Emergence and composition of the traditional-modern bicultural self of people in contemporary Taiwanese societies

Luo Lu[1] and Kuo-Shu Yang[2]

[1]*Institute of Human Resource Management, National Central University, Jhongli City, and* [2]*Department of Psychology, Fo Guang College of Humanities and Social Sciences, I Lan,Taiwan*

In the present paper, a preliminary statement on the traditional-modern bicultural self in contemporary Taiwan was proposed and our presentation was organized in four parts. First, a theoretical and conceptual analysis was attempted to describe the emergence and composition of the traditional-modern bicultural self of the contemporary Taiwanese people. The cultural and social roots of such a bicultural self were explored, and its constituting elements delineated and their interrelations analyzed. Second, relevant empirical evidence pertaining to this particular model of the Chinese bicultural self was reviewed. Third, our present model was related and compared against various existing bicultural self models. Finally, directions and issues for future research on the Chinese bicultural self were discussed.

Key words: bicultural self, traditional Chinese self, Western self.

Introduction

Against the greater socioeconomic background of globalization and the emerging discourses of multiculturalism in psychology, the term 'bicultural self' (Ng, 2004) has a strong intuitive appeal. The obvious candidate for this label is the case of 'dual cultural/national identity' such as acculturated immigrants. The existence and operation of such a 'bicultural self' has already been demonstrated with abundant evidence from studies on the acculturation experiences of immigrants (Hong, Ip, Chiu, Morris, & Menon, 2001; Kwak & Berry, 2001; Ataca & Berry, 2002; Berry, 2003) and cultural accommodation experiences of bilinguals (Yang & Bond, 1982; Ross, Xun, & Wilson, 2002). In the present paper, we will turn our attention to explore a phenomenon that is scarcely noticed by Western mainstream psychology but nonetheless vitally meaningful for the vast population of people living in the non-West developing world, such as the Chinese; that is, the possibility of a traditional-modern bicultural self among the presumed 'monoculturals'.

Specifically, we claim that: (i) the traditional Chinese self differs from the modern Chinese self; and (ii) as a result of modernization, the modern Chinese self becomes more widely distributed in the Taiwanese society, and both traditional and modern self are now available to most Taiwanese. To support our claims, both theoretical, conceptual analysis of the traditional and modern Chinese self was attempted and relevant empirical evidence was reviewed. Our model was then contrasted against other existing bicultural self models. Finally, directions and issues for future research on the Chinese bicultural self are deliberated and discussed.

Conceptualization of the traditional Chinese self

The essence of the traditional Chinese self is its social-oriented nature which emphasizes roles, statuses, positions, commitments, and responsibilities. The Chinese culture has been depicted as a family-style collectivism which advocates priority of collective, especially family welfare and rewards self-control, diligent role performance, and rigorous self-cultivation. The conceptualization of the self in the Confucian tradition is characterized by two interrelated assumptions: (i) the self as a centre of relationships; and (ii) the self as a dynamic process of spiritual development (Tu, 1985). A person in the Confucian tradition is seen primarily as a relational being defined in specific dyadic relationships, such as being a son, a brother, a husband, or a father, the relational way of being is thus the core of the traditional Chinese self.

Our model of the traditional self corroborates well with Yang's (1991) revelation of distinct features of the Chinese self. The following are particularly illuminating points: (i) the Chinese self is not only the original source of the individual's behaviour, but also a tool for realizing an ideal society, thus the Chinese-style self-autonomy is manifested in the gradual formation of a moral self through the internalization of prevailing moral codes and social norms; (ii) the ultimate aim of the Chinese self is to achieve the unity

between the self and the society, via self-cultivation, self-control, and self-transcendence; (iii) the Chinese self is fundamentally seen as a moral being, which has to strive for continuous moral improvement to overtake itself; and (iv) the boundary of the Chinese self is constantly extended to include more and more others as a result of the self-cultivation process. All the above characteristics of the Chinese self are tremendously different from those of the Western self.

We maintain that the traditional Chinese view of the self, in sharp contrast to the Western view, is of a connected, fluid, flexible, committed being who is bound to others. This is what Markus and Kitayama call the interdependent self (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). An interdependent view of self derives from a belief in the individual's connectedness and interdependence to others. This characterization of the self locates crucial self-representations not within unique individual attributes, but within his or her social relationships.

Our current conceptualization of the traditional Chinese self is closely related to Yang's (1995) theory of Chinese social-orientation. However, social-orientation was not initially conceived as a self theory, it is purported to depict the most defining characteristics of the Chinese mind and behaviour, thus functioning more like a generic framework to inform empirical research such as the social-oriented achievement motivation (Yu & Yang, 1994) and the social-oriented views of subjective well-being (Lu & Gilmour, in press). By focusing our present model on conceptualization of the self, we hope to sharpen the contrast between the traditional and modern rudiments.

Conceptualization of the Western self

In sharp contrast to the traditional Chinese self, the essence of the Western self is its individual-oriented nature which emphasizes personal talents, potentialities, needs, strivings and rights. As emphasized by Bakan (1966) from an individual developmental point of view, Westerners tend to develop in the direction of enhancing the agency side of human nature that stresses the attainment of self-assertion, self-expansion, mastery, power, distinction, and separation from others, while at the same time repressing the communion side of human nature that accents striving for contact, cooperation, union, and association with others. In a similar vein, Josselson (1988) stated that 'psychoanalytic developmental theory takes as its premise that the central thrust of human development is movement from a state of dependence and merger to a state of independent, differentiated selfhood' (p. 93). This statement also implies that Western people transform toward the agency aspect of human nature rather than the communal one in their life-long developmental journey.

Our conceptualization of the Western self also corroborates Geertz's (1975) vivid description of a person from a Western point of view. Such a person is 'a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational and cognitive universe, a dynamic center of awareness, emotion, judgment, and action organized into a distinctive whole and set contrastively both against other such wholes and against a social and natural background' (p. 48). Markus and Kitayama (1991) concurred and termed such a view of the person as a bounded, coherent, stable, autonomous, free entity as the independent self. An independent view of self derives from a belief in the wholeness and separateness of each individual's configuration of internal attributes, which locates crucial self-representations within the individual.

Yang (2004) recently proposed to include the individual-oriented self in the representation of the modern day Chinese self. This inclusion is justified by the theoretical proposition that contrasting self systems can coexist within an individual (Markus & Kitayama, 1991), also by the mounting evidence showing that they both are indeed available for contemporary Taiwanese (reviewed by Yang, 1996; Lu, 2003). Thus, the social-oriented self represents the essence of traditional Chinese self, especially in the Confucian heritage; in contrast, the individual-oriented self represents the increasing influence of the Western culture in the profound process of societal modernization. Now the stage has been set for the emergence of a traditional-modern bicultural self for the Taiwanese people.

The emergence of a Chinese bicultural self

In the above two sections, we presented a cross-cultural contrast highlighting differences between the traditional Chinese self and the Western self, pointing out that the modern Chinese self (modelled after the Western self) is fast evolving as a result of societal modernization. However, it needs to be emphasized that both the traditional Chinese self and modern Chinese self are hypothetical constructs or ideal types. They are useful for theoretical analysis but it certainly is not our intention to claim that the modern (individual-oriented) Chinese self did not exist in traditional China, nor that the self in modern Chinese societies is invariably individual oriented. It is more probable that the two selves are differentially distributed in Chinese societies at different historical epochs. Following Brumann's (1999) anthropological argument, a culture can mean the forms of behaviour which are characteristic of a given society, or of a certain area, or of a certain period of time. Thus, we may state that the social-oriented self is more characteristic of the traditional Chinese societies, or of less developed (industrialized) Chinese regions, or of a more distal Chinese past, whereas the individual-oriented

self is more characteristic of the modern Chinese societies, or of more advanced (industrialized) Chinese regions, or of a more proximal Chinese history.

More akin to our proposal of biculturality is the increasing empirical evidence at the monocultural level highlighting the phenomenon of Chinese traditional-modern psychological coexistence. In the case of Taiwan, Brindley (1989) observed that cultural values in contemporary Taiwanese society are in 'a very indeterminate and fluid state' (p. 114). This is brought about by traditional values coexisting with newly introduced Western modern values. In a matter of several decades, Taiwan has transformed itself from a traditional agricultural society to a thriving industrial and service society. Such major modernization on a societal scale, together with massive importation of Western values has resulted in a pluralistic society with coexisting multivalue systems. Brindley (1990) further stated that although traditional Chinese cultural values such as filial piety and interpersonal harmony were still pervasive, Western cultural values such as respect for science and emphasis on independence were increasingly asserting influences on people's mentalities and behaviours.

In a recent study combining theoretical analysis with in-depth focus group discussions and individual interviews, Lu (2003) proposed a construct of 'composite self' to characterize an evolving self system among contemporary Taiwanese people. This system of 'composite self' intricately integrates the traditional Chinese construct of 'self-in-relation' (interdependence) with the Western construct of 'independent and autonomous self' (independence). For the contemporary Chinese, the neglected, even suppressed, independent self may be nurtured, developed, elaborated and even emphasized in certain domains of life, such as work. An attitude favouring the coexistence and ultimate integration of the independent and interdependent self to help deal with the apparent conflicts between strong traditionality and requisite modernity, might well be the most favourable outcome for people in Taiwan, and possibly other Chinese societies.

The basic duality of humanity provides a vital impetus for the emergence of this composite self. Various personality theorists have repeatedly described these basic yet seemingly contrasting systems of human needs and drives using diverse terminologies, such as communion versus agency (Bakan, 1966), union versus individuation (Rank, 1945), and homonymy versus autonomy (Angyal, 1941), to name but a few. A common concern among these scholars is how a balance can be struck between the contrasts. Only when the conflict of these seemingly opposing needs, drives, and tendencies are resolved, can a healthy, adaptational, and fully functioning personality develop. It is conceivable that the traditional Chinese self (social-oriented, interdependent) is more akin to the communion needs and merging tendency, whereas the modern Chinese self (individual-oriented, independent) is more akin to the agency needs and separation tendency. The emerging composite self thus serves as a way of expressing both types of needs and tendencies, manifesting the duality of humanity for contemporary Chinese people. The composite self thus constructed can also be seen as a bicultural self encompassing traditional Chinese cultural rudiments and modern Western cultural rudiments.

The composition of the Chinese bicultural self

As previously stated, the proposed Chinese traditional-modern bicultural self is composed of two main constituents: social-oriented self and individual-oriented self. The individual-oriented self corresponds to the modern Western version of 'independent and autonomous self', whereas the social-oriented self corresponds to the traditional Chinese 'interdependent and ensembled self'. The overall Chinese self is apparently a multiple self (Elster, 1986). However, it is not the poorly or very loosely integrated kind of multiple self in which the constituent selves represent contradictory, conflictual, or defensively psychologically compartmentalized psychic systems as separate, independently functioning agents. We agree with Confucian philosophers that the Chinese self is an active agency and has a synthetic tendency towards coherent elaboration. This organismic integration can be considered at two levels. On the one hand, there is the tendency towards unity in one's self; that is, towards coherence in one's regulatory activity and experience. In other words, this is the tendency towards integration of the two subsystems of the Chinese self. For example, a modern day Chinese person may very likely behave in accordance with the modern self at work situations, while striving to retain the traditional behavioural pattern at home. As long as the person perceives coherence and meaningfulness in his or her functioning, the unity in his or her self has been achieved. On the other hand, there is the tendency towards interacting in a coherent and meaningful way with others to achieve satisfying relationships with other people and harmonious encounters with the larger social order. In our previous example, if the person behaves in accordance with situational demands and social expectations, although alternating between the traditional and modern self, he or she is likely to be perceived by the others as well-adjusted and coherent. Thus, the integration between the self and its social environment has been achieved too. This dual process of self development emanates from the agentic self and is driven primarily by the need to seek integration both within oneself and with others. As a result, the overall Chinese self is most likely the well-integrated kind of multiple self with bicultural (Chinese social-orientation and Western individual-orientation) rudiments.

However, before such a fine integration and coherence can be achieved, a long and hard struggle to resolve sharp contrasts and bitter conflicts between rudiments of two diverse cultural traditions may have to be fought. A thorough conceptual analysis of such a transformational process is beyond the scope of the present paper and may be endeavoured at a later time. Suffice it to state that various strategies such as defense mechanisms (Yang, 1986) and dynamic construction (Hong *et al.*, 2001) may be used to the best benefit of effective adaptation and optimal functioning. Compartmentalization is a common form of defense mechanism, when a person draws a clear and impermeable distinction between two domains of life, such as work and home, proceeding to function with different self systems in each domain, without any awareness of conflict or inconsistencies. Dynamic construction, in contrast, may also operate at the conscious level. When one is equipped with two self systems, one can voluntarily switch mind to respond to situational demands, social expectations or self-presentational needs, and elicit different behaviours to enhance personal well-being. Although integration and coherence are projected as the ultimate purpose for a functional self system, momentary stagnation, moving forward and retreating backward are all likely to happen. Possible changes during this quest for integration and transcendence need to be delineated further.

The Chinese bicultural self is thus better conceived as a dynamic process of constantly resolving conflicts and striving for a better adaptation when the individual is caught up in a transitional society with both traditional and modern cultural systems side by side. In the following section, we will attempt a selective review of the emergent empirical evidence pertaining to the existence and functioning of a traditional-modern bicultural self, based on research conducted mainly with Chinese respondents in Taiwan.

Some empirical evidence related to the Chinese bicultural self

Early research in the 1980s and '90s centred on the value and attitude changes for the Chinese people during modernization, reviewed by Yang (1986, 2003), more recent endeavours have attempted to analyze the nature and functioning of the Chinese bicultural self. Our conceptualization of individual-oriented and social-oriented self has provided a generic theoretical framework for this ongoing research effort. We will now briefly report these emergent findings pertaining to the conceptualization, process, and ultimate realization of the Chinese traditional-modern bicultural self.

In a direct attempt to analyze and measure the content of the Chinese bicultural self, Lu (2005) constructed two comprehensive conceptual frameworks pertaining to the indi-vidual-oriented and social-oriented self-views following careful analysis of diverse self-conceptions. Subsequent scale development and evaluation efforts were then carried out on this theoretical basis. Large scale data ($N = 839$) from college students and community adults revealed that both the individual-oriented and social-oriented self-views were composed of multiple factors. Independence (e.g. 'the greatest happiness in life is to realize one's own interests'), self-determination (e.g. 'I myself make important decisions in life, not influenced by others'), competition (e.g. 'it is very important for me to out-perform other people in all aspects'), and consistency (e.g. 'I behave the same whomever I am with') are four meaningful psychological constituents of the Chinese individual-oriented self. Contextual self (e.g. 'I think that there are many faces of a person, which may conflict with one another'), interpersonal relatedness (e.g. 'family is a life unity, and I will put my family the foremost in any circumstances'), self-cultivation (e.g. 'we should focus on improving ourselves spiritually, rather than indulging in hedonic pursuits'), and social sensitivity (e.g. 'I will conceal my true thoughts and preferences in order to preserve interpersonal harmony') are four meaningful psychological constituents of the Chinese social-oriented self. The correlations among the individual-oriented and social-oriented factors are low ($r = -0.02$) to moderate ($r = 0.63$), with a median correlation of 0.10, demonstrating that the traditional and modern selves are clearly distinguishable for Taiwanese people. Furthermore, both the traditional (social-oriented) self and modern (individual-oriented) self are available to Taiwanese people, although the former (mean = 4.43 on a scale that ranges from 1 to 6) is still stronger than the latter (mean = 4.03, paired $t_{760} = 21.71$, $p < 0.001$).

Although such evidence supports the existence of the bicultural self at the group level, the more important demonstration is the phenomenon at the individual level. With another sample of 883 university students, we explored the construct validity of the measures of the two selves by looking at the network of associations between these selves and independent/interdependent self-construals, individualism/collectivism, social relationships, cognition, emotions, and motivation (Lu, 2006). Results revealed that the Chinese individual-oriented self was associated with independent self-construals, individualism, self-esteem, ego-focused emotions (e.g. feeling superior), happiness, psychological modernity, and individual-oriented achievement motivation. In contrast, the Chinese social-oriented self was associated with interdependent self-construals, collectivism, relationship strength (e.g. the impact of a significant other on one's decision-making), inclusion of others in the self (measured by the graphical representation of overlap between oneself and a significant other), communal orientation, harmony beliefs, other-focused emotions (e.g. feeling close to someone), depression, holistic thinking,

psychological traditionality, and social-oriented achievement motivation. It is reasonable to infer from this evidence that Taiwanese people may be using two separate ways of construing the self, the individual-oriented and social-oriented self, each with its distinctive network of associations. In other words, contemporary Taiwanese may indeed now possess a bicultural self.

Subjective well-being (SWB) may be another realm for the manifestation of the Chinese bicultural self, albeit this is not a traditional topic for the study of the self. Guided by the overriding framework of individual-oriented and social-oriented self, and supported by the rich folk psychological accounts of happiness by Chinese and American students (Lu, 2001; Lu & Gilmour, 2004), a pair of contrasting cultural conceptions of SWB was proposed and analyzed (Lu & Gilmour, in press). In a nutshell, we argue that individualist and collectivist cultures produce different meanings for SWB, and through active participation of the individual, subjective conceptions of happiness are systematically varied across cultural systems throughout the world. Striving for personal happiness and the recognition of such striving (personal accountability and explicit pursuit) are the defining features of individual-oriented cultural conceptions of SWB, whereas role obligations and dialectical reservation (role obligations and dialectical balance) are the defining features of social-oriented cultural conceptions of SWB. Both Taiwan and mainland Chinese endorsed individual-oriented and social-oriented cultural conceptions of SWB with nearly equal strengths (Lu & Gilmour, in press). More importantly, across three cultural groups (Taiwanese, mainland Chinese, Euro-Americans), individual-oriented SWB conception was associated with independent self-construal, whereas social-oriented SWB conception was associated with interdependent self-construal and harmony beliefs. This is again evidence that the two self-related conceptions are distinct cognitive units.

Finally, as a treasured value of humanity and an ultimate accomplishment of the person, self-actualization of the Chinese people has now received some long-overdue rigorous research efforts. Lu and Yang (2005) started with a theoretical analysis of the discourses of self-actualization as embedded in the traditional Chinese and Western cultural contexts. Concepts of individual-oriented self-actualization based on an independent and autonomous self and those of social-oriented self-actualization based on an interdependent and ensembled self were elaborated. Subsequently, qualitative methods of focus group and essay writing were adopted to collect empirical data from Taiwanese university students. Analysis revealed three major constituents of the Chinese views of self-actualization: to become oneself completely, to repay the family with personal accomplishments, and expanding personal well-being to serve the community. It is clear that these young Taiwanese students endorsed both individual-oriented and social-oriented conceptions of self-actualization, which is a necessary indication of biculturalism.

Yang and Lu (2005) also attempted a systematic conceptual comparison between the psychological characteristics of the Western style individual-oriented self-actualizers (e.g. as presented by humanistic psychologists) and those of social-oriented self-actualizers (i.e. *junzi*, the morally accomplished people in the Confucian tradition). Analyses on data collected from students and adults in Taiwan and mainland China revealed that psychological characteristics of individual-oriented and social-oriented self-actualizers were both multidimensional constructs. The five dimensions of characteristics of the social-oriented self-actualizers are: (i) constant self-improvement and commitment to the community; (ii) avoiding *xiaoren* (the morally deficient) and respect for *junzi* (the morally accomplished); (iii) simple contentment and desirelessness; (iv) forgiving and benevolence; and (v) self-integrity and propriety. The five dimensions of characteristics of the individual-oriented self-actualizers are: (i) self-acceptance and independence; (ii) brotherly love and sense of commitment; (iii) aesthetics and creativity; (iv) acceptance of and respect for others; and (v) transcendence and loyalty to the self. Furthermore, subsequent canonical correlation analysis with an independent sample found that four of the social-oriented and three of the individual-oriented characteristics formed a significant canonical variable (canonical $r = 0.893$, $p < 0.001$). This finding seems to suggest that individual-oriented and social-oriented self-actualization may be conducive to merging and integration rather than inherently conflictual and contradictory. Of course, stronger and more direct evidence is needed to support our hunch.

Thus far, we have provided a systematic albeit selective review of mostly recent empirical work organized around the theoretical constructs of individual-oriented (or independent) and social-oriented (or interdependent) self. This series of pioneering work spanning the scope of a functioning self system, including self-views, self-adjustment (SWB), and self-actualization, is still ongoing and evolving.

Relations to other bicultural self models

It is now necessary to relate our proposition of the Chinese traditional-modern self with other models of biculturality currently in the literature. Ronald Inglehart (1971) proposed a theory of value change that predicted that value priorities in advanced industrial countries would shift away from 'materialist' concerns about economic and physical security, towards a greater emphasis on freedom, self-expression, and the quality of life, namely 'postmaterialist' values. Over two decades later, the thesis is supported by data from the large-scale World Values Survey (1990–1991)

conducted in 40 countries representing over 70% of the world's population (Abramson & Inglehart, 1995). The authors claim that supporting evidence for the occurrence of value change is unequivocal, although whether there actually is a trend toward Postmaterialism is a continuing controversy.

It is interesting to note that the same processes that contribute to value change in advanced industrial societies seem to contribute to similar change in all societies that have experienced enough economic growth in recent decades. Such observation led to the claim that value change is a potentially universal process.

Inglehart's original theory of value change is a sociological one and their subsequent analysis and interpretation of survey data also focus on societal variables, such as modernization, economic growth, and generational replacement. However, the identification of the global phenomenon of value shift along with modernization has provided us with a broader societal background to situate our model of the Chinese bicultural self. It can be said that cultural change may go hand in hand with modernization, some core psychological values though can still persist. In a more recent analysis of the World Values Survey including 65 societies and 75% of the world's population, Inglehart and Baker (2000) found evidence of both massive cultural change and the persistence of distinctive cultural traditions. Corroborative evidence has also been provided by a recent cross-cultural comparative study, in which we found that Chinese values still hold a dominant place among Taiwanese participants, whereas Western values are the dominant ones for their British counterparts (Lu *et al*., 2001).

To reiterate, cultures are not static, but are changing for a variety of reasons. One reason is when cultures come into contact with one another, the phenomenon of acculturation occurs. This term refers to 'the process of adapting to (and in many cases adopting) a different culture from the one in which a person was enculturated' (Matsumoto, 2000; p. 175). The term is generally used in connection with immigration. In the case of immigrants, having successfully resolved any initial conflicts or dissolutions bound to occur when two disparate cultural traditions meet, they will eventually incorporate some core values of the guest culture into their selves. Now they may possess two systems of the self, one originated from their home culture, and the other developed and matured later from their acculturation experiences. The encounter of a home culture and a host culture which are often geographically located in two separate places is a prerequisite for the emergence of such a 'bicultural self'.

However, while individual members of immigrant groups often grow up with multicultural identities, the identity of their native culture is often one of long-standing tradition and heritage. This cultural reaffirmation effect has been documented in some studies among multicultural individuals living in multicultural societies. For instance, Kosmitzki (1996) examined monocultural and bicultural Germans and Americans, and found that bicultural individuals endorsed more traditional values associated with their native culture than did native monocultural individuals in those native cultures.

It is clear now that the work on both acculturation and multiculturalism focuses on people who have come to meet a different or 'foreign' culture and used development of multicultural identities as a way of answering to this challenge. Our model of bicultural self, however, is not dependent on any real experiences of living in another culture. We are concerned primarily with people who stayed in their native culture, yet their very culture is undergoing a 'transition' as a result of substantial Euro-American influences. However, one thing in common between our model and the acculturation work is that we all believe that intercultural contact provides a great opportunity to create new cultural forms, whether people are staying in their home society or migrating to another country.

Following acculturation models and our own model of biculturalism, the coexistence of multicultural identities suggests the existence of multiple psychocultural systems of representations in the minds of multicultural individuals. Triandis (1989) argued that three kinds of self: private, public, collective, are available in all cultures; however, people sample them with different probabilities, in different cultures, and with specific consequences for social behaviour. Sedikides and Brewer's (2001) recent volume is devoted to the task of exploring and delineating the possible interactive relations among the three self-representations, which they termed individual, relational, and collective self. Private or individual self involves traits, states, or behaviours of the person (Triandis, 1989), and is achieved by differentiating from others (Sedikides & Brewer, 2001). Public or relational self concerns the generalized other's view of the self (Triandis, 1989), and is achieved by assimilating with significant others (Sedikides & Brewer, 2001). Collective self concerns a view of the self that is found in some collective (e.g. family) (Triandis, 1989), and is achieved by inclusion in large social groups and contrasting the group to which one belongs with relevant out-groups (Sedikides & Brewer, 2001). Our bicultural model is in agreement with Triandis' assertion and Sedikides and Brewer's three-part model that there is more than one form of self available but sampling probabilities for multiple selves may differ as a function of culture, situation, and time. Private or individual self is similar in content with our Chinese modern, individual-oriented self, whereas public/relational self and collective self are similar in content with our Chinese traditional, social-oriented self. However, various three-part self models are concerned primarily with delineating people's organization of self-knowledge or self-

concept (i.e. answering the question of 'who we are'). Our model instead tries to conceptualize people's views of themselves as human beings, (i.e. answering the question of 'what we are'). Putting it in anther way, self-knowledge or self-concept is more akin to James's (1890) 'Me-self', which can be assessed by probes such as 'I am . . .' used in the Twenty Statement Test, pertaining to usually peripheral understandings of oneself as a unique human being. Views or conceptualizations of the self, as delineated in our model is more akin to James's (1890) 'I-self', which addresses the more fundamental philosophical enquiry of what is the nature of personhood or selfhood as embedded in and mandated by a specific cultural tradition. Such self-views or self-ways transcend the meticulous knowledge of any specific persons while organized systematically around key cultural values and ideals pertaining to being a person in its most general and abstract form. To summarize, self-concept is undoubtedly included in any conceptualizations of the self, yet self-views or self-ways are supposedly more wide-reaching and philosophical.

Given that the existence of multicultural identities within individuals is now a proven fact, researchers are endeavouring to understand how people manage these different conceptions of self. Trafimow and Smith (1998) proposed the latest extension of the 'two basket' theory, arguing that private and collective self-cognitions are differentially organized and stored, with culture affecting the relative accessibility of these self-cognitions. Evan among monoculturals, the coexistence of different selves and the situation-dependency of the relative salience of individual and collective selves have been empirically demonstrated using the priming paradigm. For instance, Gardner, Gabriel and Lee (1999) pointed out the shifting nature of the self. They demonstrated that priming independent or interdependent self-construals within a culture resulted in differences in psychological worldview that mirror those traditionally found between cultures. Hong, Morris, Chiu and Benet-Martinez (2000) highlighted the central role of frame switching in their theory of dynamic constructivism. Specifically, they argue that individuals are able to shift between interpretive frames rooted in different cultures in response to cues in the social environment. However, internalized culture as a network of discrete, specific constructs guides cognition only when they come to the fore in an individuals' mind. Their series of cognitive priming experiments (Hong *et al.*, 2000, 2001) have greatly impacted the field and illuminated the dynamic nature of biculturalism. Gardner, Gabriel and Dean (2004) purported that the ability to display culturally appropriate behaviours in both the new and old cultural settings is a marker of bicultural competence. We believe that this dynamic form of biculturalism can also be used to explain the often reported experience of differing endorsement of and compliance to traditional or modern values across diverse life domains among the Chinese. As a preliminary statement of our bicultural model, dynamism is not emphasized but implied in the conceptualization we adopted that since both traditional and modern rudiments of the self are now available, people can call on either system to respond effectively to situational demands or to express personal preferences.

In short, our bicultural model is generally in line with existing models of cultural (value) change, acculturation, multiculturalism, dynamic constructivism, and situation-dependency of self-activation. There is agreement that individualistic and collectivist self are available in all cultures, but culture changes may have effected a redistribution of the two selves in a transitional society, resulting in a shift in the relative salience and importance of the two selves. Our model, however, is primarily concerned with the Chinese people living in a transitional society such as Taiwan, who are normally regarded as 'monoculturals'. In addition, our model conceptualized the self at a more philosophical level, including self-knowledge or self-cognition, but encompassing a wider scope of self-related views and conceptions. Finally, in the case of social-oriented self, these views and conceptions are rooted in the traditional Chinese heritage, thus with a clear indigenous grounding.

Suggestions for future research related to the bicultural self

Having offered a preliminary statement of the Chinese bicultural self model, numerous research questions can be derived for testing the model. Two specific ones are outlined below. First, what is the phenomenological reality of the existence of individual-oriented and social-oriented self? Or what is the distribution of the various combinations of these two systems? Large-scale surveys with representative samples should be conducted to describe the distribution of four types of people: (i) those with high endorsement on both individual-oriented and social-oriented self (HH type); (ii) those with low endorsement on both selves (LL type); (iii) and (iv) those with high endorsement on one but low endorsement on another self (HL type and LH type). Interesting demographical and psychosocial profiles of these four types of people can also be explored.

Second, what is the impact of individual-oriented and social-oriented self on life adjustment and personal well-being? Psychological adaptation at its core is the attunement between the individual's psyche and the cultural imperatives as both the meaning and form of 'wellness' is constituted in a specific cultural context. Therefore, in a value flux Chinese society, the adaptational functions of individual-oriented and social-oriented self may depend on the specific life domains where traditional or modern values prevail. Empirical studies can, for example, first

identify several salient and important life situations (e.g. team cooperation at work, living arrangement concerning elderly parents), then systematically investigate how people with different variations of the bicultural self (the aforementioned four types) cope with these real-life dilemmas. Such explorations will help us to fully appreciate the bicultural self in action to resolve real adaptational issues.

Third, as it stands in the present form, our model focuses on the emergence of a bicultural self in the Chinese context. This is an important topic which has received little attention from cross-cultural or multicultural psychologists. Specifically, while processes and outcomes of biculturalism in Western societies have received abundant attention, these issues have not been as well studied in Eastern societies. We take the view that the Western cultural influences introduced with modernization are antecedents for the emergence of the Chinese bicultural self; however, careful conceptual analysis still needs to be conducted on the transformation of this bicultural self, highlighting underlying processes and adaptational implications for various types of biculturals. Such efforts on theoretical enrichment and refinement is necessary if we are to better understand how the contemporary Chinese people strive to coordinate, regulate, compromise, synthesize, and integrate the traditional and modern self systems, in the pursuit of a more balanced, effective, and happy life. Our request has begun and will continue to the end.

Finally, the theoretical significance of the bicultural self in contemporary Chinese societies can't be easily overstated. As we referred to earlier, there is the ongoing debate in cultural anthropology on whether the construct of culture tends to essentialize a human group (Brumann, 1999), the notion of bicultural self and composite self helps to counter this tendency. By focusing on how the Chinese self evolves together with social economic changes, and how Chinese people constantly incorporate new cultural repertoires to update their self, we highlight the dynamic qualities of the cultural self. Culture is alive and evolving, our bicultural model will not only be a key to understanding the intricacy of psychological adaptation of the Chinese people caught in the cultural crossroads of the East and the West, we also hope to add a new dimension of dynamism to the discussion of the culture and self.

Acknowledgements

References

Abramson, P. R. & Inglehart, R. (1995). *Value Change in Global Perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Angyal, A. (1941). *Foundations for a Science of Personality*. New York: Commonwealth Fund.

Ataca, B. & Berry, J. W. (2002). Psychological, sociocultural, and marital adaptation of Turkish immigrant couples in Canada. *International Journal of Psychology, 37,* 13–26.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The Duality of Human Existence*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Berry, J. W. (2003). Conceptual approaches to acculturation. In: K. M. Chun & P. Balls Organista, eds. *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement, and Applied Research*, pp. 17–37. Washington, DC, USA: American Psychological Association.

Brindley, T. A. (1989). Socio-psychological values in the Republic of China (I). *Asian Thought and Society, XIV,* 98–115.

Brindley, T. A. (1990). Socio-psychological values in the Republic of China (II). *Asian Thought and Society, XIV,* 1–16.

Brumann, C. (1999). Writing for culture: Why a successful concept should not be discarded. *Current Anthropology, 40* (Suppl.), S1–S27.

Elster, J., ed. (1986). *The Multiple Self*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S. & Dean, K. K. (2004). The individual as 'melting pot': The flexibility of bicultural self-construals. *Current Psychology of Cognition, 22,* 181–201.

Gardner, W. L., Gabriel, S. & Lee, A. Y. (1999). 'I' value freedom, but 'we' value relationships: Self-construal priming mirrors cultural differences in judgment. *Psychological Science, 10,* 321–326.

Geertz, C. (1975). On the nature of anthropological understanding. *American Scientist, 63,* 47–53.

Hong, Y. Y., Ip, G., Chiu, C. Y., Morris, M. W. & Menon, T. (2001). Cultural identity and dynamic construction of the self: Collective duties and individual rights in Chinese and American cultures. *Social Cognition, 19,* 251–268.

Hong, Y. Y., Morris, M. W., Chiu, C. Y. & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55,* 709–720.

Inglehart, R. (1971). The silent revolution in Europe: Intergenerational change in Post-industrial societies. *American Political Science Review, 65,* 991–1017.

Inglehart, R. & Baker, W. E. (2000). Modernization, cultural change, and the persistence of traditional values. *American Sociological Review, 65,* 19–51.

James, W. (1890). *Principles of Psychology* (Vols. 1–2). New York: Holt.

Josselson, R. (1988). The embedded self: I and thou revisted. In: D. K. Lapsley & F. C. Power, eds. *Self, Ego, and Identity: Integrative Approaches*, pp. 91–107. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Kosmitzki, C. (1996). The reaffirmation of cultural identity in cross-cultural encounters. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22,* 238–248.

Kwak, K. & Berry, J. W. (2001). Generational differences in acculturation among Asian families in Canada: A comparison of Vietnamese, Korean, and East-Indian groups. *International Journal of Psychology, 36,* 152–162.

Lu, L. (2001). Understanding happiness: A look into the Chinese folk psychology. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 2,* 407–432.

Lu, L. (2003). Defining the self-other relation: The emergence of a composite self. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies, 20,* 139–207.

Lu, L. (2005). The individual-oriented and social-oriented self views: Conceptual analysis and empirical assessment. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of Taiwanese Psychological Association, Jhongli City, Taiwan. Taipei: Taiwanese Psychological Association.

Lu, L. (2006). *Construct Validity of the Individual-Oriented and Social-Oriented Self Views.* (Tech. Rep. NSC94-2752-H-008-002-PAE). Taipei, Taiwan: the National Science Council.

Lu, L. & Gilmour, R. (2004). Culture and conceptions of happiness: Individual oriented and social oriented SWB. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 5,* 269–291.

Lu, L. & Gilmour, R. (2006). Individual-oriented and socially oriented cultural conceptions of subjective well-being: Conceptual analysis and scale development. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 9,* 36–49.

Lu, L. & Yang, K. S. (2005). Individual- and social-oriented views of self-actualization: Conceptual analysis and preliminary empirical exploration. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies, 23,* 3–69.

Lu, L., Gilmour, R., Kao, S. F., *et al.* (2001). Two ways to achieve happiness: When the East meets the West. *Personality and Individual Differences, 30,* 1161–1174.

Markus, H. R. & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implication for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224–253.

Matsumoto, D. (2000). *Culture and Psychology*, 2nd edn. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks Cole.

Ng, S. K. (2004). Bicultural self among Hong Kong Chinese. Paper presented at Bicultural Self Symposium, Hong Kong, China. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong.

Rank, O. (1945). *Will Therapy and Truth and Reality.* New York: Alfred Knopf.

Ross, M., Xun, W. Q. E. & Wilson, A. E. (2002). Language and the bicultural self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28,* 1040–1050.

Sedikides, C. & Brewer, M. B., eds. (2001). *Individual Self, Relational Self, Collective Self*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Trafimow, D. & Smith, M. D. (1998). An extension of the 'two-baskets' theory to Native Americans. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 28,* 1015–1019.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96,* 506–520.

Tu, W. M. (1985). Selfhood and otherness in Confucian thought. In: A. J. Marsella, G. DeVos & F. L. K. Hsu, eds. *Culture and Self: Asian and Western Perspectives*, pp. 231–251. New York: Tavistock.

Yang, C. F. (1991). A preliminary analysis of the Chinese self: Theoretical considerations and research directions. In: C. F. Yang & H. S. R. Kao, eds. *Chinese People, Chinese Mind: Personality and Social Psychological Perspectives*, pp. 93–145. Taipei, Taiwan: Yuanliu Publishing Co.

Yang, K. S. (1986). Chinese personality and its change. In: M. H. Bond, ed. *The Psychology of the Chinese People*, pp. 106–170. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Yang, K. S. (1995). Chinese social orientation: An integrative analysis. In: T. Y. Lin, W. S. Tseng & E. K. Yeh, eds. *Chinese Societies and Mental Health*, pp. 19–39. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Yang, K. S. (1996). Psychological transformation of the Chinese people as a result of societal modernization. In: M. H. Bond, ed. *The Handbook of Chinese Psychology*, pp. 479–498. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yang, K. S. (2003). Methodological and theoretical issues on psychological traditionality and modernity research in an Asian society: In response to Kwang-Kuo Hwang and beyond. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6,* 263–285.

Yang, K. S. (2004). A theoretical and empirical analysis of the Chinese self from the perspective of social and individual orientation. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies, 22,* 11–80.

Yang, K. S. & Bond, M. H. (1982). Ethnic affirmation versus cross-cultural accommodation: The variable impact of questionnaire language. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 13,* 169–185.

Yang, K. S. & Lu, L. (2005). Social- and individual-oriented self-actualizers: Conceptual analysis and empirical assessment of their psychological characteristics. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies, 23,* 71–143.

Yu, A. B. & Yang, K. S. (1994). The nature of achievement motivation in collectivist societies. In: U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitçibasi, S. C. Choi & G. Yoon, eds. *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Application*, pp. 239–250. London: Sage.