sense of self seems to reflect interactive relationships between society and the individual. They also talked about lacking consideration of others as a new social phenomenon. This was also mentioned among the Japanese participants as a social change, even though the meaning given to it seems different between the British and the Japanese. The similarity in the perception of increasing self-focused behaviour may represent the similar level of development in these two societies.

**RIC scale**

With regard to the result of RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000), Table 6.1 shows the mean scores for each self-concept for the British and the Japanese.
Table 6.1. Mean scores for Individual, Relational, and Collective self-concept scores for the British and the Japanese participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Self-concept</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent sample t-test was performed for the mean scores for each self-concept between the two cultural groups. The difference between means were significant for relational self (t (39) = 4.083, p<.001) and for collective self (t (39) = -3.083, p<.01), but not for individual self. Thus, the t-test seems to have shown that the self concept of the British women was more relational and collective than that of the Japanese in this study.

Within each cultural group, Japanese tended to score higher on individual self than the others, and the British tended to score higher on relational self than others. Paired sample t-test was carried out and found that the Japanese individual score was significantly higher than their relational score (t (21) = 4.08, p=.001) and than their collective score (t (21) = 7.24, p<.001). The British relational score was significantly higher than their collective score (t (18) = 4.97, p<.001), but not significantly higher than their individual score (t (18) = -.1.06, p>.05). These results indicate that the Japanese participants tended to perceive themselves as a unique individual and the British tended to perceive themselves as a unique individual as well as in relation to others. Moreover, for both cultural
groups, the collective score was significantly lower than the others
(Japanese relational/collective: $t(21) = 5.89, p<.001$; British
individual/collective: $t(18) = 2.84, p<.05$). This indicates that the both
cultural groups showed less of a tendency to conceive the self in terms of
social categorical membership. Thus, even though the samples were too
small to consider statistical significance in this study, the results of RIC
indicated that the individualistic and collectivistic orientations at the
individual level among the participants in the present study showed more
complex orientation than the theory of I-C expected.
Concluding Remarks

Overall, the present study suggests that the distinction between Individualism and Collectivism is not as clear-cut as it has been assumed. According to the theory of I-C, societies are divided into two categories by defining characteristics. Emphasis on individuals, prioritisation of individual action and thought (Kim, 1997) and the values of independence (Markus and Kitayama, 1991) are considered to be defining characteristics of individualistic societies, such as Britain. On the other hand, maintenance of ascribed social status and personal relationships (Kim, 1994) and the values of interdependence and social relationships (Markus and Kitayama, 1991) are considered to be defining characteristics of collectivistic societies, such as Japan.

Collectivistic characteristics in the representation of society among the Japanese

When Japanese people talked about their society, they stated that it was important to diminish differences and uniqueness in public personal relationships. Being different from others triggers a sense of isolation among the Japanese, and thus they try to blend in with other people. Moreover, when they talked about close interpersonal relationships, the importance of empathy and internalisation of other people's views were emphasised. This indicates 'other-focused' values, which represents a collectivistic orientation. These 'other-centric' values were also represented in their beliefs about deviance. Behaviour that shows a lack of consideration of other people is regarded as 'deviant' within society.
When they talked about social success, the qualities of interdependence and conformism to social needs were emphasised. An individual's ability is essential for success. However, it needs to be compatible with social requirements. The idea of ability is also contextualised. An individual's ability is not present in a social vacuum and is only useful in a specific organisation and within specific interpersonal relationships. This belief makes social mobility between and within organisations difficult. All these issues reflect the defining characteristics of a collectivistic society, such as the priority given to harmonious and interdependent personal relationships (Markus and Kitayama, 1991).

Individualistic characteristics in the representation of society among the Japanese

However, when they described their society, they indicated that individuality is present in Japanese society but without expression. Moreover, even if it is not permissible to express in public, it is permissible to do so within the context of a close interpersonal relationship. This suggests that the Japanese people also need to express individual uniqueness and there is a specific way to do so within the social restrictions. The needs for expression of individual uniqueness were reflected by the fact that Japanese participants accepted individualistic social changes positively. They talked about an increase in individualistic values within Japanese society such as the importance of individual ability positively. These social trends reflect an emphasis on and prioritisation of the individuals, which represents an individualistic orientation. Moreover,
even though social mobility within and between organisations was regarded as difficult, social mobility in general terms was believed to be easy, as people do not believe in a class system. This is in contrast to the British representation of society, and represents a rather individualistic orientation. Finally, the way they attributed the failure of homeless people to their lack of effort was individualistic. Instead of showing sympathy, they rationalised that it was their fault that they were on the lowest rung of the social ladder. This reflects the meritocratic idea and the attribution of behaviour to the actor, instead of to external factors. Thus, the representation of society among the Japanese participants also reflected the defining characteristics of Individualism.

Individualistic characteristics in the representation of society among the British

The representations of success by the British were mainly characterised by individualistic properties. They believed in the importance of individual abilities, effort, and independence in their beliefs about social success, and individuals were considered to be agents for their own success. Moreover, when they talked about close interpersonal relationships, they emphasised the importance of acceptance of individual differences, and the importance of respecting personal space. These reflect the defining characteristics of an individualistic society, such as ‘value of independence’ (Schwartz, 1990) and ‘emphasis on individuals’ (Kim, 1997). Moreover, their perception of deviance and failure reflect the idea of meritocracy. Asylum seekers and refugees were regarded as ‘deviant’ as they get what they do not deserve.
They are perceived negatively, as they receive social benefits without contributing to the society. This is against the principle reflected in the idea of a meritocracy. Moreover, dependence on the social system is against their social values of 'independence'. Asylum seekers and refugees are believed to deserve their position as a social 'failure' since they are dependent without contributing to society. Thus, in their representation of deviance and failure, the British participants have also shown the individualistic orientation of their society.

Collectivistic characteristics in the representation of society among the British

Even though the representations of society above are characterised by individualistic characteristics, the British perceptions of society and success was also characterised by collectivistic defining characteristics. The aspect that was most strongly reflected in their beliefs about society was social class. Social class was believed to interfere with social success. High social class is perceived to be a symbol of success and low social class is perceived to be a symbol of failure. This belief about social class was also reflected in their ideas about social mobility. Social mobility was believed to be difficult as money cannot compensate for people's perception of social class. Even though money and education is believed to help social mobility to a certain extent, the opportunity for education is believed to be limited to a degree to people of a higher social class. Wealth is also associated with the upper classes. Thus, those who belong to the upper social classes are provided with the opportunities for success and those who
belong to the lower social classes are deprived of such opportunities. Therefore, social mobility is perceived to be difficult within the British society. This belief reflects the importance of social ascribed status, which was a defining characteristic of Collectivism (Kim, 1994). Furthermore, value of prioritisation of others, which is also a collectivistic characteristic, was reflected in their ideas of family and their ideas of deviance. They indicated that people should prioritise other members over the self in family relationships and the increasing trend of a lack of consideration for others in the modern society was described negatively and perceived to be deviant.

Thus, the representations of society and success among the British and Japanese participants were made up with both individualistic and collectivistic characteristics. This result implies that it is difficult to divide the societies into either individualistic or collectivistic orientations.

Moreover, the results of the present study show a link between society and the individual. This was reflected in the participants' discourse as well as in our analysis of the data. For example, Japanese participants mentioned how the introduction of democracy after the WWII increased the favourable attitudes towards individualistic values. They also suggest that the change in lifetime employment and age-related promotion increased importance of individual ability and encouraged individualistic values and attitudes among the people. Moreover the British participants talked about how multiculturalism changed people's sense of self. Hence,
participants themselves perceived a link between social structural change and change in psychological functions. Furthermore, this link between society and individual was also reflected in our analysis of the data. For example, similarities between two societies (loss of consideration as a social change) were attributed to similarities in their level of economic development. This link between social structure and psychological process reminds us of the function of a meta-system (Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001).

The findings from the present study suggest that it was important to re-visit the theory of Individualism and Collectivism. The present study shows how the study of a common sense understanding of society has resulted in a complex cultural characterisation of Japanese and British societies. Moreover, the common sense understanding of society and success reflects a link between society and an individual's psychological functioning. In this respect, the SRT approach (Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001) which provides a framework to investigate the meaning attached to the social world and the interactive meaning making process between the social world and individuals, is useful in order to re-visit the theory of I-C and to investigate further how social regulations in one society maps onto the theory of I-C.

Considering the characteristics of the participants in the present study, the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000) found the tendency that the Japanese participants perceive themselves more in terms of individualistic
self than relational and collective selves. It may be possible that the Japanese women are becoming to show more individualistic orientation with the social changes, especially compared to Japanese men. Japanese men are traditionally expected to devote their life to the 'company'. They spend more time in a 'company' that has been established upon rather collectivistic characteristics. Thus, their perception of society and interpersonal relationships may be more collectivistic. In contrast, Japanese women are less likely to spend their time in a traditional 'company' and therefore, may have more freedom from social constraints than Japanese men. Thus, the results obtained in this study may have emphasised increasing individualistic characteristics among Japanese women that may not be so apparent when repeated with Japanese men.

The relationships between representation of society and Self-knowledge

Finally, the investigation of the representation of society also indicated how self is conceptualised in British and Japanese societies. As discussed, a division between public and private spheres of life among the Japanese participants reflected their acceptance of a duality within the self. People are believed to have a 'public' and a 'private (true)' self and it is natural that people say and behave differently, depending on the situation. In the representation of close interpersonal relationships, the importance given to the internalisation of other people's views was emphasised as opposed to explicit communications, in order to understand each other. The closer people are, the less communication should be required. This belief seems
to be consistent with the idea of the 'interdependent self-construal' (Markus and Kitayama, 1991), in which the definition of self is present within the context of socialisation with others. People achieve the sense of self in their relationship with others. Thus, understanding of each other does not require direct communication. On the other hand, the British participants mentioned the importance of openness and honesty in close interpersonal relationships. Explicit communication is a key to success of close interpersonal relationships in order to understand each other. They also suggest the importance of acceptance of individual differences and respect of personal space. The idea of innate potentiality was also reflected in their representation of success. These beliefs seem to be consistent with the idea of an 'independent self-construal'. The 'independent self-construal' has a clear boundary between self and others and the individual is defined by unique internal attributes and abilities. Under this concept of self, understanding between two individuals can only be achieved by the explicit exchange of ideas. Each individual is believed to be unique and the space within a self-boundary is conceived as private, which should be respected by the other people. People were born with a set of innate abilities which determines the area that an individual can be successful in. Thus, individual needs to find an area which is compatible with his/her talents to be successful (Oyserman and Markus, 1998). Thus, the representation of society and success seems to indicate a specific belief about self in British (individualistic concept of self) and Japanese societies (collectivistic concept of self) and how Self-knowledge is uniquely constructed in these societies. As discussed in Chapter 4, the identity
perspective by Chryssochoou (2003) expects interactive relationships between Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition to construct the sense of self. The following empirical studies will investigate Self-claim and Recognition, in order to see whether the Self-knowledge reflected in this study will be mirrored in those aspects of self.
Chapter 7: Study 2: Representations of Self in Individualistic and Collectivistic Societies: How Self is Presented to Friends and to Co-workers in Britain and in Japan

Introduction

This study investigates how people present the self to others among British and Japanese women university students. Moreover, the ways in which I-C elements are reflected in such self-presentation are studied. As discussed in Chapter 4, the way Self-knowledge is constructed is influenced by how self is claimed to others. Thus, in order to understand the meaning given to self, it is important to study the social rules that are applied to self-presentation in different contexts within societies.

As discussed earlier, the meanings given to the social world and to the self are believed to be compatible to each other (Marková, 1987, 2000a, 2000b; Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001). Markus and colleagues (Kitayama and Markus, 1999; Markus and Kitayama, 1998; Markus, Mullally and Kitayama, 1997) also argued that representation of self consisted of a part of representation of their surroundings. Thus, the meaning given to society should also be represented in the common sense understanding of self. The first study (Chapter 6) showed this relationship, in which the meanings given to the social world indicated a culturally specific meaning that constituted the 'Self-knowledge'. As 'Self-knowledge' interact with 'Self-claim' to construct the sense of self (Chrysochoou, 2003), the meanings given to society should also be reflected in the self-presentation. For this reason, the findings from the previous study are expected to have
some implication for this study and thus used to construct the hypotheses.

In order to investigate the social norm reflected in the self-presentation, this study will use the 'Twenty Statement Test (TST)' (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954) to elicit the self-descriptions of Japanese and British participants. Oyserman and Markus (1998) argued that the answer to the question 'who am I?' was determined by the social representation of the self. They argue that how people describe themselves varies from society to society, depending on how people understand what the self is and how it should be presented to others. The TST asks respondents to fill in the blanks followed by the sentence 'I am' and they are freely able to describe themselves. In this sense, the TST is considered to be an appropriate tool to elicit the self-descriptions in order to explore the common principles in the idea of self prevailing in society.

Unlike the original TST, respondents in this study will be asked to describe themselves in either of two specific conditions: the self with friends or the self at the work place. This change was introduced due to different assumptions of self in the present study from the original study. The original TST was intended to elicit the general attitude to the self (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954). Thus, the aim of the TST was to measure the self-construct, which was independent of situational influences. In the present study, however, situational influences are considered to have an important implication to the meaning given to self. The self is believed to be socially shared beliefs, which reflect social norms. Social norms in
self-presentation could vary between different situations in the same society. Thus, in order to understand the representation of identity, it is important to investigate norms in self-expressions that are different between the contexts.

As discussed in Chapter 6, it was found that the Japanese people suppressed individual distinctiveness in public interpersonal relationships, whereas they are relaxed enough to show their true selves in the private interpersonal relationships. Therefore, the way people express themselves in public and private interpersonal relationships is expected to be different among the Japanese participants. Moreover, the results of Chapter 6 showed that I-C is transitiuational. The Japanese personal relationship in public spheres is characterised by a rather collectivistic orientation, whereas that in private sphere is characterised by a rather individualistic orientation. In order to measure these contextual differences in self-presentation, half of the participants will be asked to describe themselves to friends, representing a casual and private interpersonal relationship and other half, to their colleagues, representing a formal and public interpersonal relationship.

Hypotheses

Hamaguchi (1985) argue that the Japanese tend to use the 'outside-in' perceptual pattern, where others are used as a frame of reference. Similarly, Heine et al. (1999) argue that the Japanese are sensitive to the
responses of the audience because their self-evaluation is based on the judgment of internalised others. Moreover, Kimura (1972) argue that the word ‘jibun’, selfhood in Japanese, literally means shared portion of sense of self, which is produced in the relationship. Furthermore, the previous study in Chapter 6 has shown that the internalisation of other’s view was considered to be important in the close interpersonal relationship among the Japanese participants. According to these meanings given to the Japanese selfhood, it seems inevitable that the others are involved in the sense of self. Thus, the Japanese are expected to present themselves by self-references that represent the sensitivity to others’ view of self.

Hypothesis 1: The Japanese are expected to use more Allocentric self-references than the British.

On the other hand, Hamaguchi (1985) argues that Euro-Americans tend to use the ‘inside-out’ perceptual pattern, where the self is used as a frame of reference. Moreover, the selfhood in the individualistic societies is believed to consist of internal attributes that are independent of the context (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). Thus, the British are expected to present themselves by self-references that represent abstract personal characteristics free of contextual restraints.

Hypothesis 2: The British are expected to use more Idiocentric self-references than the Japanese.
Theoretically, Collectivism is expected to emphasise the collective identity and a group (Kim, 1994; Triandis, 1989; Triandis et al., 1990). Thus, it is possible that Japanese may use more Group self-references than the British. However, in the previous study (Chapter 6), it was found that social class had a very important meaning for the British sense of identity. On the other hand, the Japanese believed that there was no class system as such in the Japanese society. Thus, self-descriptions reflecting belongings to social groups are expected to be used more frequently by the British, than by the Japanese.

Hypothesis 3: The British are expected to use more Group self-references than the Japanese.

In terms of contextual differences, the result from the previous study (Chapter 6) found that the Japanese tended to suppress individual distinctiveness in the public relationships, whereas they feel free to show the real self to people with whom they have close interpersonal relationships. Based on this result, self-references that are suited to express individual uniqueness, are more likely to be used in the friend context (private interpersonal relationships), and those that help blending in with and maintaining a harmony with others are more likely to be used in the work context (public interpersonal relationships). Therefore,

Hypothesis 4: The Japanese are expected to use more Idiocentric self-references in the friend context than in the work context and
more Allocentric in the work context (public) than in the friend context (private).

For the British, because the self is believed to be a unique existence, and consistent across situations in the Western societies (Markus and Kitayama, 1991) the way self is described should be similar across situations. However, the previous study (Chapter 6) also showed that the social class, which should be reflected in Group self-references, had an important meaning for the sense of self among the British people. Interpersonal relationships in the public context are expected to make social division more salient to people than that in the private context. Hence,

Hypothesis 5: The British are expected to use more Group self-references in the work context than in the friend context.

Heine et al. (1999) argue that the need for positive self-regard is common within North Americans, where individualistic values are prevalent. Individualistic values emphasise the importance of individuals and encourage them to be unique. Moreover, in the Western cultural frame, where self needs to be asserted positively to maintain positive self-regard, a vast discrepancy between ideal and self will cause negative psychological effects (Higgins, 1987; Heine et al., 1999). Thus, positive self-evaluations are commonly used in self-presentations in individualistic societies. On the contrary, in the collectivistic societies, self-criticism is more common.
than positive self-evaluation in order to feel good about themselves. Heine and Lehman (1999) found that even though the Japanese were generally more dissatisfied with themselves (reflected in negative self-evaluation), it did not cause negative psychological effects. The Japanese believe that there is an ultimate ideal state and it is a virtue for individuals to make continuous effort to diminish the difference between their state and the ideal state (Kitayama and Karasawa, 1995; Kitayama and Markus, 1999; Kitayama et al., 1997). Within the Japanese cultural framework, feelings of self-dissatisfaction and self-criticism are essential force for individuals to make a progress. The present study predicts that these trends of self-presentation in individualistic and collectivistic societies will be reflected in the self-descriptions of the British and Japanese participants.

Hypothesis 6: The self-descriptions of the Japanese are expected to be more negative than positive, in order to serve self-criticism. In contrast, they should be more positive than negative among the British, in order to achieve positive self-regard.

In terms of contextual differences, Endo (1995) found that Japanese people did not show self-enhancement bias towards people that they have a direct contact with. Following this result, it is possible that the Japanese people will be self-critical in front of both co-workers and friends. Moreover, the British, whose society is supposed to be 'individualistic', are unlikely to evaluate themselves negatively in both conditions. Therefore,
Hypothesis 7: There will be no contextual differences in terms of self-evaluations among the British and the Japanese.

Method

Participants

The participants were university students, mainly majoring in human sciences. The nationalities were restricted to Japanese and British. A small number of Irish nationals were included within the British sample, because their cultures were considered to be similar. Ethnicity was restricted to Caucasian for the British to avoid various cultural backgrounds being confounding variables. The age of the samples was between 18 and 29. Finally, the gender of the participants was also restricted. It has been documented that there are differences between men and women and that women’s self-concept is more collectivistic (Josephs et al., 1992; Kashima et al., 1995; Triandis, 1990). In order to avoid gender influencing differences in the self-concept, the present study only selected women as its participants. Table 7.1 shows demographic characteristics of the samples used in this study.
Table 7.1. Demographic summary of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Japanese (N=151)</th>
<th>British (N= 103 British + 3 Irish)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age range (mean age)</td>
<td>18·28 (20.12)</td>
<td>18·29 (20.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Single: 98.0%</td>
<td>Single: 99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married : 2.0%</td>
<td>Married : 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others : 1.0 %</td>
<td>Others : 1.0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were also asked about the number of close friends they had and their work experiences. Within participants who were randomly allocated to the 'friend' context, more than 60 percent from both cultural groups reported that they had more than 5 close friends, none of the British and a small number of Japanese participants reported that they had no close friends. Within participants who were allocated to the 'work' context, 95 percent of the Japanese and 84.5 percent of the British had some kind of working experience. Therefore, samples from each cultural group and in each condition were considered to be comparable.

Procedure

Participants were presented with a questionnaire which was distributed at universities in Japan and Britain, and participation in the study was voluntarily. The questionnaires were distributed during lectures or at the university cafeteria and were collected by the researcher in person or through a collection box placed in the university faculty. The response rate was 37.55% (169/450) for the Japanese and 51.42% (180/350) for the British.
After data collection, the demographic information of the participants was examined carefully and only participants who fulfilled the requirements for nationality, ethnicity, age, and sex were used for the analysis.

**Design**

2 (nationalities: Japanese vs. British) X 2 (conditions: friend vs. work) between subjects design was used in the present study. Attention was paid to obtain the equivalent amount of responses for each condition. Table 7.2 shows the number of participants in each cultural group and context-condition.

Table 7.2. The number of responses in the friend and in the work contexts by Japanese and British participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Materials**

Participants were presented with the 'Twenty Statement Test (TST)' (Kuhn and McPartland, 1954). A back translation (Brislin, Lonner and Throndeike, 1973) was conducted for the Japanese version of TST, in order to insure that both versions of the questionnaire were equivalent. A slight modification was introduced in the TST. Firstly, the respondents were asked to make only ten self-descriptions, as in the past studies (Bochner, 1976, 1994), it was found that twenty statements were too many, and respondents started
repeating the same contents after the 10th statement. Secondly, because of practical reasons, no time limitation was set to complete the task in this study, even though participants were reminded to go through fairly quickly. Finally, self-descriptions elicited in the present study were context-specific (the self with co-worker vs. the self with friend), instead of context-free. (Appendices 3 and 4).

Analysis

Two coding schemes were used to analyse the data. Firstly, the coding scheme used by Bochner (1994), 'Idiocentric', 'Allocentric' and 'Group' self-references were used to investigate individualistic and collectivistic characteristics in the self-presentations. Idiocentric self-references represent 'personal qualities, attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, states, and traits that do not relate to other people' (1994, p.275). Allocentric self-references are self-definitions that represent 'qualities of interdependence, friendship, responsiveness to others, and sensitivity to how others perceive the person, a general interest in and concern with the viewpoint of other people' (1994, p.275). Group self-references refer to 'the person's group membership, to the demographic categories or groups with which people experience a common fate' (1994, p.275).

Secondly, the responses were categorised into positive, negative and neutral self-evaluations (Watkins and Gerong, 1997). This coding scheme was used to measure the evaluative aspects of self-concepts (Breakwell,
Two researchers from each cultural group performed the content-analysis independently and inter-rater reliability score was obtained to insure the reliability of the analysis.

Results

Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references between British and Japanese participants

Self-descriptions were firstly categorised into Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references (Bochner, 1994). For the initial categorisation, inter-rater reliability between two researchers were Cohen's $k = 0.81$ for the Japanese and Cohen's $k = 0.26$ for the British. In order to improve these figures, researchers discussed and agreed on the coding for some of the items that were initially disagreed. The inter-rater reliability was improved after the discussion to Cohen's $k = 0.94$ for the Japanese, and Cohen's $k = 0.75$ for the British.

Table 7.3 shows the frequencies for Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references used by the Japanese and the British.
Table 7.3. Frequencies for the Japanese and the British of Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Idiocentric</th>
<th>Allocentric</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Others (Difficult to classify)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>2154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 7.3 shows, more than half of the Japanese self-descriptions were classified as ‘Others (Difficult to classify)’. Because of this, it was considered to be necessary to perform further content analysis for the items in this category. Chi-square tests were conducted only for the items that were classified in the proposed 3 categories (See Appendix 5 for contingency table). The differences were found to be statistically significant $X^2 (2, N=1635) = 197.16$, $P<.05$).

The Hypothesis 1 predicted that the Japanese would use more Allocentric self-references than did the British. In order to test this account, further 2 x 2 chi-square test was conducted for the use of Allocentric self-reference against the rest of the self-references between the Japanese and the British (Table 7.4).

Table 7.4. Frequencies of Allocentric references vs. Idiocentric + Group self references between the Japanese and the British

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Allocentric</th>
<th>Idiocentric + Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>282 (167.6)</td>
<td>536 (650.4)</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>53 (167.4)</td>
<td>764 (649.6)</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\phi$ represents expected frequencies
The test showed the significant result ($X^2 (1, N=1635) = 196.54, P<.001$), and thus, confirmed that the Japanese used Allocentric self-references significantly more than the British did. When contents of the Japanese self-descriptions were analysed, it was found that many self-descriptions contained descriptions of others. For example, the Japanese tended to express themselves in relation to others, such as 'I am concerned with what the others are thinking', 'I affectionately listen to others', and 'I think about others from my heart'. They also contain the perception of self by others, such as 'I am not sure how much I am trusted', and 'I want others to think I am mature'. These trends of the descriptions of others and of the perception of self by others contributed to the frequent use of Allocentric self-references by the Japanese and thus, supported Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the British would use more Idiocentric self-references than the Japanese. In order to test this hypothesis, the further chi-square test was conducted for the Idiocentric self-references against the rest of self-references between the Japanese and the British (Table 7.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Idiocentric</th>
<th>Allocentric + Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>443 (530.82)</td>
<td>375 (287.18)</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>618 (530.18)</td>
<td>199 (286.82)</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 represents expected frequencies
The test showed the significant result ($X^2 (1, N=1635) = 82.83, P<.001$). Hence, the British used significantly more Idiocentric self-references than the Japanese did. The British showed a tendency to use self-definitive adjectives, such as 'controlled', 'assertive' and 'creative' in their self-descriptions, which supported the prediction reflected in the second Hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3 stated that the British would use more Group self-references than the Japanese. In order to test this account, chi-square test was performed on Group self-references against the rest of self-references between the Japanese and the British (Table 7.6).

Table 7.6. Frequencies for the Japanese and the British of Group self-references vs. Idiocentric + Allocentric self references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Idiocentric + Allocentric</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>93 (119.57)</td>
<td>725 (698.43)</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>146 (119.43)</td>
<td>671 (697.57)</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 represents expected frequencies

The test showed the significant result ($X^2 (1, N=1635) = 13.83, P<.001$). This result suggests that Group self-references were used significantly more by the British than by the Japanese and thus, were important for the British to describe themselves, as predicted in this study.

Even though, when compared, the Japanese used more Allocentric
self-references than the British (Table 7.4) and the British used more Idiocentric self-references than the Japanese (Table 7.5). Table 7.3 indicates that the most frequently used self-references by the Japanese was Idiocentric self-references. In order to see whether the difference between self-references were significant among the Japanese, further 1 x 3 chi-square test was conducted (Table 7.7).

Table 7.7. Frequencies for the Japanese for Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Idiocentric</th>
<th>Allocentric</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>443 (272.67)</td>
<td>282 (272.67)</td>
<td>93 (272.67)</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 represents expected frequencies (Total/3)

The difference between Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references among the Japanese was found to be significant ($X^2 (2, N=818) = 225.1, p<.001$). This result suggested that even though Allocentric self-references were more frequently used by the Japanese in comparison with the British, Idiocentric self-references was still important for the Japanese self-descriptions. Thus, Idiocentric self-references may be universally used frequently to describe the self.

Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references between the contexts among the British and the Japanese participants

The contextual effects on the use of Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references were further investigated. Table 7.8 shows the frequencies of these self-references between the participants who were asked to present
themselves to their friends, and those who were asked to present themselves to their co-workers.

Table 7.8. Frequencies between friend and work contexts for the Japanese and the British for Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Idiocentric</th>
<th>Allocentric</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Others (Difficult to classify)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>1324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Chi-square test was performed again only for the items that were classified in the proposed categories (Appendix 6). The differences between context differences were found to be statistically significant both for the Japanese \(X^2(2, N=818) = 29.19, P<.05\) and for the British \(X^2(2, N=817) = 15.19, P<.05\).

In Hypothesis 4, it was predicted that the Japanese would use more Idiocentric self-references in the friend context than in the work context and use more Allocentric self-references in the work context than in the friend context. However, Table 7.8 seems to indicate the opposite trend. In order to test whether the differences in the Idiocentric and Allocentric self-references between the contexts were significant, further 2 x 2 chi-square tests were performed on Idiocentric self-references against the rest of the self-references (Table 7.9) and on Allocentric self-references
against the rest of the self-references between two contexts (Table 7.10) among the Japanese.

### Table 7.9. Frequencies of Idiocentric self-references vs. Allocentric + Group self-references between friend and work contexts among the Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Idiocentric</th>
<th>Allocentric + Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>185 (212.83)</td>
<td>208 (180.17)</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>258 (230.17)</td>
<td>167 (194.83)</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 represents expected frequencies

### Table 7.10. Frequencies of Allocentric self-references vs. Idiocentric + Group self-references between friend and work contexts among the Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Allocentric</th>
<th>Idiocentric + Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>172 (135.48)</td>
<td>221 (257.52)</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>110 (146.52)</td>
<td>315 (278.48)</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 represents expected frequencies

Chi-square tests showed the significant results for Idiocentric self-references \( (X^2 (1, N=818) = 27.04, P<.001) \) (Table 7.9), and for the Allocentric self-references \( (X^2 (1, N=818) = 28.91, P<.001) \) (Table 7.10). These results indicated that the Japanese used more Idiocentric self-references in the work context than in the friend context (Table 7.9), whereas they used more Allocentric self-references in the friend context than in the work context (Table 7.10). This result was contrary to the Hypothesis 4, where more Idiocentric self-references in the friend context,
and more Allocentric self-references in the work context was expected.

In Hypothesis 5, the British were expected to use more Group self-references in the work context than in the friend context. Table 7.8 indicates that the differences between contexts are also large for Allocentric, as well as for Group self-references among the British. Thus, further 2 x 2 chi-square tests were performed for Allocentric self-references (Table 7.11) and for Group self-references (Table 7.12) against the rest of self-references between the contexts among the British.

Table 7.11. Frequencies of Allocentric self-references vs. Idiocentric + Group self-references between friend and work contexts for British

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Allocentric</th>
<th>Idiocentric + Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>14 (24.72)</td>
<td>367 (356.28)</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>39 (28.28)</td>
<td>397 (407.72)</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 represents expected frequencies

Table 7.12. Frequencies of Group self-references vs. Idiocentric + Allocentric self-references between friend and work contexts for British

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Idiocentric + Allocentric</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>57 (68.09)</td>
<td>324 (312.91)</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>89 (77.91)</td>
<td>347 (358.09)</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 represents expected frequencies

Both tests showed the significant results \( \chi^2 (1, N=817) = 9.31, p<.01 \) for Table 7.11; \( \chi^2 (1, N=817) = 4.12, p<.05 \) for Table 7.12. These results
indicate that the British use more Allocentric self-references (Table 7.11) as well as Group self-references (Table 7.12) in the work context than in the friend context. The more use of Group self-references in the work context was consistent with the Hypothesis 5. However, more use of Allocentric self-references in the work context was not expected.

Positive, negative and neutral self-evaluations between the British and the Japanese participants

The data was further analysed by the positive, negative, and neutral self-evaluations (Watkins and Gerong, 1997) to test the trend of self-enhancing and self-criticism among the British and the Japanese. Initial categorisation produced the following inter-rater reliability: Cohen’s \( k = 0.62 \) for the Japanese, Cohen’s \( k = 0.63 \) for the British. Two researchers discussed the results in order to increase the rate of agreement on the coding and achieved Cohen’s \( k = 0.85 \) for the Japanese, and Cohen’s \( k = 0.79 \) for the British.

Table 7.13 shows the positive, negative, and neutral self-evaluations used by the British and the Japanese.

Table 7.13. Frequencies for the Japanese and the British for positive, negative and neutral self-evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>2145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the chi-square test show the differences were statistically significant \( \chi^2(2, N=2145) = 101.96, p<.05 \). The results in Table 7.13 seem to support Hypothesis 6, which expects more negative self-descriptions among the Japanese, and more positive self-descriptions among the British. In order to inscribe this account, further 2 x 2 chi-square tests were performed on positive self-evaluations (Table 7.14) and on negative self-evaluations (Table 7.15), against the rest of the self-evaluations between the Japanese and the British. Further, as there also seems to be a large difference in the frequency of neutral self-evaluation between these cultural groups, the test was further performed on this self-evaluation (Table 7.16).

Table 7.14. Frequencies for the Japanese and the British of positive self-evaluation vs. total of negative + neutral self-evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative + Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>484 (594.93)</td>
<td>777 (666.07)</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>528 (417.07)</td>
<td>356 (466.93)</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>2145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( o \) represents expected frequencies

Table 7.15. Frequencies for the Japanese and the British of negative self-evaluation vs. total of positive + neutral self-evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive + Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>256 (202.23)</td>
<td>1005 (1058.77)</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>88 (141.77)</td>
<td>796 (742.23)</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>2145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( o \) represents expected frequencies
Table 7.16. Frequencies for the Japanese and the British of neutral self-evaluation vs. total of positive + negative self-evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Positive + Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>521 (463.84)</td>
<td>740 (797.16)</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>268 (325.16)</td>
<td>616 (558.84)</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>2145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 represents expected frequencies

The differences that were found between the Japanese and the British were significant for positive self-evaluation ($X^2 (1, N=2145) = 95, P<.001$) (Table 7.14), for negative self-evaluation ($X^2 (1, N=2145) = 41.32, P<.001$) (Table 7.15), and neutral self-evaluation ($X^2 (1, N=2145) = 27.04, P<.001$) (Table 7.16). This is consistent with the Hypothesis 6; the Japanese used more negative self-evaluations (Table 7.15), whereas the British used more positive self-evaluations (Table 7.14). Moreover, the Japanese used more neutral self-evaluations than the British did (Table 7.16).

Positive, negative and neutral self-evaluations between the contexts among the British and the Japanese participants

Finally, contextual differences in the use of positive, negative, and neutral self-evaluations were considered. Table 7.17 shows the numbers of times where positive, negative, and neutral self-evaluations were used in friend and work context by the British and the Japanese.
Table 7.17. Frequencies between friend and work contexts for the Japanese and the British positive, negative and neutral self-evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square test suggests that the differences between contexts were non-significant for both Japanese ($X^2(2, N=1261) = 2.64, p>.05$) and British ($X^2(2, N=884) = 4.61, p>.05$). The result is consistent with the Hypothesis 7, which proposed that the contextual differences were not expected to influence how positive, negative and neutral self-evaluations would be used by the British and the Japanese.

Content analysis for 'Others (difficult to classify)' of the Japanese self-descriptions

Regarding the 506 items that were classified as 'others (difficult to classify)', further content-analysis was performed (Appendix 7). As it shows, 14 more categories needed to be added for most of the Japanese self-descriptions to be meaningfully categorised. Appendix 7 shows that the Japanese frequently included what she is thinking or doing in a specific context. For example, they expressed activities, such as 'I have a coffee break with my co-workers', 'Conversing with others over dinner' in a specific context. They also described their behaviours or appearance, such as 'Loud voice' or 'wearing beautiful clothes'. These self-expressions of
activities and appearance in a specific context seem to represent the perception of self, observed by themselves. This reminds us of the personality theory by Hampson (1995), who claimed that the personality consisted of three aspects: 'actor', 'observer' and 'self-observer'. The 'actor' represents the self-consciousness and agentic aspect of self. The 'Observer' represents the others, which has influence on how the actor feels about themselves or modifies the behaviours of the 'actor'. The 'self-observer' functions to see the self through the eyes of the 'observer'. The objective perception of self found among the Japanese participants seems to represent the function of 'self-observer' in Hampson's personality theory. The self-descriptions that express objective observation of self may be related to the importance of internalising of other people's view, which was discussed in Chapter 6. The importance of vigilance to other people's view of self was reflected in the perception of how to maintain the close interpersonal relationship and how deviance is perceived among the Japanese. The tendency to perceive the self objectively as other people perceive may be reflecting their continuous effort to be vigilant to how self is perceived from the outside.

Self-descriptions that express thoughts or physical conditions in a specific context, such as 'I am glad that my salary is high' or 'Sleepy', seem to indicate context-specific self. Unlike the Japanese, British self-descriptions dominated context free self-definitive adjectives, such as 'intelligent', 'creative', and 'funny'. This difference in self-descriptions reminds us of the 'independent' and 'interdependent' self-construal
(Markus and Kitayama, 1991) and the cultural-specificity in the representation of self present in these societies.

Another very unique characteristic that was found in the Japanese self-descriptions was the use of euphemistic expressions, such as ‘tiger’ or ‘air’ to describe themselves. These descriptions of self were specific to the Japanese participants. This unique property reflected in the way the Japanese conventionally describe themselves explains why more than half of the Japanese self-descriptions were not categorised by the proposed classification by Bochner (1994). In other words, the Japanese may have a unique way to describe their self, which perhaps requires different dimensions from the Western concept of self. It is possible that Bochner's coding scheme may be based on the Western concept of self. As discussed, Bochner's coding scheme was based on the theory of I-C, which is a Western concept, where the philosophy of Individualism prevails. Collectivism represents an antithetical concept to Individualism. Therefore, the collectivistic characteristics reflected in I-C theory may only contain the opposite dimensions from those that are used to measure individualistic tendencies. This represents the fallacy of 'methodological Individualism', where the assumption is established upon the philosophy of Individualism (Billig, 1993; Marková, 1996; Wagner et al., 1999). If this is the case, it makes sense that the Japanese self-descriptions are unclassifiable by the proposed classifications and require more dimensions that are based on the indigenous concept of self and beyond the scope of Western concept of self.
Discussion

As predicted, the Japanese used significantly more Allocentric self-references than did the British (Hypothesis 1), and the British used significantly more Idiocentric self-references than did the Japanese (Hypothesis 2). Moreover, the British used significantly more positive self-evaluations, whereas the Japanese used significantly more negative self-evaluations (Hypothesis 6). This trend was true regardless of contextual differences of self-descriptions (Hypothesis 7). Furthermore, significantly more Group self-references were used by the British than by the Japanese (Hypothesis 3) and were used in the work contexts than in the friend contexts among the British (Hypothesis 5).

The study also found results that were not consistent with our expectations. Even though the Japanese used more Allocentric self-references than the British, the most frequently used self-descriptions by the Japanese were the Idiocentric self-references. Moreover, half of the Japanese self-descriptions were unable to be categorised by Idiocentric, Allocentric, and Group classifications. Finally, when contexts were taken into consideration, the Japanese used significantly more Idiocentric self-references in the work context than in the friend context and significantly more Allocentric self-references in the friend context, which was inconsistent with Hypothesis 4. It was also not expected in the Hypothesis 5 that the British would use significantly more Allocentric self-references in the work context than in the friend context.
Consistent with Hypothesis 2, the British used more Idiocentric self-references than did the Japanese. As discussed in the introduction, Idiocentric self-references are suitable to describe individualistic self-concept, such as ‘independent’ self-construal (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). The frequent use of Idiocentric self-references among the British was predicted from the results found in the previous study (Chapter 6). The beliefs about interpersonal relationships (importance of communication and respect for privacy) and social success (the belief about internal attributes and individual’s potential) among the British indicated the self-concept that is abstract and context free, supporting the property of ‘independent’ self-construal. Thus, the way in which Self-knowledge is formed and the self is presented to others consistently supported the individualistic concept of self among the British participants.

The present study also shows that the British use more Group self-references than the Japanese (Hypothesis 3). This result was also consistent with the previous study (Chapter 6). For the British participants, the social class is an important concept used to describe their society. They perceive that society has a clear social division and success in society is determined by a socially ascribed status. The frequent use of Group self-references supports the importance of social categorical membership for the sense of self among the British people. Thus,
Self-knowledge and Self-claim consistently supported the abstract concept of self and the importance of social categorical membership prevailing among British nationals.

**Importance of Allocentric self-references for the Japanese participants**

Being consistent with Hypothesis 1, the Japanese used more Allocentric self-references than did the British. Many Japanese self-expressions contained a reference to others, and the self that is perceived by the other people. This supports the idea of the 'interdependent' self-construal (Markus and Kitayama, 1991), and the other theories of Japanese selfhood (Hamaguchi, 1985; Heine et al., 1999; Kimura, 1972). The results are also consistent with those from the first study (Chapter 6). As discussed, the Japanese participants believed that it was important to have an ability to internalise other people’s views in a close personal relationship. Behaviour that disregards other people’s feelings is considered disrespectful and deviant. These ideas about society reflect the importance of being vigilant to other people’s view, which constitutes the importance of ‘others’ in the sense of self in Japanese society. Thus, the relationship between the meaning given to society, Self-knowledge, and self-presentation was also found among the Japanese participants.
The proportional difference in Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references: Representing the cross-cultural differences in self-presentation

Even though the Japanese used more Allocentric self-references than the British, they also used more Idiocentric self-references than the other self-references to describe themselves. Idiocentric self-references represent self-definitions that are not related to others. It is possible that such self-references may be used frequently in order to describe the self regardless of the culture, since ‘self’ is a concept, that separates self-consciousness from others. As discussed in the introduction, Triandis (1989) argues that the cultural differences in self-concept are represented in how frequently public, private and collective self is sampled. Instead of frequencies, the present study seemed to have shown the cultural differences in self were apparent in the difference in the proportions that each self-reference was sampled. Even though idiocentric self-references were used most frequently by the Japanese, proportionally more frequent use of Allocentric self-references made the Japanese self unique from the British. Similarly, the predominant use of Idiocentric self-references, combined with frequent use of Group self-references made the British self different from the self in other societies.

Idiocentric, Allocentric, and Group self-references between contexts

Considering the effect of the context, it was found that the Japanese used more Idiocentric self-references in the work context, and more Allocentric
self-references in the friend context, contrary to our Hypotheses 4. This hypothesis was based on the results from the previous study (Chapter 6), which found that Japanese people tended to reveal true self in close interpersonal relationships, whereas they tended to suppress their individual uniqueness in the public relationships. However, the previous study also found beliefs about individualistic social change among the Japanese participants. It is possible that the results of this study reflect this social change, a decreasing inhibition to express themselves in public. Even though social norms of suppression of uniqueness traditionally governed the interpersonal relationship at work, it might not be as strict as it was before. People may feel that it is allowed for them to assert themselves, without being overly concerned for what others might think in public (formal) interpersonal relationships. Therefore, more Idiocentric self-references might have been used in the work context. The present study also used students as the sample of study. Past studies have shown that Japanese students tended to show more individualistic orientation than did the rest of the population (Arikawa and Templer, 1998; Takano and Osaka, 1999). Therefore, the individualistic tendency shown in public interpersonal relationships could represent a specific trend among the students and thus, it can be different if other groups of samples were used in the study.

With the British, both Allocentric and Group self-references were significantly used more in the work context. More frequent use of Group self-references in the work context supports Hypothesis 5 and the results
from the previous study (Chapter 6), which revealed that the social class and categorical membership had an important meaning for the sense of self for the British participants. Compared to friend context, work context may have made the sense of belonging to a categorical membership more salient to the British participants and thus increased the use of Group self-references. The more use of Allocentric self-references in the work context by the British was not expected in the Hypothesis 5 and further investigation may be required to understand this phenomenon. However, Bochner's definition of 'Group self-references' states 'the person's group membership...the groups with which people experience a common fate' (1994, p.275, underline added). Thus, it is possible the personal relationship at work can represent the group that the British people feel a common fate with, and thus, they may try to maintain interdependence with colleagues as 'fellow' members. Allocentric self-references include the self-expression that represents interdependence. As a result, it is possible that the use of Allocentric self-references might have increased with the use of Group self-references. The future investigation of meaning given to interpersonal relationships at work among the British, may clarify why more Allocentric self-references were used in the work context.

'Difficult to Classify' by the Japanese participants

Many self-descriptions by the Japanese were difficult to classify by Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references. As discussed, the Japanese tended to use less self-definitive adjectives, and more context
specific descriptions/feelings and metaphors to describe the self. It is arguable that this trend may be only apparent because participants in the present study were reminded of a specific 'context' in thinking about themselves. When the context was salient, people may pay more attention to what is going on in that situation, or specific feelings and thoughts attached to that context. However, even though the same contextual effect was introduced, this trend was not prevalent among the British. British continued to use self-definitive adjectives to describe themselves and very few items were categorised as 'Difficult to classify'. Therefore, it is likely that this trend apparent in the Japanese self-descriptions represents a specific way of conceptualising and describing self within the Japanese society, which cannot be reflected in the Western concepts, such as I-C.

**Self-enhancement bias among the British and self-criticism bias among the Japanese participants**

Consistent with Hypothesis 6, the British used more positive self-evaluations, whereas the Japanese used more negative self-evaluations. Moreover, as predicted in Hypothesis 7, the different contexts did not affect the trend of self-enhancement in Britain and self-criticism in Japan. Studies in the past found a self-enhancement bias in individualistic (North American societies) societies and a self-criticism bias in collectivistic societies (Japan) (Heine et al., 1999, 2000, Heine and Lehman, 1999; Kitayama and Karasawa, 1995; Kitayama et al., 1997). The present study has followed the results from these studies and confirmed this trend between British and Japanese participants. Furthermore, the present
study also found that the Japanese used more neutral self-descriptions than the British. This may reflect the unique way to express the self among the Japanese who use descriptions of fact, activity and euphemism to present themselves. Those descriptions cannot represent an evaluative aspect of self, and thus increased the frequency of neutral self-evaluations.

Limitations

Even though this study limited the participants to women university students for a reason, this inevitably makes it difficult to generalise its results to the population in Japan and in Britain. It is most likely, for example, that adults with full time work feel a stronger need to keep a harmonious relationship with other colleagues than the students, because it will directly affect the life of themselves and of their family. Thus, repetition of the present study with different sample types is expected to show slightly different cross-cultural patterns between Britain and Japan.

Concluding Remarks

This study shows the culturally specific characteristics of the way the self is presented to others among the British and the Japanese participants. British self-presentation was dominated by Idiocentric self-references and positive self-evaluations and further characterised by relatively large number of Group self-references. Japanese self-presentation was characterised by proportionally more importance placed on Allocentric self-references and the dominant use of negative self-evaluations. These
differences in self presentation reveal a cultural specificity, which reflects unique meanings given to self in the British and Japanese societies. Thus, it seems plausible to conceptualise identity as SR, as Doise (1998) and Oyserman and Markus (1998) suggested.

This study also shows the unique configuration of I-C in the way people describe themselves to others in the British and Japanese societies. Some characteristics in self-presentation were consistent with the theory and showed the individualistic belief about self among the British participants (the predominant use of Idiocentric self-references, and positive self-evaluations etc.) and collectivistic belief about self among the Japanese participants (the proportionally larger use of Allocentric self-references, and negative self-evaluations etc.). Other characteristics were inconsistent with the I-C theory (importance of Group self-references for the British etc.). These results showed that I-C elements were uniquely anchored into the social norm in describing the self in these societies. Hence, this study also supported that I-C is a social representation (Farr, 1991) and the way it is anchored into people's social knowledge reveals cultural variations.

Finally, the investigation of how self was presented to others showed consistency with meanings given to society and to self. As discussed, importance of Idiocentric and Group self-references were compatible with individualistic self-concept and importance of social class among the British that were found in the previous study. The importance of
Allocentric self-references was also consistent with the importance of others reflected in the meaning given to society and Self-knowledge among the Japanese. Thus, as SRT (Marková, 1987, 2000a, 2000b; Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001) explains, the meaning of society and self seem to make each other up, which, then constitute a coherent understanding of the world view (Kitayama and Markus, 1999; Markus and Kitayama, 1998). Moreover, the Self-knowledge and the Self-claim interact with each other to make a sense of self, as Chryssochoou (2003) claimed. The following study will explore this identity perspective further by investigating the 'Recognition' component of identity, to see whether results consistent with first two studies can be obtained.
Chapter 8: Study 3: The representation of a person in 'individualistic' and 'collectivistic' societies: A cross-cultural study among British and Japanese women students

Introduction

This study investigates the social representation of a person, which gives meaning to identity, among British and Japanese women university students. Following the identity approach proposed by Chryssochoou (2003), the study investigates aspects of 'Recognition' and the social norms relating to how people recognise and accept each others claims in British and Japanese societies. Chryssochoou argues that aspects of 'Recognition' interact with aspects of Self-knowledge and Self-claims to form the representation of identity. The 'Recognition' gives the person a frame of reference to create knowledge about the self and allows him/her to make a claim about the self in a culturally specific way. Following on from Chryssochoou's hypothesis, the specific way in which people recognise others in these societies is expected to reflect the way that Self-knowledge is created, as investigated in Chapter 6, and the way self is presented to others, as investigated in Chapter 7. Hence, the results of this study are expected to show some consistencies with the results from previous empirical studies, representing British and Japanese representation of identity. Moreover, in common with previous empirical studies, how I-C elements are reflected in the way people accept other people's claims is also investigated.

In this study, the participants are presented with a fictitious person, who is
described by four self-expressions. The content of the self-descriptions is manipulated by Idiocentric, Allocentric, and Group self-references (Bochner, 1994), which represent I-C characteristics. Participants will then be asked to answer a series of questions, which probe judgments about this fictitious person. How people judge a person, who is described in an individualistic or in a collectivistic manner, is expected to reflect the cultural norm prevalent in the beliefs about a person. Specifically, it should reflect what a 'person' means and what sort of qualities are perceived to be culturally ideal. Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references are considered to be an appropriate tool to elicit the representation of an individualistic and a collectivistic person and to investigate the cultural convention in how people make judgments and impressions about this person in these societies.

Questions about a fictitious person

In order to study how people judge the fictitious person, the participants will be asked to imagine; the country of origin, gender, age, what a person does for living, agreeableness, how similar the person is to the participants themselves, how similar the person is to the typical British or Japanese person, how successful the person will be in the British or Japanese society, how warm the person is, how competent the person is, how cold the person is, and how well the person will be accepted in British or Japanese society. These questions were intended to elicit the representation of an individualistic or a collectivistic person in British and Japanese societies.
Some of the questions, such as the country of origin, gender, age, occupation, warmth, coldness, and competence were included to examine the general trend in how impressions are formed, which may reflect the SR of an individualistic or a collectivistic person.

*Country of Origin and age*

The question on country of origin was included to see whether we can find a division reflected in the I-C theory, in the way people imagine the origin of a person, who is described either in an individualistic or a collectivistic manner. With regard to age, it has been argued that students tend to be more individualistic than the rest of the population (e.g. Takano and Osaka, 1999). If this is the case, it is possible that the representation of an individualistic person may be characterised by younger generations.

*Gender and power relationships*

I-C orientation has also been linked with gender differences. Men are generally considered to show an individualistic orientation, whereas women are generally considered to show a collectivistic orientation (Josephs et al., 1992; Kashima et al., 1995; Triandis, 1990; Watkins et al., 1998).

Moreover, Glick and Fiske (2001) argue that the representation of men and women reflect an asymmetrical power relationship. Men tend to be more
agentic and powerful and women tend to be more communal and subordinate in society. Similarly, Eagly and Kite (1987) found that the stereotype of nationalities was similar to the stereotype of men or the socially dominant group. The stereotype of women or of the subdominant group tended to be associated with the qualities representing the social role within the society. Thus, it is possible that individualistic and agentic descriptions of a person may trigger an image of men, as well as powerful social categorical membership, whereas collectivistic and communal descriptions of a person may trigger an image of women, as well as subordinate social categorical membership.

Further, apart from the representation of gender, the representation of I-C itself may possibly reflect the power relationships. Kagitçibasi (1994) criticised I-C as often being used as a value-laden concept. Individualism is often associated with advanced, and developed forms of society whereas Collectivism, with developing and simpler forms of society. The former societies tend to be associated with predominant societies, and the latter societies, with subordinate societies. Similarly, it has been argued that the emphasis on individual distinctiveness in the representation of a group, which is apparent in the philosophy of Individualism, are the characteristics of socially powerful groups, and the emphasis on collective aspects in the same representation, which is apparent in the philosophy of Collectivism, was those of the subordinate groups, such as women, African-Americans and lower social status groups (Jackman and Senters, 1980; Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1988, 2001; Lorenzi-Cioldi and Clémence, 2003).
Hence, there is an association between 'individualistic' properties with 'power' and 'collectivistic' properties with relative weakness. Therefore, 'Idiocentric', 'Allocentric' and 'Group' self-references may also elicit the representation of power relationships between different social categorical memberships, with or without the representation of gender.

*Warmth, Coldness, and Competence*

The classic experiment by Asch (1946) showed that warm and cold were central adjectives that activate a stereotypical impression of a person. This suggests that there is a systematic mechanism in how impressions of a warm or a cold person are formed, depending on the adjectives that are chosen to describe a person. Recently, it has been argued the traits of 'warmth' and 'competence' are related to power relationships and also created representation of ethnic minorities in the U.S. (Fiske et al., 2002; Glick and Fiske, 2001). Glick and Fiske (2001) argue that the trait of 'warmth' tends to coincide with the traits of 'incompetence' and 'failure', whereas the trait of 'competence' goes well with canniness, and uncaring personalities (represented in 'cold' personality). It is argued that the former stereotype is associated with powerless people and social groups, and the latter stereotype is associated with powerful people and social groups. Hence, power organises the stereotypical descriptions of the groups. Moreover, these stereotypes are also reflected in the representation of ethnic minorities in the U.S. The former stereotype is reflected in the representation of the African-Americans, or Hispanics,
whereas the latter stereotype is reflected in the representation of Asian-Americans or Jews. It is argued that the emphasis on positive traits such as ‘warmth’ and ‘competence’ of ethnic minorities indirectly contribute to maintaining the existing discriminatory social system in the American society, by simultaneously reinforcing the negative traits that go with those positive traits. Thus, the argument by Glick and Fiske (2001) identified a link between power, cultural stereotypes and the impression of ‘warmth’ and ‘competence’. As discussed, I·C elements may be associated with asymmetrical power relationships (Jackman and Senters, 1980; Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1988, 2001; Lorenzi-Cioldi and Clémence, 2003). If the traits of ‘warmth’ and ‘competence’ are associated with power and cultural stereotypes, as Glick and Fiske suggested, a person described either in an individualistic or in a collectivistic manner, could possibly be systematically related to the impression of ‘warmth’ and ‘competence’.

*Occupation of a person*

The stereotype in the representation of I·C may also be reflected in the occupation of a person. It is argued that Individualism is often associated with industrial, predominant and successful societies, which are associated with power, and Collectivism, with underdeveloped, traditional, and simple form societies, which are associated with relative weakness (Kagitçibasi, 1994; Triandis; 1994). Hence, individualistic characteristics might be associated with competence and power and collectivistic characteristics may be associated with incompetence and subordinate role in society.
Thus the occupation of a person described in an individualistic manner may be associated with the highly paid jobs that require advanced qualifications and/or risk taking characteristics such as entrepreneurs or business executives. On the other hand, the occupation of a person described in a collectivistic manner can be associated with low-paid jobs which do not require highly qualified skills, such as social service or customer service.

Hypotheses with regards to agreeableness, similarity, social acceptance and success in each experimental condition

The questions regarding agreeableness, similarity, social acceptance, and success are expected to reflect the social norms that are specific to British and Japanese societies. As discussed, the social norm is reflected in the way people theorise about society and Self-knowledge (Chapter 6) and the way people present themselves to others (Chapter 7). As the aspect of Self-knowledge, Self-claim and how people recognise other people are expected to be cyclically related (Chryssochoou, 2003), and the meaning given to the social world is expected to constitute the meaning of self, the results of previous studies have an influence on the hypotheses regarding the representations of a person that are investigated in this study.

Hypothesis for four Idiocentric self-references

A person who is described by 4 Idiocentric self-references is expected to
trigger an image of an individualistic person. As discussed in Chapters 6 and 7, the British participants tended to have individualistic beliefs about self. Hence, more British are expected to find this person similar to and accepted by the general public. Moreover, British participants believed that it was important to believe in innate potential to be successful in their society (Refer to the representation of success in Chapter 6). Thus, a person who positively asserts an individual's innate attributes (reflected in Idiocentric self-references) may be perceived as successful among the British participants.

Hypothesis for four Allocentric self-references

The previous studies found a tendency among the Japanese participants to value the internalisation of other people's view on self. Following these results, a person described by four Allocentric self-references is expected to be considered similar to, and socially accepted by, the Japanese participants. Moreover, the Japanese participants believed that the success was not solely the outcome of internal abilities. Internal abilities need to be compatible with social needs and interpersonal support and connection with other people are essential for social success. Attentions to other people's perception and social issues in general are expected to be essential for social success in Japanese society. Allocentric self-references represent other people's view of self. Thus, more Japanese are expected to perceive a person described by 4 Allocentric self-references to be successful in their society.
Hypothesis for four Group self-references

Theoretically, a person described by four Group self-references is expected to be more prevalent in collectivistic societies. However, the previous studies found that social class had an important meaning to the identity of British people. The investigation of self-presentation showed that more British used Group self-references to describe themselves than did the Japanese. Therefore, a person who is described by four Group self-references is expected to be perceived as similar and socially accepted among the British. With regard to success, however, even though British people talked about the importance of social class for success in their society, they also tended to believe that individuals are the agent for their social success (refer to Chapter 6). Hence, a person who describes self only by Group self-reference may not necessarily trigger the image of a successful individual.

Hypothesis for two Idiocentric and two Allocentric self-references

A person described by 2 Idiocentric + 2 Allocentric self-references is hypothesised to be perceived as having more in common and to be more accepted by the Japanese participants. It has been claimed that the Japanese are becoming more individualistic (Miyanaga, 1993; Stephen et al., 1998; Takano and Osaka, 1999). Moreover the investigation of the representation of society showed increasing individualistic tendencies and
values among the Japanese (Chapter 6). Further, the study of self-presentation showed, that the Japanese self-descriptions were characterised by the frequent use of Idiocentric self-descriptions and by proportionally larger use of Allocentric self-references than the British. Thus, a person described by a mixture of Idiocentric and Allocentric self-references should be perceived as having more in common with the Japanese participants. Moreover, a person will also be accepted and perceived as successful in Japanese society, as the person would be reflective of the trend of emerging individualistic values as well as the importance of internalisation of, other people's views.

Hypothesis for two Idiocentric and two Group self-references

A person described by 2 Idiocentric and 2 Group self-references is hypothesised to be perceived as having more in common with the British participants. The investigation of self-presentation has shown that the British used Idiocentric self-references predominantly to describe themselves. Moreover, they also used more Group self-references than the Japanese. Also, Arikawa and Templer (1998) found that Japanese university students did not show a strong sense of belonging to a university compared to their American counterparts. It implies a possibility that a sense of belonging to a group can be more important to the identity for British (individualistic) university students than for Japanese university students. Thus, a person described by a mixture of Idiocentric and Group self-references is expected to be perceived as having more in common with,
and accepted by the British participants.

_Hypothesis for two Allocentric and two Group self-references_

A person described by 2 Allocentric + 2 Group self-references is likely to be perceived as having more in common with, accepted and successful by the Japanese participants. The social norms of internalisation of others and importance of others are quite strong in the Japanese representation of society, which was also reflected in the way they present themselves to others. Even though the Group self-references were found to be more important for the British participants in the previous studies, the importance of others was not strongly emphasised in the representation of society and self among the British participants. Thus, a person described by the combination of Allocentric and Group self-references should be more likely to be perceived as having more in common with, accepted and successful by the Japanese participants.
Method

Participants

Participants included 288 Japanese and 169 British women university undergraduate students. The age range for the Japanese students were between 18 and 29 (Mean age = 19.69), and for the British students were between 18 and 28 (Mean age = 18.66). Gender was restricted to women, following the first two studies (Chapters 6 and 7). The Japanese data was collected at 3 universities in Nagoya and 1 university in Tokyo. All the British data was collected at a university in the South of England. About half of the Japanese participants were majoring in Education, whereas about half of the British participants were majoring in Management. The rest of the participants were mostly consisted of students majoring in Human sciences in both cultural groups. Ethnicity of British participants was restricted to Caucasian in order to ensure the cultural comparison between a White European population (individualistic society) and an Asian population (collectivistic society).

Design

2 (nationalities) x 6 (self-claims) between-subjects design was used in this study. Table 8.1 shows the number of participants in each cultural group and in 6 experimental conditions.
Table 8.1. The number of responses in 6 conditions between 2 cultural groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idiocentric</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocentric</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocentric + Allocentric</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocentric + Group</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocentric + Group</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>288</strong></td>
<td><strong>169</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure

Most of the questionnaires were distributed and collected in lectures. Some of the Japanese questionnaires were collected by the students from their friends. The anonymity and confidentiality of the data was insured and participants were made aware of this as well as of their right to withdraw at any moment. After data collection, the participants were thoroughly debriefed. The demographic information of the participants was carefully examined and for the British, only the data of the participants who fulfilled the requirements for ethnicity were used for the analysis.

Materials

*Constructing a Pilot Questionnaire*

*Item selection*

A questionnaire, investigating a 'Recognition' aspect of identity, was
designed. The first step to constructing a pilot questionnaire was to select the self-descriptions to be used as an independent variable. Following Study 2 (Chapter 7), this study used Idiocentric, Allocentric, and Group self-references (Bochner, 1994) to elicit the representations of an 'individualistic' or a 'collectivistic' person.

Unlike the original definition by Bochner (1994), Allocentric self-references are defined exclusively as self-descriptions that refer to other people and include other people’s view of self in this study. The self-descriptions that express friendliness and interdependence, that are represented in the adjectives such as ‘sociable’ or ‘caring’, are excluded from the concept of Allocentric self-references. As discussed in Chapters 6 and 7, the Japanese representation of identity emphasises the idea of ‘others’ and ‘other people’s view of self’. Thus, the aspect of ‘other person’s view of self’ in Allocentric self-references is considered to be essential in capturing the unique meanings given to identity in Japanese society. For this reason, the definition of Allocentric self-references is limited to self-definitions that express other people and other people’s perception of self in this study.

Firstly, from the responses of the previous self-presentation study (Chapter 7), six items for each self-reference, which were commonly used by the participants, and whose contents were positive or at least neutral, were selected. Then, a questionnaire was devised in order to find out which of the six items were perceived to represent most ‘idiocentric’, ‘allocentric’, and ‘group’ characteristics and was distributed among professional
psychologists. Seven questionnaires were returned in Britain and three from Japan. From the results of this questionnaire, four self-expressions that had higher means and lower standard deviations (SD) (Refer to Appendix 8), and thus were perceived to represent most 'idiocentric', 'allocentric' and 'group' properties respectively were selected. The four 'idiocentric' self-descriptions were 'I am hardworking', 'I am efficient', 'I am creative' and 'I am confident'. The four 'allocentric' self-descriptions were 'I want to please other people', 'I care about how other people perceive me', 'I am considerate to other people's needs and feelings' and 'I would like to be accepted by other people'. The four 'group' self-descriptions were 'I am a member of XXX club (name of the club)', 'I am from the northern part of XXX (name of the country)', 'I am a supporter of my local sports team' and 'I am an active member of my local community'.

A Pilot questionnaire

The fictional situation in the pilot questionnaire was set at the airport, as it is considered as a place where people naturally come across different nationalities. The questionnaire started as follows:

'Imagine that you are sitting at the airport and talking to a person sitting next to you that you have just met. During the conversation, this person described oneself using the following expressions'
After this description of the setting, four self-expressions of a fictitious person, which were manipulated by Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references, were given. Then, respondents were asked to answer a series of questions, prompting the judgment about this person.

The pilot questionnaire was distributed to 99 second year psychology university students in Britain, during a lecture. The results from the pilot questionnaire indicated several problems. First of all, there was a problem of the setting. Many respondents felt a fictitious person quite boasting, as a person starts disclosing very personal matters to a stranger whom s/he meets at the airport for the first time. This was problematic, as the impression of the person was an effect of the context, not related to the representation of an 'individualistic' or a 'collectivistic' person. Moreover, most of the respondents imagined their own nationality (British) as the country of origin of the fictitious person. This may also have reflected the effect of the specific setting in the questionnaire. The respondents might have thought that the person needed to see some apparent commonality in order to strike a conversation and to share very personal matters with a stranger. As they are British, they might have guessed the fictitious person to be British.

Finally, one of the items in the Group self-references was problematic. Many respondents mentioned that the fictitious person was 'posh' as one of the self-expressions of the Group self-references stated that s/he is a member of XXX club. Participants mentioned that belonging to a 'club'
means something 'posh' in the British cultural context. This impression influenced the total affect towards this person among the British participants. These problems were considered in constructing the main questionnaire.

Main questionnaire

In order to deal with the problems encountered in the pilot study, the fictitious setting needed to be altered. Instead of using an airport as a setting, the main questionnaire explains that the four self-expressions of a person were elicited from the international survey of identity which asked participants to perceive themselves positively. In this way, the questionnaire was expected to elicit the various countries of origin for a fictitious person, based on the impression reflecting the representation of an 'individualistic' or a 'collectivistic' person. Moreover, it can avoid the impression of 'boasting' by the fictitious person. Further, the item 'I am a member of XXX club (name of the club)' in the Group self-references was replaced by 'I am the eldest in my family'. This was to eliminate the impression of a 'posh' person, which was elicited from belonging to a 'club' in the pilot study.

Hence, the main questionnaire introduces the setting as follows:

'An International study in self-perception asked people to think of themselves in a positive light and then give four descriptions.
One participant gave the following answer:

This instruction is followed by 4 self-expressions, which were manipulated by Idiocentric, Allocentric and Group self-references. There were six experimental conditions: '4 Idiocentric self-expressions', '4 Allocentric self-expressions', '4 Group self-expressions', '2 Idiocentric + 2 Allocentric self-expressions', '2 Idiocentric + 2 Group self-expressions', and '2 Allocentric + 2 Group self-expressions'. For the last three experimental conditions, combinations of 2 self-references that were considered to represent the most Idiocentric ('I am efficient' and 'I am hardworking'), the most Allocentric ('I want to please other people' and 'I care about how other people perceive me') and the most Group ('I am an active member of my local community' and 'I am from the northern part of XXX') characteristics, consisted of 4 self-expressions.

After the descriptions of a person, participants were asked a series of questions with regard to: country of origin, gender, age, what the person does for living, how much you like this person, how similar this person is to the respondents, how similar this person is to a typical British/Japanese person, how successful this person would be in the British or Japanese society, how warm, cold, and competent this person is, and how well this person would be accepted in British/Japanese society. Participants were asked to give either a descriptive answer (country of origin, age, what a person does for living), tick an appropriate option (gender), or to circle one of the options on a five-point rating scale ranging from the end-points
labelled as 1 “not at all” (e.g. “Not at all similar”, “Not at all successful” etc.) and as 5 “totally” (e.g. “Totally similar”, “Totally successful” etc.) (how much do you like this person, how similar this person is to the respondents and to a typical British/Japanese person, how warm, cold, and competent, and how well this person would be accepted in British/Japanese society). Refer to Appendices 9-14 for the final versions of the questionnaires that are used in this study.

For the Japanese questionnaire, the back translation (Brislin, Lonner and Throndike, 1973) was conducted to make sure the contents of it were equivalent to the English one.

RIC scale

The respondents were also asked to fill in the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000). This scale measures the aspects of individual, relational and collective self within an individual. Refer to the method section in Chapter 6 for a detailed description of the scale. This scale measures individualistic and collectivistic orientation at the individual level. Thus, the results of this scale should clarify whether the differences found in this study represents cultural differences, or the particular I-C orientations of the participants of this study. Refer to Appendix 15 for the ‘RIC scale’ used in this study.
Results

The scores of the RIC scale

With regard to the result of RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000), Table 8.2 shows the mean scores for each self-concept for the British and the Japanese students.

Table 8.2. Mean scores for individual, relational and collective self for Japanese and British

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Self-concept</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent sample t-test was performed on the mean scores for each self-concept between the two cultural groups. The difference between means were significant for independent self ($t (455) = -4.00, p<.001$), for relational self ($t (451) = -1.758, p<.001$) and for collective self ($t (397) = -11.41, p<.001$).

Within each cultural group, Japanese tended to score higher on individual self than the others, and the British tended to score higher on relational self than others. A paired sample t-test was carried out and found that the Japanese individual score was significantly higher than their relational score ($t (287) = 5.44, p<.001$) and than their collective score ($t (287) = 18.26, p<.001$). The British relational score was significantly higher than their
individual score \( t(168) = -11.22, p<.001 \) and than their collective score \( t(168) = 17.91, p<.001 \). These results indicate that the British participants tended to perceive themselves in relation to others, whereas the Japanese participants tended to perceive themselves in terms of a unique individual. Moreover, for both cultural groups, the collective score was significantly lower than the others (Japanese relational/collective: \( t(287) = 19.90, p<.001 \); British individual/collective: \( t(168) = 6.98, p<.001 \)). This indicates that both Japanese and British participants in this study showed less of a tendency to conceive the self in terms of social categorical membership. Similar to the results obtained in Chapter 6, cultural orientation at the individual level, reflected in the results of RIC scale shows more complex characteristics than the theory of I-C assumes.

Origin of a person

Appendix 16 shows which countries of origin were suggested by the participants. Regardless of self-expressions, the British imagined the fictitious person to be British. On the other hand, the Japanese tended to describe the Allocentric and the Idiocentric-allocentric person to be the Japanese, and the Idiocentric, the Group, the Idiocentric-group and the Allocentric-group person to be the American. This result indicated that the representation of an 'individualistic' and a 'collectivistic' person did not influence the judgment of a country of origin of the fictitious person among the British, whereas it did influence the Japanese.
Appendix 17 shows what participants thought the fictitious person did for living in the 6 conditions. There was a general tendency for the British to consider a person to be a student and for the Japanese, an office worker. However, the majority of responses were categorised as 'others', which represents the category that reached less than 5 frequencies. The fact 'others' dominated most of the responses reflected that there were a variety of answers in each condition. Thus, it is difficult to make an inference from the data regarding the relationship between the representation of an 'individualistic' and a 'collectivistic' person and occupation. However, there seems to be some trend in job types between conditions. In idiocentric conditions, the kinds of work that were included seemed to have represented white collar jobs, highly paid jobs, or the jobs with power or authority status. For example, the jobs such as a doctor, a lawyer, the president, a professor, and marketing tended to appear as the job type in the idiocentric condition. On the contrary, the job type in allocentric and allocentric-group condition seemed to have included those that require caring of others/customers. As examples, a stewardess, a social worker, a teacher and a nurse came up in allocentric and allocentric-group conditions. For the British, the job type for a Group person seems to represent, working class jobs, such as postman, working in supermarket, or builders. This seems to indicate that the representation of a person described by Group self-references reflects someone who is in the working class among the British participants. This seems to show some consistency with the
results found in the previous studies (Chapters 6 and 7) where the importance of Group self-references among the British are somehow related to their perception of social class.

How old this person is?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question ‘How old this person is’. The results showed a main effect of nationalities ($F_{1, 437} = 8.36, p<.01$) with the Japanese considering the person as older in general than did the British, and a main effect of the descriptions ($F_{5, 437} = 8.84, p<.001$) (see Table 8.3 for the means and standard deviations). Pairwise comparisons, adjusted by LSD, showed significant differences (Table 8.3 and Figure 8.1) between the ‘Group’ person and the ‘Idiocentric’, the ‘Allocentric’ and the ‘Idiocentric-allocentric persons (G/I $p<.01$, G/A $p<.001$, G/IA $p<.001$), for the ‘Group’ person to be always considered as older. There was no difference between the ‘Group’ and the ‘Idiocentric-group’ persons, who were equally considered older than the ‘Idiocentric’, the ‘Allocentric’ and the ‘Idiocentric-allocentric’ persons (IG/I $p<.05$, IG/A $p<.001$, IG/IA $p<.001$). The ‘Allocentric-group’ person was perceived to be significantly older than the ‘Allocentric’ and the ‘Idiocentric-allocentric’ persons (AG/A $p=.001$, AG/IA $<.01$), but not significantly older than the ‘Idiocentric’ person. There was no difference between the ‘Allocentric-group’ person and the ‘Group’, and the ‘Idiocentric-group’ persons. There was no difference between the ‘Allocentric’ and the ‘Idiocentric-allocentric’ persons, who were
equally perceived younger than the 'Group', the 'Idiocentric-group' and the 'Allocentric-group' persons. The 'Idiocentric' person was perceived significantly older than the 'Allocentric' person (I/A p<.05), but not significantly older than the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person.

Table 8.3. Mean age and (standard deviations) of the fictitious person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.07</td>
<td>23.96</td>
<td>32.20</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>32.24</td>
<td>29.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.01)</td>
<td>(6.82)</td>
<td>(9.11)</td>
<td>(5.37)</td>
<td>(7.76)</td>
<td>(6.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>25.22</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>27.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.34)</td>
<td>(8.53)</td>
<td>(12.51)</td>
<td>(5.66)</td>
<td>(7.96)</td>
<td>(7.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>30.88</td>
<td>24.99</td>
<td>30.83</td>
<td>28.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.31)</td>
<td>(7.47)</td>
<td>(10.64)</td>
<td>(5.48)</td>
<td>(8.02)</td>
<td>(7.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*I = Idiocentric self-references condition, A = Allocentric self-references condition, G = Group self-references condition, IA = Idiocentric Allocentric self-references condition, IG = Idiocentric Group self-references condition, AG = Allocentric Group self-references condition

These results indicate that independent of the nationality, the 'Group' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons were perceived as older than the 'Idiocentric', the 'Allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons. The 'Allocentric-group' person was perceived as older than the 'Allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons. The 'Idiocentric' person was perceived as older than the 'Allocentric' person, but was not perceived differently from the 'Allocentric-group' and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons.
Table 8.4 represents the gender of the fictitious person that participants imagined in each condition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Underline represents significant difference between male and female

A chi-square test was performed for each cultural group. The results show that the differences were found to be significant for both Japanese ($X^2 (5, \ldots$
N=287) = 33.785, P<.001) and British (X^2 (5, N=167) = 43.213, P<.001).

Further analysis by chi-square test shows that the differences between males and females in allocentric (X^2 (1, N=287) = 26.25, P<.001 for Japanese, X^2 (1, N=167) = 8.11, P<.01 for British) and group (X^2 (1, N=287) = 11.30, P<.001 for Japanese, X^2 (1, N=167) = 35.57, P<.001 for British) conditions are significant for both cultural groups. Moreover, the difference in the allocentric-group condition was shown to be significant for the British (X^2 (1, N=167) = 5.23, P<.05). Even though differences were not significant, the Japanese tended to imagine the 'Idiocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons as a male. This trend was not found among the British, and more people believed the person to be a woman in all conditions, except in the Group condition. Hence, a person described by Allocentric self-references seems to elicit an image of a woman and a person described by Group self-references seems to elicit an image of a man in both cultural groups. There is a tendency among the Japanese to perceive the 'Idiocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons to be a man. This tendency was specific to the Japanese and the British tended to perceive the fictitious person to be a woman, except when the person is described by Group self-references.

How much do you like this person?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question 'How much do you like this person?' with the scores of RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000) as covariates. The results
showed only the main effect of the descriptions to be significant ($F_{5,442} = 2.66\ p<.05$) (see Table 8.5 for the means and standard deviations). Pairwise comparisons, adjusted by LSD, showed significant differences (Table 8.5 and Figure 8.2) between the 'Group' and all other self-descriptions except the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and 'Idiocentric-group' descriptions ($G/I\ p<.05$, $G/A\ p=.001$, $G/AG\ p<.05$). The 'Group' person was less liked than the other conditions. Even though the differences were not significant, there was a tendency for the 'Allocentric' person to be more liked than the other conditions. The significant covariates were the scores of relational self ($F_{1,442}=5.28\ p<.05$, $m=5.52$) and of collective self ($F_{1,442}=4.51\ p<.05$, $m=4.71$).

Table 8.5. Mean scores and (standard deviations) of how much a person is liked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, independent of the nationality, participants seemed to like the 'Allocentric' person more and to less like the 'Group' person.
How similar to you?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question, 'How similar this person is to you' with the scores of individualistic, relational and collectivistic orientations from the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000) as covariates. Significant covariates were the score of relational self (F₁, 44₁=4.14 p<.05, m=5.52) and of collective self (F₁, 44₁=9.32 p<.01, m=4.71). The results showed a main effect of the descriptions (F₅, 4₄₁=26.66 p<.001). Pairwise comparisons, adjusted by LSD (see Table 8.6 for means and standard deviations), showed that the 'Allocentric' person was considered as more similar than all the other descriptions (A/I p<.001, A/G p<.001, A/IG p<.001, A/AG p<.001), except for the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person and the 'Group' person was described as less similar (G/I p<.001, G/IA p<.001, G/IG p<.01,
G/AG \( p < .001 \) than all the other descriptions. Further, the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person was considered as more similar to all descriptions except for the 'Allocentric' description (IA/I \( p < .001 \), IA/IG \( p < .001 \), IA/AG \( p < .001 \)). Finally, there was no difference in similarity between the 'Idiocentric', the 'Idiocentric-group' and the 'Allocentric-group' persons. Thus, it seemed that the participants, independent of nationality, found the 'Allocentric' person followed by the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person as most similar to them personally and the 'Group' person as the least similar.

This effect was, however, qualified by a significant interaction between descriptions and nationalities \( (F_{5, 441} = 4.32 \ p < .001) \) (see Table 8.6 and Figure 8.3).

Table 8.6. Mean scores (standard deviations) of how similar a person was perceived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>(0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(0.99)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way ANOVA \( (F_{11, 444} = 16.22 \ p < .001) \) showed that, in general, the Japanese found the 'Allocentric' person as more similar to them

---

1 All multiple comparisons (LSD) commented here were significant at either \( p < .01 \) or \( p < .001 \)
2 (in this sample, Japanese Allocentric score was significantly higher than any other scores except the Japanese and the British 'Idiocentric-allocentric' scores)
personally than any other conditions, except 'Idiocentric-allocentric' one. In addition, for the Japanese, the 'Group' person was perceived significantly less similar to themselves than all the other conditions, except 'Idiocentric' and 'Idiocentric-group' persons who are equally perceived dissimilar to themselves. The British considered the 'Idiocentric', the 'Allocentric', and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons equally similar to them and differentiated the 'Group' person, considering this person as less similar. The 'Idiocentric-group' and the 'Allocentric-group' persons were not different from the 'Idiocentric', the 'Allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons, or from the 'Group' person. These results confirm the fact that the Japanese considered themselves more similar to the 'Allocentric' person (including its combinations with idiocentric characteristics) and less similar to the 'Idiocentric' the 'Group' or the 'Idiocentric-group' people. On the other hand, the British found more similarities to a person with either idiocentric or allocentric characteristics as well as their combination. They really distanced themselves from the group description. One could speculate that this might be an attempt of the British participants to distance themselves from the working-class associations, probably evoked by the group description.
How similar to a typical British/Japanese?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question, 'How similar this person is to the typical British/Japanese?' with the scores of individualistic, relational and collectivistic orientations from the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000) as covariates. Significant covariates was the score of collective self (F 1, 441=12.47 p<.001, m=4.71). The results showed a main effect of the descriptions (F 5, 441=11.01 p<.001). Pairwise comparisons (see Table 8.7 for means and standard deviations), adjusted by LSD, showed that the 'Allocentric' person was considered as more similar than all the other descriptions, except for the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person (A/I p<.001, A/G p<.001, A/IG p<.001, A/AG p<.001). The idiocentric person was described as least similar (I/IA p<.001, I/AG p<.05) and the 'Group' person and the
'Idiocentric-group' person was equally dissimilar to the typical British/Japanese (G/IA p=.001, IG/IA p<.001). There are no differences between 'Group', 'Idiocentric-group' and 'Allocentric-group' conditions. Further, the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person was considered as more similar to the typical British/Japanese person than all descriptions, except the 'Allocentric' person (IA/AG p<.01). Thus, it seems that the participants, independent of nationality, found the 'Allocentric' person as well as the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person as most similar to the typical British/Japanese and the 'Idiocentric' person as the least similar.

This effect was, however, qualified by a significant interaction between descriptions and nationalities (F 5, 441=15.67 p<.001) (see Table 8.7 and Figure 8.4).

Table 8.7. Mean scores (standard deviations) of how similar a person was perceived to the typical British/Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.59)</td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way ANOVA (F 11, 444=15.47 p<.001) showed that in common with 'How similar to you?' question, the Japanese found the 'Allocentric' person

---

3 All multiple comparisons (LSD) commented here were significant at either p<.01 or p<.001
4 (in this sample, the allocentric person was considered as more similar to the typical Japanese than all other descriptions and Japanese Allocentric score was significantly higher than the British scores in any conditions)
as more similar to the typical Japanese followed by the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and the 'Allocentric-group' ones. In addition, for the Japanese the 'Idiocentric' person was the least similar to the typical Japanese, with the 'Group' person, being considered equally low in similarity. The British did not consider any person specifically as more similar to the typical British than the others. Unlike the 'How similar to you?' question, there was a trend among the British that the 'Group' person was considered to be more similar and the 'Allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons to be less similar. These results confirm the fact that the Japanese considered an 'Allocentric' person, including its combinations with idiocentric and group characteristics, similar to and the 'Idiocentric' the 'Group' and the 'Idiocentric-group' ones less similar to, the typical Japanese person. This trend was similar to their perception of similarity to themselves. On the other hand, the British did not find a person with a particular description more similar to the typical British than the others. They tended to consider that the 'Group' person was more similar, and the 'Allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons as less similar to the typical British. However, the difference between conditions was not significant. As the similarity judgments at the individual level (how similar to you) and at the social level (how similar to the typical British/Japanese person) were alike, one could speculate that the importance of Allocentric self-references in the judgment of similarity could represent a cultural effect among the Japanese. On the contrary, the importance of Allocentrism in the judgment of similarity to themselves among the British participants may represent the effect of gender, as this
effect was not apparent in the similarity judgment at the social level.

Figure 8.4: Similarity to typical Japanese/British

How successful would this person be?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question, 'How successful would this person be if he/she is in Britain/Japan' with the scores of individualistic, relational and collectivistic orientations from the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000) as covariates. None of the covariates were significant. The results showed a main effect of the descriptions ($F_{5, 442} = 3.81, p<.01$). Pairwise comparisons (see Table 8.8 for means and standard deviations), adjusted by LSD, showed that the 'Idiocentric' person, as well as the 'Idiocentric-group' persons were considered to be more successful than the 'Allocentric', the 'Group' and the 'Allocentric-group' persons ($I/A p<.01$, $I/G p<.01$, $I/AG$
Further, the 'Allocentric-group' person was considered as least successful and the 'Allocentric' and the 'Group' persons were also equally perceived to be unsuccessful. The 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person was perceived as significantly more successful than the 'Allocentric-group' person (IA/AG p<.05), but not significantly different from other descriptions. However, the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' score tended to be closer to the 'Idiocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' scores than to the 'Allocentric', 'Group', and 'Allocentric-group' scores. Thus, it seemed that the participants, independent of nationality, found the 'Idiocentric', the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons more successful than the 'Allocentric', the 'Group' and the 'Allocentric-group' persons.

This effect was, however, qualified by a significant interaction between descriptions and nationalities (F 5, 442=3.27 p<.01) (see Table 8.8 and Figure 8.5).

Table 8.8. Mean scores (standard deviations) of how successful a person was perceived to be in the Japanese and the British society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(0.96)</td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A one-way ANOVA (F \(11, 445=2.96\) p=.001) showed that\(^5\) the Japanese did not find a particular person to be more successful than the others. On the other hand, the British\(^6\) considered the 'Idiocentric' person as more successful than the 'Allocentric', the 'Group' and the 'Allocentric-group' persons. The 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons also tended to be perceived as successful. They further found the 'Allocentric' person as least successful and significantly less successful than the 'Idiocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons. The 'Group' person and the 'Allocentric-group' persons were perceived to be equally unsuccessful as was the 'Allocentric' person and significantly less successful than the 'Idiocentric' person. These results indicate that the descriptions do not influence the judgment of success among the Japanese. On the other hand, the British found the person with 'Idiocentric' self-expressions (either in a pure form or with combination with others) more successful.

---

\(^5\) All multiple comparisons (LSD) commented here were significant at either p<.01 or p<.001

\(^6\) (in this sample the British idiocentric person was considered as more successful than all other descriptions including the Japanese scores, except UK's Idiocentric-allocentric and Idiocentric-group scores)
Figure 8.5: Means of Success

nationality by condition

How warm this person is?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question 'How warm this person is' with the scores of individualistic, relational and collectivistic orientations from the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000) as covariates. None of the covariates were significant. The results showed a main effect of the descriptions ($F_{5, 442}=11.04, p<.001$) (see Table 8.9 for the means and standard deviations). Pairwise comparisons, adjusted by LSD, showed significant differences (Table 8.9 and Figure 8.6) between the 'Idiocentric' person and all other descriptions (I/A $p<.001$, I/G $p<.001$, I/IA $p<.001$, I/IG $p<.05$, I/AG $p<.001$). This person was considered less warm than all the others. On the contrary the ' Allocentric-group' and the ' Allocentric' persons were considered as warmer than the others, and as significantly warmer than the 'Idiocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons (AG/IG $p<.001$, A/IG $p<.001$). The 'Group' person was significantly warmer than the 'Idiocentric' and the
‘Idiocentric-group’ persons (G/IG p<.05), but was not significantly different from the ‘Allocentric’, the ‘Idiocentric-allocentric’ and the ‘Allocentric-group’ persons. The ‘Idiocentric-allocentric’ person was not significantly different from any other conditions except from the ‘Idiocentric’ person.

Table 8.9. Mean scores (standard deviations) of how warm a person was perceived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>(0.90)</td>
<td>(0.98)</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
<td>(0.79)</td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.99)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that independent of nationality, the ‘Allocentric’ and the ‘Allocentric-group’ persons were perceived as warmer and the ‘Idiocentric’ and ‘Idiocentric-group’ persons were perceived as less warm.

**Figure 8.6: Means of warmth**

by Conditions
How competent this person is?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question 'How competent this person is' with the scores of individualistic, relational and collectivistic orientations from the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000) as covariates. A significant covariate was the score of collective self (F 1, 440=4.49 p<.05, m=4.71). The results showed a main effect of nationalities (F 1, 440=13.16 p<.001) with the Japanese generally considering the person as more competent than did the British, and a main effect of the descriptions (F 5, 440=14.62 p<.001) (see Table 8.10 for the means and standard deviations). Pairwise comparisons, adjusted by LSD, showed significant differences (Table 8.10 and Figures 8.7) between the ‘Idiocentric’ person and all other descriptions, except for the ‘Idiocentric-group’ person (I/A p<.001, I/G p<.001, I/IA p<.001, I/AG p<.001). This person was considered to be more competent than the others, with the exception for the ‘Idiocentric-group’ person, who was considered as competent as the ‘Idiocentric’ person (IG/A p<.001, IG/G p=.001, IG/IA p<.001, IG/AG p<.001). On the contrary the ‘Allocentric’ person was considered to be less competent than all the others (A/G p<.01, A/IA p<.01, A/AG p<.05). No differences were found among the ‘Group’, the ‘Idiocentric-allocentric’ and ‘Allocentric-group’ persons.
Table 8.10. Mean scores (standard deviations) of how competent a person was perceived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.95)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(0.95)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that independent of nationality, the 'Allocentric' person was perceived as less competent and the 'Idiocentric' and 'Idiocentric-group' persons as more competent.

Figure 8.7: Means of competence by Conditions

How cold this person is?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question 'How cold this person is' with the scores of
individualistic, relational and collectivistic orientations from the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000) as covariates. None of the covariates were significant. The results showed a main effect of the descriptions (F 5, 442=6.95 p<.001) (see Table 8.11 for the means and standard deviations). Pairwise comparisons, adjusted by LSD, showed significant differences (Table 8.11 and Figure 8.8) between the 'Idiocentric' person and all other descriptions (I/A p<.001, I/G p<.001, I/IA p<.01, I/IG p<.05, I/AG p<.001). This person was considered colder than all the others. On the contrary the 'Allocentric-group' person was considered as less cold than all the others with the exception of the 'Allocentric' and the 'Group' persons (AG/IA p<.05, AG/IG p<.01). The 'Group' person was significantly less cold than the 'Idiocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons (G/IG p<.05), but not different from the others. There was no difference between the 'Allocentric', the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons.

Table 8.11. Mean scores (standard deviations) of how cold a person was perceived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
<td>(0.72)</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
<td>(0.85)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.84)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(0.71)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results indicate that independent of nationality, the 'Idiocentric' person was perceived as colder than all others and the 'Group' and 'Allocentric-group' persons were perceived as less cold. These results are
consistent with the perception of 'How warm this person is', where, regardless of the nationality, the 'Idiocentric' and 'Idiocentric-group' persons were considered to be less warm, and 'Allocentric' and 'Allocentric-group' persons were considered to be warmer than the others. Moreover, these also seem to be related to the perception of 'competence' where, regardless of nationality, the 'Idiocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons were perceived more competent, and the 'Allocentric' person was perceived less competent.

**Figure 8.8: Means of coldness**

`Figure 8.8: Means of coldness` by Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mean Cold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idiocentric</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocentric group</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocentric</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiocentric alloc</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocentric group</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How well accepted this person would be in British/Japanese society?

A 2 (nationalities) x 6 (descriptions) between subjects ANOVA was performed on the question, 'How well this person would be accepted in British/Japanese society?' with the scores of individualistic, relational and collectivistic orientations from the RIC scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000)
as covariates. None of the covariates were significant. Moreover, none of the main effects were significant. However, there was a significant interaction between descriptions and nationalities ($F_{5, 441} = 8.45 \ p < .001$) (see Table 8.12 and Figure 8.9).

Table 8.12. Mean scores (standard deviations) of how well a person was perceived to be accepted in the Japanese/British society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>IG</th>
<th>AG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(0.82)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(0.99)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.88)</td>
<td>(0.77)</td>
<td>(0.70)</td>
<td>(0.81)</td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
<td>(0.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(0.89)</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
<td>(0.92)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.9: Means of acceptance

A one-way ANOVA ($F_{11, 444} = 6.66 \ p < .001$) showed that, in general, the Japanese found the ‘Allocentric’ person to be better accepted than any other

7 All multiple comparisons (LSD) commented here were significant at either $p < .01$ or $p < .001$
descriptions, except for the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person. The 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person followed the 'Allocentric' person in terms of acceptance, and was significantly better accepted than the 'Idiocentric', and the 'Group' persons. On the contrary, for the Japanese the 'Idiocentric' person was least accepted in society, and significantly less accepted than the 'Allocentric', the 'Idiocentric-allocentric', and the 'Allocentric-group' persons. There is no difference between the 'Group' the 'Idiocentric-group', and the 'Allocentric-group' persons. The British did not consider a specific description as more accepted than the others. These results confirm the fact that the Japanese considered the 'Allocentric' person as better accepted than the other descriptions in Japanese society, followed by the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person. They also considered the 'Idiocentric' person the least accepted in Japanese society. On the other hand, the judgment of social acceptance was not influenced by descriptions among the British.
Discussion

Importance of 'Allocentrism' among the Japanese in the judgment of similarity and social acceptance

The Japanese people regarded the 'Allocentric', and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons, followed by the 'Allocentric-group' person, to be similar and the 'Idiocentric', the 'Group' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons to be less similar to themselves. This trend was also found in their judgment of similarity to the typical Japanese person. Moreover, the 'Allocentric' person was perceived to be socially accepted, whereas the 'Idiocentric' person was perceived to be the least accepted in Japanese society. These results indicate the importance of 'Allocentrism' in Japanese society, and are consistent with the hypotheses in this study, which predicted that the 'Allocentric', the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and 'Allocentric-group' persons would be perceived as more similar and more socially accepted among the Japanese participants. However, the importance of 'Allocentrism' was not reflected in their judgment of success. The Japanese did not perceive any persons specifically more successful than the others. This was not consistent with the hypotheses, in which the 'Allocentric' 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and 'Allocentric-group' persons were expected to be perceived as more successful in Japanese society, because of the positively valued 'Allocentrism'.
Importance of 'Idiocentrism' in the judgment of success among the British

The British regarded a person described with Idiocentric self-references was the most successful. Moreover, when Idiocentric self-references were included as a part of the self-descriptions, s/he tended to be perceived as successful in their society. On the contrary, a person described by 'Allocentric', 'Group', and the combination of both was perceived to be less successful in society. This result indicates the importance of 'Idiocentric' self-references in their judgment of success and was consistent with the hypothesis that the 'Idiocentric' person was perceived as more successful among the British. The hypotheses for the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons, however, did not specifically state that the British would consider those more successful than would the Japanese. In fact, the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person was expected to be perceived as more successful by the Japanese. Contrary to this hypothesis, the Japanese did not specifically perceive 'Idiocentric-allocentric' person successful, but the British did. Thus, the results were not consistent with the hypotheses. This result may reflect the importance of 'Idiocentric' self-references to represent social success in British society. Idiocentric self-references may be suitable in asserting the innate ability of individuals. In British society, assertion of what one can do may symbolise confidence and social success. Thus, if self-description included 'Idiocentric' self-references, even partly, a person may be perceived as successful. Contrary to the Japanese, the self-descriptions did not influence their judgments of similarity to the typical British person and social acceptance. The British did not find a
person described by specific self-references similar to the typical British person or more accepted in their society than the others. With regard to the judgment of similarity to themselves, the British considered the 'Idiocentric', the 'Allocentric, and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons as similar to themselves and the 'Group' person as having less in common with themselves. This result was not consistent with the hypotheses that expected the 'Idiocentric', the 'Group', and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons to be perceived as similar to themselves as well as to the typical British person and to be more likely to be socially acceptable to the British in general.

Importance of similarity and social acceptance among the Japanese and of success among the British as dimensions for the representation of a person

The fact that the judgment of similarity and social acceptance was highly influenced by interaction between nationality and self-descriptions seems to show that these dimensions are important to conceptualise a person within Japanese society. The social norm of importance of others, reflected in the Allocentric self-references became important when people needed to make judgment about similarity and social acceptance. As discussed earlier, the importance of others within Japanese society is also reflected in previous studies (Chapters 6 and 7). The fact that this social norm was important in terms of making judgments of similarity and social acceptance, but not in terms of other variables, such as success, or agreeableness, shows these two dimensions are important in
conceptualising a person in Japanese society.

Contrary to this, self-descriptions had little effect on the judgment of similarity and acceptance among the British participants. However, they had an effect on their judgment of success. The social norm of importance of individual's ability and uniqueness, which is reflected in the Idiocentric self-references, became important when they made judgments about success. As discussed, the representation of success showed an individualistic orientation within British society (Chapter 6). The fact that this individualistic social norm was important in terms of making judgments about success, but not in other variables, shows that the success is important in conceptualising a person in British society.

The importance of social acceptance and similarity and less emphasis placed on success for the Japanese representation of a person indicate that the description of a person is independent of social success, but has a great impact on inclusion in their society. Only certain people (e.g. Allocentric people) are perceived to be similar and are accepted in Japanese society. On the other hand, the importance of success and less emphasis placed on social acceptance and similarity for the British representation of a person indicate that the British are ready to accept people in their society independently of their descriptions. However, people need to be 'individualistic' to be considered as successful in British society.
With regard to gender, a person described by Allocentric self-references was perceived to be a woman and a person described by Group self-references was perceived to be a man in both cultural groups. The British tended to perceive a person as a woman, except the ‘Group’ person. The Japanese tended to perceive a person described by Idiocentric and Group self-references to be a man. This result was partly consistent with the expectation in this study, which predicted that the Idiocentric self-references may trigger the image of a man, whereas the Allocentric self-references may trigger the image of a woman. The systematic way that ‘Idiocentric’, ‘Allocentric’ and ‘Group’ self-references elicited the image of either a man or a woman indicate that the representations of a person that are elicited by these self-references may reflect the representation of gender, rather than the representation of an ‘individualistic’ and a ‘collectivistic’ person. However, further investigation is required to determine why the ‘Group’ person elicited an image of a man in both cultural groups, and why the ‘Idiocentric’ person did not necessarily elicit the image of a man.

Concerning the occupation of the person, the responses were too diverse to make any concrete inferences. However, there was a tendency for a
person described by Idiocentric self-references to be imagined as someone who was involved in highly paid, higher status jobs for both cultural groups. This representation might be related to the judgment of competence. The 'Idiocentric' person was considered to be competent, regardless of the nationality in this study. Hence, the 'Idiocentric' self-references may elicit the image of competent, and highly skilled individuals. On the other hand, a person described by Allocentric self-references tends to be perceived as being involved in a job which requires caring for other people, such as a social worker, nurse etc. This association between 'Allocentric' self-references and the types of jobs may represent the gender effect. As discussed, the participants in the present study tended to imagine the 'Allocentric' person to be a woman. Moreover, as discussed in the introduction, the representation of a woman tended to imply subordinate power in society. The type of job such as a nurse is often associated with women and represents a subordinate role in society. For instance, in comparison with a doctor, who makes medical decisions, the responsibility of nurses is to assist the doctor. Thus, the type of jobs that are associated with 'Allocentric' self-references may reflect the representation of woman and their subordinate place in society. Finally, among the British, a person described by Group self-references was associated with working class jobs. This representation might have an influence on their judgment of similarity at the personal level, where they perceived the 'Group' person less similar to themselves than any other self-descriptions. It is possible that they distanced themselves from the 'Group' person, due to the association with working class and the lower economical status of
individuals with that association.

Judgment of similarity at the personal level: Gender or cultural effect?

Even though the British did not find a person with a specific self-description as any more similar to the typical British, they tended to perceive the 'Idiocentric', the 'Allocentric, and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons as similar and the 'Group' person as less similar at a personal level. It is possible that this difference in the judgment of similarity among the British may represent the effect of gender. When the gender of a hypothetical person was asked, the British tended to perceive the 'Group' person as a man, and the rest as a woman. As all the participants in this study were women, the perceptions of the 'Idiocentric', the 'Allocentric', and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons to be similar, and of the 'Group' person to be dissimilar to themselves may have represented the effect of gender (the person is similar (dissimilar), because she is a woman (he is a man)), instead of the effect of the representation of an 'individualistic' or a 'collectivistic' person.

Contrary to this, the Japanese perceived the 'Allocentric', the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' and the 'Allocentric-group' people as similar and the 'Idiocentric', the 'Group' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons less similar to themselves, as well as to the typical Japanese. Thus, even though, in common with the British, the Japanese also showed the tendency to perceive the 'Allocentric' person as a woman and the 'Group' persons as a
man, the fact that the 'Allocentric' person was also perceived similar to the typical Japanese indicate that the phenomenon represents more than the gender effect, but the cultural phenomenon.

Judgment of warmth, coldness, and competence: representation of gender and power relationships

There were no cultural differences in the way people judged how warm or cold or how competent a person is. A person described by Allocentric, Group, and Allocentric-group self-references was perceived to be warmer and less cold and a person described by 'Idiocentric' and 'Idiocentric-group' self-references was perceived to be less warm and cold. With regard to competence, a person described by 'Idiocentric' and 'Idiocentric-group' self-references was perceived to be more competent, and a person described by 'Allocentric' self-references was perceived to be less competent. Thus, 'the Idiocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons were perceived as 'cold and competent' and 'Allocentric', 'Group', and 'Allocentric-group' persons, as 'warm and incompetent'. As discussed in the introduction, Glick and Fiske (2001) proposed the systematic way in which the dimensions of 'warmth/coldness' and 'competence' were related. The present study confirmed this relationship between warm and incompetence, and between cold and competence. Moreover, this study also showed these impressions were systematically elicited by the 'Idiocentric', the 'Allocentric' and the 'Group' self-references, which represent I-C orientations. According to Glick and Fiske, power organises the stereotypical descriptions of groups. The results of this study indicated that power relationships between social
categorical membership may possibly be related to the representation of an 'individualistic' and a 'collectivistic' person.

The fact that the ' Allocentric' person was perceived as 'warm but incompetent', regardless of nationality, was interesting, given the importance of 'Allocentrism' among the Japanese. If an Allocentric person was perceived to be more similar to themselves and more socially accepted in Japanese society, it seems strange that they were also perceived to be 'incompetent'. The reason for this effect requires further investigation. It is possible that this effect may perhaps reflect the representation of gender and an asymmetrical power relationship. In this study, a person who is described by Allocentric self-references tended to be perceived as women by both cultural groups. If so, Allocentric self-descriptions might have been associated with the representation of a woman, rather than the representation of a collectivistic person. As Eagly and Kite (1987) found, the representation of women included the image of a subdominant group and tended to be associated with the communal and domestic qualities within society. Following this study, Allocentric self-references might have reminded the participants of the representation of women and their subordinate role in society. The 'warm-incompetent' impression might have been elicited from the stereotype of woman, instead of from the stereotype of collectivistic national characteristics. This may be why the 'Allocentric' person was perceived as 'incompetent' regardless of nationality.
Judgment of agreeableness and representation of gender

With regard to agreeableness, no cultural effect was found. A person described by Allocentric self-references was more liked than a person described by any other self-references. In general, a person described by Group self-references was least liked. This effect may again reflect the gender effect. The participants were women in this study, and the Allocentric self-references tended to elicit the image of a woman. Thus, they may have felt more similar to and closer to a person described by Allocentric self-references than to a person described by Idiocentric or Group self-references. Thus, it is possible that a person described by Allocentric self-references were liked, regardless of nationality.

Country of origin of the fictitious person

With regard to a country of origin of the person, the British tended to imagine the person to be British regardless of self-descriptions. This effect may perhaps reflect multiculturalism in British society, which was reflected in their representation of society (Chapter 6). When the British participants talked about social change, they mentioned how their society was becoming multicultural and they feared losing the sense of a 'British' national identity. The British representation of society also contained the idea of ethnic minorities and asylum seekers. These beliefs about their society reflect the heterogeneous social characteristics. Thus, it is possible that they can conceptualise different cultures within British society, when they imagine the person.
On the other hand, the Japanese tended to find a person described by Allocentric and Idiocentric-allocentric self-references to be Japanese, whereas a person described by Idiocentric, Group, Idiocentric-group and Allocentric-group self-references, to be the American. The question of the country of origin was included to see whether the dichotomy in the I-C theory is reflected in the judgment of the fictitious person. This result has shown that the dichotomy in I-C theory was reflected more in the representation of a person among the Japanese than among the British. It may perhaps be related to the Japanese tendency to pay attention to the 'others' when they think about themselves. As discussed in Chapter 6, Japanese tend to think about others, when they try to conceptualise themselves. Considering this meaning given to the self and its relationships with others, when the Japanese people think about and try to define 'Japanese', the definition of 'others' also becomes important. They may perhaps pay closer attention to others and think more about similarity and differences between themselves and others. As the concept of I-C helps distinguishing their society from the others, this academic concept may perhaps be more salient to the Japanese people and thus more anchored into their understanding of the world. Thus the academic concept of I-C is more consistently reflected in the representation of an 'individualistic' and a 'collectivistic' person among the Japanese, when they need to judge their country of origin.
Age of the fictitious person

This study found that the 'Group' and the 'Idiocentric-group' persons were perceived to be older and the 'Allocentric' and the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons were perceived to be younger. The 'Allocentric-group' and the 'Idiocentric' persons tended to be perceived as older. The study expected that the 'Idiocentric' person might be perceived as younger, as the students who are from a younger generation tend to show an individualistic orientation. This expectation was not supported in this study. Further investigation is required as to why the 'Allocentric' the 'Idiocentric-allocentric' persons were also perceived to be younger, and why the 'Group', 'Idiocentric-group' and 'Allocentric-group' persons were perceived to be older. It may again be related to the representation of gender. As discussed, the 'Allocentric' person tended to be perceived as a woman, whereas the 'Group' person was perceived to be a man. It may perhaps be that the representation of a man in general may be older than the representation of a woman in general. However, this is only speculation and further investigation is needed to understand this result from the study.

Inference from the results of the RIC scale

None of the scores for the individual self was significant as covariates. For some questions, the score for the relational self (Questions for 'How much do you like?', and 'How similar to you?'), and the score for the collective self (Questions for 'How much do you like?', 'How similar to you?','
'How similar to typical British/Japanese?', and 'How competent?') were significant as covariates. Thus, I-C orientation at the individual level did not have a consistent effect on all the questions and it is difficult to make an inference regarding how I-C orientation at an individual level influenced the results of this study as a whole.

However, there are some indications that the relational and collective orientation of the participants at the personal level might have influenced the significant difference found at the collective level. For example, the scores of RIC scale showed that the British tended to show higher on relational self. Kashima et al. (1995) argued that the women's self-concept is more relational than men's. Thus the higher score on relational self among the British may represent the gender effect in this study. As discussed, the answers to the question regarding 'How similar to you?' among the British participants might have represented the effect of gender. Relational self, as well as collective self were significant as covariates for this question. The significant result of relational self as covariates seems to support the possibility that the result of this question was influenced by the I-C orientation of gender, instead of cultural effect.

Conclusion

This study investigated the social norms that are present in the way people recognise other people's claims among British and Japanese women university students. In general, the study found that Allocentrism was important for the Japanese in their judgment of similarity and social
acceptance. On the other hand, Idiocentrism was important for the British in their judgment of social success. Moreover, similarity and social acceptance were important for the Japanese and success was important for the British, as dimensions in the representation of a person. The study also found similarities, as well as these differences in the way both nationalities perceived an ‘individualistic’ and a ‘collectivistic’ person. Both nationalities perceived the ‘Idiocentric’ and the ‘Idiocentric-group’ person as colder but competent, and the ‘Allocentric’ person, as warmer but less competent. Both cultural groups liked the ‘Allocentric’ person more, and less liked the ‘Group’ person. These similarities in perception may reflect the representation of gender and of asymmetrical power relationships between different social categorical groups, instead of the representations of an ‘individualistic’ and ‘collectivistic’ person.

The results of the present study seem to indicate some consistencies with the previous studies that investigated representation of society and self. The next chapter will discuss the results of all three empirical studies, and how the meaning of society and self was consistently constructed. Furthermore, the results of this study have also shown that Recognition has cyclical relationships between Self-knowledge (Chapter 6) and Self-presentation (Chapter 7). The implication of these results will be discussed in the light of Chryssochoou’s identity approach (2003) in the next chapter.
Chapter 9: Conclusion

Summary of theoretical backgrounds and research question investigated in this thesis

This thesis started off by questioning the assumptions underlying I-C theory, in which cultural ideologies are expected to shape the individuals' psychological functioning. The cross-cultural differences that are depicted in this theory reflect the unidirectional influence from society to the individual, and thus are rather socially deterministic. It has been argued that such an assumption in I-C theory is methodologically incorrect (Hofstede, 1980, 1984, 1994), empirically unsupported (Arikawa and Templer, 1998; Crystal et al., 1998; Harrington and Liu, 2002; Jackson et al., 2000; Kemmelmeier et al., 2003; Ma and Schoeneman, 1997; Oyserman et al., 2002; Pilgrim and Rueda-Riedle, 2002; Santiago and Tarantino, 2002; Shimizu, 2000; Stephen et al., 1998; Takano and Osaka, 1999; Ujiie, 1997; Wang and Tamis-Lemonda, 2003; Xie, 1996), and theoretically overlooks important issues. Such issues include the cultural variability within societies, cultural dynamics and the different forms that I-C could take in the meaning given to surroundings.

Instead of relying on the assumption inherent in the I-C theory, this study investigated cross-cultural differences from the perspective of SRT (Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001). SRT assumes an interactive relationship between society and the individual. Individuals construct socially shared beliefs about their world, which in turn influences their psychological functioning which is perceived as collective cultural
characteristics. The representation is constructed through socialisation and thus, the way it is formed reflects a variation between different groups. Within this perspective, the cultural differences can be conceptualised as the ways in which common sense knowledge about the social world is constructed. Thus, SRT explains the cultural variation within societies and provides a theoretical framework to investigate the meanings given to social surroundings. Moreover, SRT explains that common sense knowledge is constantly produced in the process of communication. In this respect, the formation of common sense knowledge reflects social change. Hence, an SRT perspective provides a framework to investigate the socially shared meanings and affords explanation for variability and change within society.

In this thesis, the representation of identity was used as an entry point to understand cross-cultural differences. The recent thinking by Markus and Kitayama (1998) showed that the concept of identity links the cultural ideology and individual’s psychological functioning. Moreover, from the SRT perspective, identity reflects social regulations. The way people describe and conceptualise self reflects a socially shared understanding of a person (Doise, 1998). Thus, the representation of identity reflects the interactive link between the meanings given to society and an individual’s psychological functioning and helps in the understanding of different norms prevailing in society.

If identity is SR, the meanings of self are supposed to be constructed in the
communication process among the people within the community. If so, it is important to investigate the social context in which the meanings of identity is constructed. Moreover, the way people claim the self to others and the way people accept other people's claims about themselves also have important consequences to people's sense of self. Thus, the meaning given to society, the way the self is claimed to others and the way people recognise other people were investigated in this thesis to understand the representation of identity among the British and Japanese nationals.

The identity approach proposed by Chryssochoou (2003) was used as a framework to investigate representation of identity. In this approach, identity is conceptualised as SR and the sense of self is expected to be constructed in the dynamic interaction of three aspects, 'Self-knowledge', 'Self-claim' and 'Recognition'. In this thesis, three empirical studies were separately designed to investigate these aspects of identity, as well as the representation of society. The first study investigated how people talk about their society and the aspect of 'Self-knowledge'. The second study investigated the 'Self-claim' and the norms in presenting the self to others in the different contexts, as well as between different societies. In the third study, the aspect of 'Recognition' was investigated. Specifically, how British and Japanese people evaluate a person described in an 'individualistic' or in a 'collectivistic' manner was studied. As the identity perspective expects the dynamic interaction between the meanings given to society and to individuals, and three components of self, the results of these studies were expected to be consistent with each other.
This thesis also expected I-C elements to be reflected in the common sense knowledge about society and self. As discussed in Chapter 2, the dimension of I-C can be conceptualised as a social representation (Farr, 1991). As an academic concept that classifies societies into two cultural categories, I-C dichotomy can be reflected in people's common sense understanding of their society. At the same time, as a function of a meta-system, I-C elements could also be uniquely anchored into the understanding of society. Thus, the meaning given to the society among the British and the Japanese was expected to reflect some consistency with, but not be completely identical to the I-C dichotomy described in the theory.

Findings of three empirical studies

Consistent meanings given to society and self

British representation of society and self

When the British talked about social success, they mentioned innate abilities as one of the elements required for success. When they talked about interpersonal relationships, they mentioned the importance of communication and honesty and the respect of personal space in order to maintain a good relationship. The importance of ability in social success represents the belief about the self born with innate potentiality. Moreover, the need for explicit communication and honest expression to understand each other and the importance of respecting other people's private space seem to indicate the idea of self which is clearly separated
from others. The belief about innate ability and the context-free self seem to reflect the individualistic idea of self, such as an 'independent' self-construal by Markus and Kitayama (1991). Thus, the representation of society shared among the British participants indicated an individualistic 'Self-knowledge', showing that the meaning given to society is closely related to the meaning given to self.

The consistent meaning given to society and self was also reflected in the way they present themselves to others. In the first study (Chapter 6), collectivistic beliefs about society (belief about social class) were also found among the British nationals. This aspect of representation of society was also consistently apparent in the way they presented themselves to others. In the second study (Chapter 7), it was found that the British used more Group self-references than did the Japanese participants. The Group self-references represent the self-concept based on the social categorical membership (Bochner, 1994). The importance of Group self-references to their identity reflects the importance of social class in the meaning given to their society. Thus, collectivistic representation of society among the British was also apparent in their representation of self.

The consistent meaning given to society and self was also reflected in the representation of success and the way people recognise others in British society. The first study (Chapter 6) found that the British representation of success was characterised by individualistic properties. The innate ability and efforts (hard work) were mentioned as the elements that were
required for social success, and success was believed to be represented by independence and the realisation of one's dream. The importance of effort (hard work) represented the individualistic philosophies of the Protestant work ethic (Weber, 1958), meritocracy (Lerner, 1977) and equity (Kim, 1994). Moreover, the value of independence represents an individualistic value (Schwartz, 1990). Thus, the British representation of success was characterised by individualistic cultural ideologies. In the third study, it was found that the Idiocentric self-references were important in judging the level of success a person has achieved. This result indicated that a representation of an 'individualistic' person was associated with social success in British society. The philosophy of Individualism was reflected in the British meaning of success, and individuals need to be 'individualistic' to be perceived as successful. Thus, the results of these studies indicated the consistency in the way people give meaning to success (representation of society) and in the way people recognise other people (representation of identity).

Japanese representation of society and self

The link between representation of society and 'Self-knowledge' was also apparent among the Japanese participants. When the Japanese described their society, they talked about division between the public and private spheres of their lives. In the public sphere, people were expected to diminish individual uniqueness and to blend in with other people. In the private sphere, people are allowed to show their individual uniqueness and
true self. This meaning given to their society seems to be reflected in the meaning given to self in Japanese society. The acknowledgement of a division in the social spheres allows people to recognise a duality within a person. In the interviews, the Japanese participants claimed that people do behave differently in public and private spheres. People are vigilant as to what others think or do in the public sphere. On the other hand, they are more relaxed in revealing their true self in the private interpersonal relationships. The duality within a person was also theorised as 'official frame' and 'personal frame' by Kitayama and Markus (1999). Thus, a division between the public and private spheres in the representation of society was reflected in the meaning given to self in Japanese society.

When the Japanese talked about social mobility, they considered that it was difficult to change their place within and between organisations. This belief reflected an idea that an individual's ability was contextualised. Ability is believed to be only useful within a specific organisational setting and thus, not applicable to other settings. Moreover, when the Japanese people talked about interpersonal relationship, they claimed that close interpersonal relationships can be measured by how easily one understands others without explicit communication. The belief about context specific ability and understanding without communication also seem to represent the contextualised sense of self, which was theorised by Markus and Kitayama (1991) as an 'interdependent' self-construal. The 'interdependent' self-construal is characterised by a fuzzy boundary between self and others and is defined by attributes that are specific within
contexts. According to this belief about self, ability does not represent purely as innate ability but is conceived as what is developed in a specific context. Moreover, people do not need explicit communication to understand each other and, instead, are expected to read each others' minds. This specific 'Self-knowledge' in Japanese society also supports the various theories about Japanese personhood (Hamaguchi, 1985; Heine et al., 1999; Kimura, 1972). Hence, the belief about social mobility and the interpersonal relationships, which was apparent in the representation of society, also indicated the specific 'Self-knowledge' within Japanese society.

Link between representation of society and the individual's psychological processes

The investigation of the representation of society also reflected a link between the meanings given to their society and the individual's psychological processes. Some of the links were mentioned by the participants themselves. For example, in the first study (Chapter 6), Japanese participants claimed that the trend toward prioritisation of self over the others emerged with the introduction of democracy after WWII. Furthermore, other Japanese participants mentioned that the abolishment of lifetime employment and age related promotion has increased the importance of uniqueness and the role of the individual's innate ability in social success. Similarly, when the British talked about social change, they claimed that their society was becoming multicultural and, as a result, they were losing their sense of national identity. These comments reflect the participants' perception that social structural change influences the
psychological functioning of individuals. This link between social structure and the psychological functioning of individuals reflects the functioning of meta-system (Moscovici, 1984, 1988, 1998, 2001). The perception of the change in social relationships is reflected in the change in the psychological function. Thus, a link between cultural ideology and individual's psychological functioning, which was reflected in SRT, was perceived by participants themselves.

How do individualistic and collectivistic elements characterise the British and the Japanese cultures?

As discussed above, the British representation of interpersonal relationships and success reflected the importance of individualistic philosophy, which indicated 'individualistic' self-conception. Even though these British representations of society and self showed individualistic characteristics, they were also strongly characterised by collectivistic characteristics. When the British people talked about their society, they tended to describe a division by social class. They believed that a social class interfered with success and made social mobility difficult. The value of socially ascribed status is a defining characteristic of Collectivism (Kim, 1994). Thus, the British representation of society also showed collectivistic as well as individualistic properties.

As discussed earlier, the representation of society and self by the Japanese supported a division between public and private spheres and a contextualised sense of self. These aspects show a collectivistic
characteristic. The division of public and private spheres of life suggests that an individual's uniqueness, which is suppressed in public interpersonal relationships, is socially undesirable. Moreover, as Markus and Kitayama (1991) argued, the contextualised belief about self represents the self-concept that is prevailing in collectivistic societies.

In the representation of interpersonal relationships and of deviance, the importance of empathy, consideration for others and the internalisation of other people's view was emphasised. Moreover, Japanese people tended to emphasise the importance of social demands and other people for their success. Success cannot be achieved without other people's help and recognition (importance of others) and the innate ability needs to be compatible to the social demands to be acknowledged as a success. Thus, the representations of interpersonal relationships and success among the Japanese were characterised by the prioritisation of others and society, and personal relationships, which are some of the defining characteristics of Collectivism (Kim, 1994, 1997; Schwartz 1990; Yamaguchi, 1994).

The Japanese representation of society also showed an individualistic orientation. For example, they anticipated individualistic social change within Japanese society. They mentioned that people are beginning to assert themselves more in public. In addition, they mentioned that individual ability and uniqueness are becoming more important for social success. Moreover, the Japanese people did not believe that social mobility was generally difficult as they claimed that their society was not
based on a class system. They believed that money could easily facilitate a change in social position. Flexible social mobility was theoretically considered to be an individualistic defining characteristic (Triandis, 1994). Thus, the Japanese representation of society also reflected both individualistic and collectivistic characteristics.

Consequences of these results for the theory of Individualism-Collectivism and Social Representation Theory

Hence, the meaning given to society and self showed the distinctive mixture of individualistic and collectivistic orientations in British and Japanese society. Some of the orientations found in representations of society and self were consistent with the dichotomy reflected in I-C theory. For example, the individualistic representation of success, and individualistic Self-knowledge that were found among the British, the collectivistic representation of success, a division between public and private in the representation of society and self, and the importance of others in defining self that were found among the Japanese, were consistent with the theory. However, some aspects were not consistent with the I-C dichotomy. For example, the importance of social class in the British representation of society and self and the individualistic social change among the Japanese were not consistent with the dichotomy reflected in I-C theory. The results of this study suggest that I-C elements are differently reflected in the common sense theory of society and self in order to characterise the British and Japanese culture. As discussed in Chapter 2, Farr (1991) argues that Individualism is the collective representation that prevails in Western society. Following his claim, this
thesis conceptualised I-C as SR and expected that the common sense knowledge about society and self would reflect the I-C dichotomy only to a certain extent. The result of this study confirms that the SR of society and self are regulated both by individualistic and collectivistic philosophies and different individualistic and collectivistic elements characterise a unique cultural orientation in British and Japanese society.

The investigation of cultural differences in how people construct the meaning of society and self captured a different mixture of I-C elements in both societies, which forms the different cultural characteristics between British and Japanese society. Discovering how different I-C elements constitute the meanings of the surroundings by people living within society is beyond the theoretical assumption of I-C. Therefore, the SRT framework offers a novel approach to cross-cultural study and thus distinctively contributes to the advancement of cross-cultural knowledge.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the study of self-presentation (Chapter 7) showed that more than half of the Japanese self-descriptions were unable to be classified within the proposed categories by Bochner (1994) that was based on I-C theories. As discussed, this result might have represented 'methodological Individualism' (Billig, 1993; Marková, 1996; Wagner et al., 1999), which indicates that I-C distinction may only reflect the Western idea of self. Thus, in order to analyse non-Western representation of identity, a more indigenous approach might be necessary. This result also seems to indicate the possible limitation of the I-C
dichotomy in explaining cross-cultural differences.

Consistent results from three empirical studies and its implications for the identity approach (Chryssochoou, 2003)

As discussed above, the Self-knowledge, found in the representation of society among the British nationals (Chapter 6), showed an individualistic idea of self. This meaning given to self was also reflected in the way British people express themselves to others (Chapter 7) and in the way they recognise other people (Chapter 8) in British society. The second study showed that the British tended to use Idiocentric self-references predominantly in order to describe themselves. In the third study, a person whose self-expression contained Idiocentric self-references, at least partly, was perceived to be successful. These results were consistent in showing the importance of Idiocentric self-references in Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition, which supports the British representation of identity.

As discussed above, the Japanese representation of society showed the co-presence of individualistic and collectivistic orientations. This trend in the common sense belief about society was also apparent in the way people present themselves to others and in the way others recognise other people's claim. In the second study (Chapter 7), it was found that the Japanese tended to use more Allocentric self-references than the British. The frequent use of Allocentric self-references can be considered to represent collectivistic orientation, as Allocentric self-references represent
interdependence and importance of others in the definition of self. Even though the Japanese used proportionally more Allocentric self-references than did the British, the most frequently used self-descriptions by the Japanese were Idiocentric self-references. Thus, the social norms which organise the self-presentation have shown the mixture of individualistic and collectivistic orientations among the Japanese. Moreover in the third study (Chapter 8), a person described by the mixture of Idiocentric and Allocentric self-references were also perceived to be as similar and acceptable as a person described solely by the Allocentric self-references. This result indicated the importance of Allocentric self-references, as well as the emerging social acceptance of individualistic orientations (reflected in the acceptance of Idiocentric-allocentric person) in recognising other people among the Japanese. Hence, the social norm organising Recognition also indicated both individualistic and collectivistic orientations among the Japanese.

The consistent results throughout the empirical studies support cyclical relationships between Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition. This is compatible with the assumption underlying the identity perspective (Chryssochoou, 2003), which expects that a dynamic interaction between Self-knowledge, Self-claim and Recognition forms the representation of identity.
The dynamic relationship between the common sense knowledge of society and the common sense knowledge of self: Implications for SRT as a framework to understand identity

As discussed in Chapter 3, the function of a meta-system is to apply the social rules to assist the function of 'System' in order to create SR. Within this theoretical perspective, the concept of identity also represents common sense knowledge and thus reflects social regulations (Chapter 4). This thesis showed a common principle within the representation of identity, which was investigated through three components 'Self-knowledge', 'Self-claim' and 'Recognition' in the identity approach (Chryssochoou, 2003). As discussed, the importance of others and of being vigilant with respect to other people's views on self was reflected in the socially shared Self-knowledge among the Japanese. Such social norms in self-concept were identified in the conventions of how people present themselves to others and recognise other people's self-claims. Japanese people tended to use Allocentric self-references more often than did the British to describe themselves to others. Moreover, a person described by 'Allocentric' self-references was considered to be similar and socially accepted by the Japanese.

On the other hand, the British representation of society reflected an individualistic belief about self. Self is an abstract entity, which is independent of context. This individualistic idea of self was also reflected in the systematic way British people describe themselves to others and recognise other people's claims. They tended to use Idiocentric
self-references dominantly in the self-presentation. Moreover, a person described by Idiocentric self-references tended to be perceived by them as successful in their society. Thus, the importance of Idiocentric references was apparent in their Self-claim and Recognition. Hence, the representation of identity among the British and Japanese participants showed a cultural specificity in the way that the self-concept was formed, that they present themselves, and in their recognition of other people's Self-claims. Thus, this study indicates that the identity reflects the social regulations, which is consistent with the theoretical assumption reflected in SRT. Therefore, it is viable to conceptualise identity as SR, and SRT gives an appropriate theoretical background to investigate cross-cultural differences in the meaning given to self.

The issue of the representation of gender and the power relationships between members of different social categories

Finally, the empirical studies also indicate the possibility that the recognition of a person may be influenced by the representation of gender instead of cultural differences. In the third study (Chapter 8), Idiocentric, Allocentric, and Group self-references (Bochner, 1994) were used to elicit the representation of an 'individualistic' and a 'collectivistic' person. However, the results of this study showed these self-references could elicit the representation of a man and a woman, as well as power relationships between the members of different social categories.

A person described by 'Allocentric' self-references tended to be perceived as
a woman, and to be perceived as warm and incompetent, regardless of nationality. This result indicates that the 'Allocentric' self-references could elicit the stereotypical image of women and of their subordinate social roles, instead of the representation of a 'collectivistic' person. As found in the study by Eagly and Kite (1987), the stereotypical image of nationality is similar to the stereotypical image of a man, and the stereotypical image of a woman tended to contain the stereotypical image of social role (such as association with domestic work, nurturing etc.) within society. Following their study, this study also seems to have shown the possibility that I-C distinction may trigger the stereotypical image of gender and asymmetrical power relationship between genders.

The link between I-C orientation and gender characteristics was discussed elsewhere (Josephs et al., 1992; Kashima et al., 1995; Triandis, 1990, Watkins et al., 1998). Moreover, the link between I-C characteristics and the power relationship of different social groups was also discussed in past research. Emphasis on individuals seems to be apparent in the representation of a group that is shared among the socially dominant group, and emphasis on collectives, among the socially subordinate groups (Lorenzi-Cioldi, 1988, 2001; Lorenzi-Cioldi and Clémence, 2003). Moreover, Jackman and Senters (1980) found women, African Americans and low social status groups tended to form the representation of a group that emphasises the property of collectives, rather than individuals. All these arguments indicate that I-C characteristics may trigger the representation of power relationships between different social groups,
rather than the representation of cultural typology.

Hence, the analysis of representation elicited from I-C defining characteristics needs to be carefully handled. The investigation of meanings given to the surroundings becomes important in order to find out whether differences elicited from I-C characteristics represent cultural variations or gender and power relationships.

Limitations

When beginning this research, the aim was to avoid the student samples wherever possible. It is well known that student samples tend to show an individualistic orientation, and thus are not likely to be representative of the population (Arikawa and Templer, 1998, Green Staerklé, 2002; Takano and Osaka, 1999). Even though we managed to obtain 20 non-student samples from both cultural groups for the first study, it was difficult practically to obtain over 100 non-student samples from each cultural group for the subsequent quantitative studies. Hence, even though I believe that results of this thesis show some of the true cultural characteristics of British and Japanese society, it is possible that the results may represent a slightly more individualistic orientation than the cultural orientation of the population as a whole. This has an important implication, especially to the Japanese results, as the emergence of individualistic orientations was one of the major findings throughout the study.
Moreover, all the participants in this project were women. Thus, results of this study represent common sense theory of society and self among women. As the selection of one gender was intentional (as discussed in Chapters 6 and 7), in order to investigate cultural differences in representations without being confounded by the gender differences, this inevitably makes it impossible to generalise the results of this thesis to the rest of the population. The reader of this project needs to be aware that the results reflect the representations of a subset of the population (mainly students and women). Further investigation is required with a different group of samples to further deepen the understanding of the cultural differences between these two societies.

Moreover, even though the final study of this thesis indicated the possibility that some results of this study might be influenced by the representation of gender and power relationship, instead of cultural effect, further investigation of this issue was beyond the scope of this thesis. This issue has vital implications for the investigation of cross-cultural differences and thus, needs to be studied further in future research.

Final Remarks: Contribution of this thesis to cross-cultural studies

This thesis investigated the cross-cultural differences between British and Japanese societies, in the way people talked about their society and the way they constructed the meaning given to self. Moreover, how I-C elements are reflected in the common sense understanding of society and self was investigated. This approach to cross-cultural differences was
based on the SRT perspective, which assumes the interactive relationship between meanings given to society and self and provides the theoretical framework to investigate meanings given to surroundings. Instead of assuming individualistic and collectivistic psychological functions among the British and Japanese nationals respectively, this thesis aimed at studying how I-C elements are differently reflected in the way common sense theory about the social world was constructed.

The studies in this project found consistent meanings given to society and self and a link between cultural ideology and the individual's psychological functioning. Moreover, the consistent meanings given to society and self reflected a different mixture of individualistic and collectivistic orientations to characterise a culture in British and Japanese society.

The results of this study indicated the importance of meanings given to the social world in cross-cultural studies. This approach to cross-cultural psychology is different from the approach used in the I-C theoretical perspective, which expects a unidirectional influence from society to individual. Within the I-C perspective, research tends to attempt to confirm individualistic and collectivistic properties in the population within societies. The investigation of common sense theory in this project showed the distinctive meanings given to the social world, which reflected different I-C elements in the British and Japanese cultures. The investigation of meanings is beyond the scope of I-C theory. Thus, even though this thesis does not deny the utility of the I-C typology, which continues to be a useful
concept, it also implies that the SRT is a valuable theory to investigate cross-cultural differences. It is valuable in a sense it provides a theoretical background to investigate the meanings given to the surroundings that contribute to deepening the knowledge of cross-cultural differences from a very different perspective. It is hoped that this project has shown the utility of the SRT theory and that it is used more frequently in future research as a theoretical framework in the domain of cross-cultural psychology.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Social class</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Administration Support</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Not Mentioned</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Administration Support</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwyneth</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Learning support assistant</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanne</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Widower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Yoga instructor</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Temping PA</td>
<td>Anglican</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Church of England</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrika</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>Social class</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Independent business</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Working class</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikue</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Company employee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eri</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kana</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiyo</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Teacher/ Student/ Housewife</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumiko</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Part timer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachiko</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shizuka</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Photographer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumiko</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setsuko</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Hair dresser</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taeko</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chie</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terumi</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Part timer</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomiko</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noriko</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Office clerk</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiromi</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
<td>Not mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miwa</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rie</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Part timer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Part timer</td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants' scores of Individual, Relational, and Collective Self (Kashima and Hardie, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gwyneth</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanne</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoebe</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzy</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrika</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikue</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eri</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kana</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiyo</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumiko</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keiko</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sachiko</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shizuka</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumiko</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setsuko</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taeko</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chie</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terumi</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomiko</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nana</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noriko</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiromi</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mari</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miwa</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rie</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumi</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2 - Interview Schedule

(Description of Society)
1. If you have to describe what British (Japanese) society is, what would you say?

(Perception of Success and failure)
2. When would you say a particular society successful?
3. In Britain (Japan), is there a particular group which is especially successful? Why? To what do you attribute the success of that group?
4. How do you become a member of this group?
5. Is this successful group also powerful? In what way do you think they are powerful? (Specifically, what power?)
6. In Britain (Japan), what is the least successful group? Why? To what do you attribute the non-success of that group?

(Social change)
7. Do you think that British (Japanese) society will change in future? In what way? How do you think the society changes?

(Value and Deviance)
8. What is the most important value in your society? And why?
9. Is there a group that exemplifies these values or propagates these values?
10. What sort of behaviour is considered as ‘deviant’ in your society? And why?

(Perception of social mobility)
11. Do you think that it is easy for someone to change its place in society? Why?
12. Is there any specific group, for whom this change is easier?

(Interpersonal relationship)
14. How do you characterise that relationship? (close in what way?)
15. What can cause tension in such a relationship?
16. What would be embarrassing in such a relationship?
Imagine yourself in your working environment (any kind of work).

There are ten numbered blanks on the page below. Please write ten answers to the simple question ‘Who am I?’ in the blanks, while imagining yourself in the working environment. Just give ten different answers to this question. Answer as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write the answers in the order that they occur to you. Don’t worry about logic or ‘importance’. Go along fairly fast.

1. __________________________________________________ 
   .
2. __________________________________________________ 
   .
3. __________________________________________________ 
   .
4. __________________________________________________ 
   .
5. __________________________________________________ 
   .
6. __________________________________________________ 
   .
7. __________________________________________________ 
   .
8. __________________________________________________ 
   .
9. __________________________________________________ 
   .
10. __________________________________________________ 
    .
Appendix 4 - Self-descriptions towards friends (Adapted from the TST by Kuhn and McPartland, 1954)

Imagine yourself when you are with your best friend.

There are ten numbered blanks on the page below. Please write ten answers to the simple question ‘Who am I?’ in the blanks, while imagining yourself with your best friend. Just give ten different answers to this question. Answer as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. Write the answers in the order that they occur to you. Don’t worry about logic or ‘importance’. Go along fairly fast.

1. ___________________________________________________

2. ___________________________________________________

3. ___________________________________________________

4. ___________________________________________________

5. ___________________________________________________

6. ___________________________________________________

7. ___________________________________________________

8. ___________________________________________________

9. ___________________________________________________

10. ___________________________________________________
## Appendix 5 - Contingency Table without 'Others (difficult to classify)'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Idiocentric self-references</th>
<th>Allocentric self-references</th>
<th>Group self-references</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6 - Contingency Table without 'Others (difficult to classify)' with contextual differences between the Japanese and the British

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Idiocentric</th>
<th>Allocentric</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Japanese</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>British</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7 - Contents for 'Others (difficult to classify)' in the Japanese self descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation of category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Frequencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thoughts in the context</td>
<td>What am I going to do next when I finish this work?</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am glad that my salary is high!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Activities in context</td>
<td>Going into a cafeteria to have a cup of tea.</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taking a break.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traveling in a lift between 10th floor and a warehouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Behavioural descriptions or appearance</td>
<td>Loud voice</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am wearing beautiful clothes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explaining about self/role in a specific interpersonal relationship</td>
<td>I work for my shop.</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am a woman who works for money.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A person who serves a tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Physical condition in a specific context</td>
<td>Sleepy</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My feet are sore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Abstract/euphemistic expression</td>
<td>Air</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Universal/extensional</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One ordinary person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am nothing but myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Self-evaluation in a specific context</td>
<td>A person who is at least trying hard</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Important existence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am good at making sandwiches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of category</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. Complaints/opinions about work | Too low hourly wage!  
This work does not make me earn much money  
Repetition of the same things | 6           |
| 10. Description/characteristics of interpersonal relationship | Companion  
I can forget bad things in this relationship  
I am between a friend and a teacher for my students | 6           |
| 11. Physical description | I am tall  
I think my skin is rather white  
I am fat | 4           |
| 12. likes/dislikes | I like bread.  
I like older generation's jokes | 2           |
| 13. Difficult to understand the contents | Running away from the reality  
Continuous tension  
Idea | 26          |
| **Total** | **506** |
Appendix 8 - Mean and Standard Deviation of each self-description as 'Idiocentric', 'Allocentric' and 'Group' self-references in Pilot Questionnaire

### Mean and SD for each self-description as Idiocentric self-references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>1.397</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean and SD for each self-description as Allocentric self-references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.512</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean and SD for each self-description as Group self-references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>.378</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Items
1. I am honest.
2. I want to please other people.
3. I am a supporter of my local sports team.
4. I am a member of XXX club. (name of the club)
5. I am considerate to other people's needs and feelings.
6. I am from the northern part of XXX (name of the country)
7. I am hardworking.
8. My friends are important to me.
9. I am confident.
10. I am efficient.
11. I am the eldest in my family.
12. I would like to be accepted by other people.
13. I am creative.
14. I am an active member of my local community.
15. I am sociable.
16. I tend to be vigilant to people around me.
17. I care about how other people perceive me.
18. I work for XXX.
Appendix 9 - 'Idiocentric Questionnaire'

An International study in self-perception asked people to think of themselves in a positive light and then give four descriptions. One participant gave the following answer:

- I am hardworking.
- I am confident.
- I am efficient.
- I am creative.

Please imagine this person in your mind.

After you imagined this person, please answer the following questions. Please be aware that there are NO wrong answers to these questions. It is your opinion that matters.

1. From which country, do you think, does this person come from? 

2. Is this person a man or a woman? (Please tick as appropriate)
   - Man .......
   - Woman ........

3. How old do you think this person is? ................... Years old

4. What do you think this person does for living? (type of job, housework, studies, retirement etc)

5. Do you like this person? (please circle as appropriate)
   - Do not like at all 1 2 3 4 5 Like very much

6. How similar this person is to you? (please circle as appropriate)
   - Not at all similar 1 2 3 4 5 Totally similar

7. How similar do you think this person is to the British people in general?
   - Not at all similar 1 2 3 4 5 Totally similar

8. How successful would this person be if he/she were to live in Britain?
   - Not at all successful 1 2 3 4 5 Totally successful

9. How warm would you say that this person is?
   - Not at all warm 1 2 3 4 5 Totally warm

10. How competent would you say that this person is?
    - Not at all competent 1 2 3 4 5 Totally competent
11. How cold would you say that this person is?

Not at all cold 1 2 3 4 5 Totally cold

12. How much do you think this person will be accepted by the British people in general, if he/she were to live in Britain?

Not at all accepted 1 2 3 4 5 Totally accepted

Could you give some reasons why?

...............................................................................
...............................................................................
...............................................................................

Is there anything else that comes to your mind when you think about this person?

...............................................................................
...............................................................................
...............................................................................

Appendix 10 - 'Allocentric Questionnaire'

An International study in self-perception asked people to think of themselves in a positive light and then give four descriptions. One participant gave the following answer:

- I want to please other people.
- I am considerate to other people's needs and feelings.
- I would like to be accepted by other people.
- I care about how other people perceive me.

Please imagine this person in your mind.

After you imagined this person, please answer the following questions. Please be aware that there are NO wrong answers to these questions. It is your opinion that matters

1. From which country, do you think, does this person come from? ...........................................
2. Is this person a man or a woman? (Please tick as appropriate)
   Man.......  
   Woman.......  
3. How old do you think this person is? ................... Years old
4. What do you think this person does for living? (type of job, housework, studies, retirement etc)................................................................................................................................................................................... 
5. Do you like this person? (please circle as appropriate)  
   
   Do not like at all 1  2  3  4  5  Like very much
6. How similar this person is to you? (please circle as appropriate)  
   Not at all similar 1  2  3  4  5  Totally similar
7. How similar do you think this person is to the British people in general?  
   Not at all similar 1  2  3  4  5  Totally similar
8. How successful would this person be if he/she were to live in Britain?  
   Not at all successful 1  2  3  4  5  Totally successful
9. How warm would you say that this person is?  
   Not at all warm 1  2  3  4  5  Totally warm
10. How competent would you say that this person is?  
    Not at all competent 1  2  3  4  5  Totally competent
11. How cold would you say that this person is?
   Not at all cold 1 2 3 4 5 Totally cold

12. How much do you think this person will be accepted by the British people in general, if he/she were to live in Britain?
   Not at all accepted 1 2 3 4 5 Totally accepted

Could you give some reasons why?

.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................

Is there anything else that comes to your mind when you think about this person?

.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................
Appendix 11 - 'Group Questionnaire'

An International study in self-perception asked people to think of themselves in a positive light and then give four descriptions. One participant gave the following answer:

- I am an active member of my local community.
- I am from the northern part of XXX (name of the country)
- I am a supporter of my local sports team.
- I am the eldest in my family.

Please imagine this person in your mind.

After you imagined this person, please answer the following questions. Please be aware that there are NO wrong answers to these questions. It is your opinion that matters.

1. From which country, do you think, does this person come from?

2. Is this person a man or a woman? (Please tick as appropriate)
   - Man
   - Woman

3. How old do you think this person is? .................. Years old

4. What do you think this person does for living? (type of job, housework, studies, retirement etc)..............................................................................................................

5. Do you like this person? (please circle as appropriate)
   - Do not like at all
   - Like very much

6. How similar this person is to you? (please circle as appropriate)
   - Not at all similar
   - Totally similar

7. How similar do you think this person is to the British people in general?
   - Not at all similar
   - Totally similar

8. How successful would this person be if he/she were to live in Britain?
   - Not at all successful
   - Totally successful

9. How warm would you say that this person is?
   - Not at all warm
   - Totally warm

10. How competent would you say that this person is?
    - Not at all competent
    - Totally competent
11. How cold would you say that this person is?
   Not at all cold 1 2 3 4 5 Totally cold
12. How much do you think this person will be accepted by the British people in general, if he/she were to live in Britain?
   Not at all accepted 1 2 3 4 5 Totally accepted

Could you give some reasons why?
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

Is there anything else that comes to your mind when you think about this person?
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
Appendix 12 - ‘Idiocentric-Allocentric Questionnaire’

An International study in self-perception asked people to think of themselves in a positive light and then give four descriptions. One participant gave the following answer:

- I am efficient.
- I want to please other people.
- I am hardworking.
- I care about how other people perceive me.

Please imagine this person in your mind.

After you imagined this person, please answer the following questions. Please be aware that there are NO wrong answers to these questions. It is your opinion that matters.

1. From which country, do you think, does this person come from? ..........................................
2. Is this person a man or a woman? (Please tick as appropriate)
   Man........
   Woman.......  
3. How old do you think this person is? .................. Years old
4. What do you think this person does for living? (type of job, housework, studies, retirement etc) ..............................................................................................................................
5. Do you like this person? (please circle as appropriate)
   Do not like at all  1  2  3  4  5 Like very much
6. How similar this person is to you? (please circle as appropriate)
   Not at all similar  1  2  3  4  5 Totally similar
7. How similar do you think this person is to the British people in general?
   Not at all similar  1  2  3  4  5 Totally similar
8. How successful would this person be if he/she were to live in Britain?
   Not at all successful  1  2  3  4  5 Totally successful
9. How warm would you say that this person is?
   Not at all warm  1  2  3  4  5 Totally warm
10. How competent would you say that this person is?
    Not at all competent  1  2  3  4  5 Totally competent
11. How cold would you say that this person is?
   Not at all cold  1  2  3  4  5 Totally cold

12. How much do you think this person will be accepted by the British people in general, if he/she were to live in Britain?
   Not at all accepted  1  2  3  4  5 Totally accepted

Could you give some reasons why?
..............................................................................
..............................................................................

Is there anything else that comes to your mind when you think about this person?
..............................................................................
..............................................................................
Appendix 13 - ‘Idiocentric-Group Questionnaire’

An International study in self-perception asked people to think of themselves in a positive light and then give four descriptions. One participant gave the following answer:

- I am an active member of my local community.
- I am hardworking.
- I am from the northern part of XXX (name of the country)
- I am efficient.

Please imagine this person in your mind.

After you imagined this person, please answer the following questions. Please be aware that there are NO wrong answers to these questions. It is your opinion that matters.

1. From which country, do you think, does this person come from? ....................
2. Is this person a man or a woman? (Please tick as appropriate)
   Man........
   Woman........
3. How old do you think this person is? ............... Years old
4. What do you think this person does for living? (type of job, housework, studies, retirement etc)..........................................................
5. Do you like this person? (please circle as appropriate)
   Do not like at all 1 2 3 4 5 Like very much
6. How similar this person is to you? (please circle as appropriate)
   Not at all similar 1 2 3 4 5 Totally similar
7. How similar do you think this person is to the British people in general?
   Not at all similar 1 2 3 4 5 Totally similar
8. How successful would this person be if he/she were to live in Britain?
   Not at all successful 1 2 3 4 5 Totally successful
9. How warm would you say that this person is?
   Not at all warm 1 2 3 4 5 Totally warm
10. How competent would you say that this person is?
    Not at all competent 1 2 3 4 5 Totally competent
11. How cold would you say that this person is?

Not at all cold 1 2 3 4 5 Totally cold

12. How much do you think this person will be accepted by the British people in general, if he/she were to live in Britain?

Not at all accepted 1 2 3 4 5 Totally accepted

Could you give some reasons why?

...................................................................

...................................................................

Is there anything else that comes to your mind when you think about this person?

...................................................................

...................................................................

...................................................................
Appendix 14 - ‘Allocentric-Group Questionnaire’

An International study in self-perception asked people to think of themselves in a positive light and then give four descriptions. One participant gave the following answer:

- I want to please other people.
- I am from the northern part of XXX (name of the country)
- I care about how other people perceive me.
- I am an active member of my local community.

**Please imagine this person in your mind.**

After you imagined this person, please answer the following questions. Please be aware that there are NO wrong answers to these questions. It is your opinion that matters

1. From which country, do you think, does this person come from? .................................
2. Is this person a man or a woman? (Please tick as appropriate)
   - Man ..........
   - Woman ..........
3. How old do you think this person is? ................. Years old
4. What do you think this person does for living? (type of job, housework, studies, retirement etc)..............................................................................................................
5. Do you like this person? (please circle as appropriate)
   - Do not like at all 1 2 3 4 5 Like very much
6. How similar this person is to you? (please circle as appropriate)
   - Not at all similar 1 2 3 4 5 Totally similar
7. How similar do you think this person is to the British people in general?
   - Not at all similar 1 2 3 4 5 Totally similar
8. How successful would this person be if he/she were to live in Britain?
   - Not at all successful 1 2 3 4 5 Totally successful
9. How warm would you say that this person is?
   - Not at all warm 1 2 3 4 5 Totally warm
10. How competent would you say that this person is?
    - Not at all competent 1 2 3 4 5 Totally competent
11. How cold would you say that this person is?
Not at all cold 1 2 3 4 5 Totally cold

12. How much do you think this person will be accepted by the British people in general, if he/she were to live in Britain?
Not at all accepted 1 2 3 4 5 Totally accepted

Could you give some reasons why?
............................................................................................................
............................................................................................................
............................................................................................................

Is there anything else that comes to your mind when you think about this person?
............................................................................................................
............................................................................................................
............................................................................................................
Appendix 15 - ‘RIC’ scale (Kashima and Hardie, 2000)

Below, there are 10 statements, each of which is accompanied by three alternative options. Please rate EACH ALTERNATIVE in terms of how much the statement is true/not true of your self, or like/not like something that you would think, do or feel by circling the number which most appropriately describes you. The numbers represent the continuum ranging from ‘1 = Not like me, Not true of me’ to ‘7 = Like me, Very true of me’. Therefore, if you think the statement is like you or very true of you, circle 7; or if you think the statement is not like you or not true of you, circle 1. If you think you are somewhere in the middle of the continuum, please indicate the number that most appropriately describes yourself.

Please rate EVERY response and DO NOT CHOOSE JUST ONE ALTERNATIVE from each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>True of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. I think it is most important in life to....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work for causes to improve the well-being of my group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have personal integrity/be true to myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have good personal relationships with people who are important to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. I would teach my children....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be loyal to the group to which they belong.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be caring to their friends and attentive to their needs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To know themselves and develop their own potential as a unique individual.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. I regard myself as ....</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good partner and friend.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good member of my group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone with his or her own will, individual.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. I think honour can be attained by.....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not true of me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>True of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being true to people with whom I have</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being true to my groups such as my</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extended family, work group, religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and social groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being true to myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. I would regard someone as a good employee for a company if

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not true of me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>True of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He or she takes personal responsibility</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the task assigned.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He or she gets on well and works</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-operatively with other colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He or she works for the development of</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the organisation or the work group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. The most satisfying activity for me is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not true of me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>True of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doing something for my group (e.g. my</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school, church, club, neighbourhood, and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing something for someone who is</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing something for myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. When faced with an important personal decision to make,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not true of me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>True of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I talk with my partner or best friend.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask myself what I really want to do</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk with my family and relatives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. I would feel proud if

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not true of me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>True of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My close friend was praised in the newspaper for what he or she has done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group to which I belong was praised in the newspaper for what they have done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was praised in the newspaper for what I have done.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. When I attend a musical concert

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not true of me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>True of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel that enjoying music is a very personal experience.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel enjoyment if my company (partner, friend, guest) also enjoys it.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel good to be part of the group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X. I am most concerned about

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Not like me</th>
<th>Not true of me</th>
<th>Like me</th>
<th>True of me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with myself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with a specific person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My relationship with my group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 16 - Frequencies of country of origin of a person in each condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Idiocentric</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Allocentric</td>
<td>Japanese (39)</td>
<td>Others (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US (16)</td>
<td>British (8)</td>
<td>Others (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idio-Allo</td>
<td>Japanese (34)</td>
<td>Others (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US (19)</td>
<td>Japanese (7)</td>
<td>Others (27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idio-Group</td>
<td>US (14)</td>
<td>Japanese (8)</td>
<td>Others (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocentric</td>
<td>British (18)</td>
<td>Others (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>British (17)</td>
<td>Others (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idio-Allo</td>
<td>British (13)</td>
<td>Others (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idio-Group</td>
<td>British (13)</td>
<td>US (7)</td>
<td>Others (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allocentric</td>
<td>British (12)</td>
<td>Others (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Frequencies that were less than 5 were categorized as others
### Appendix 17 - Frequencies of what a person does for living

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>British</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idiocentric</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office worker</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>Student (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(40)</td>
<td>Management (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocentric</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>Student (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office worker</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Others (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office worker</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>Student (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>Others (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idio-allo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office worker</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>Student (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Office worker (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>Others (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Idio-Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office worker</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>Student (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>Others (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allo-group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public services</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Student (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office worker</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Others (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>(26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>