SELF and CULTURE
What type of change?

Cigdem Kagitcibasi
Koç University
Turkish Academy of Sciences

Koc University, June 22\textsuperscript{nd}, 2010
CONNECTIONS BETWEEN LEVELS OF ANALYSIS

Culture level

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{Individualism} & \quad - \quad \text{Collectivism} \\
\text{Independence} & \quad - \quad \text{Interdependence}
\end{aligned}
\]


A further distinction:

Values orientation and Self orientation
To I/C

‘Normative Individualism/Collectivism’
(Norms/values; Vertical-Horizontal I/C; Hierarchy)

‘Relational Individualism/Collectivism’
(Self-other relations; separateness-embeddedness)

The latter - - self boundaries, self - other relations has found expression in contrasts made between the ‘Western’ **Self-Contained Self** and ‘Other’ Views of the Self:

- Enriquez : The Filipino *Kapwa* the unity of the “self” and the “other”
- Japanese : *Group Self* (Amae)
- Nsameng : West African *Social Selfhood*
- Sun : The Chinese *Two Person Matrix* (Yin and Yan)
- Roland : Japanese and Indian *Familial Self*

Also reflected in Popular Psychology
Connected and Separate Selves/Family

Connected family

Separate family
Autonomy and Relatedness are Basic Human Needs

However, the construal of Autonomy and Relatedness as **conflicting** has prevailed over Autonomy and Relatedness as **basic needs**

Thus, Relatedness is seen as **incompatible** with Autonomy; and Separation from others is seen as necessary for autonomy ("Separation-Individuation" hypothesis)
What is the underlying reason?

Not evolutionary, which rather stresses the survival value of cooperation and relatedness in humans and other primates (Euler et al, 2001; Guisinger & Blatt, 1994).

It is cultural ... Western Individualism as a ‘Cultural Affordance’ (Poortinga, 1992).
In much cross-cultural research and theory, individualism is understood as autonomy (Hofstede, 1980, 1991; Rothbaum et al., 2000; Rothbaum & Trommsdorff, in press; Smith & Schwartz, 1997; Triandis, 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1991).


This is especially the case for Normative I-C.

Thus issues of both conceptualization and measurement...
Yet, it is neither logically nor psychologically necessary for Autonomy to mean Separateness if we recognize the existence of two distinct dimensions:

**Agency:**
- Autonomy
- Heteronomy (dependency)

**Interpersonal Distance:**
- Separateness
- Relatedness
The two dimensions underlie self, self-other relations and social behaviors.

They reflect basic human needs for **autonomy** and **relatedness**.

As conceptually distinct dimensions, either pole of each one can coexist with either pole of the other one.

A Conceptual Model of Different Types of Selves

Autonomous-Separate self

Autonomous-related self

Heteronomous-separate self

Heteronomous-related self

AGENCY

Autonomy
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Separation

Relatedness

Heteronomy
This conceptualization renders viable
The Autonomous-Related Self

Despite the consensual agreement that Autonomy and Relatedness are basic needs, this self construal has not been readily recognized in psychology, even in cross-cultural psychology.

• Global Change toward the Autonomous-Related Self

With
• Urbanization
• Increased Education
• Increased Affluence