

DUBLIN BUSINESS SCHOOL

**A STUDY OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION  
DIRECT/INDIRECT AGGRESSION AND FEAR OF  
NEGATIVE EVALUATION AMONG INDIVIDUALISM  
AND COLLECTIVISM IN IRELAND**

---

Submitted in part fulfillment of requirement for the award of Bachelor of Arts degree  
in Psychology at DBS School of Arts, Dublin

**HUAN ZHU**

1449732

Supervisor: Dr. Babera Caska.  
Head of Department: Dr. Sinead Eccles.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. Babera Caska, who provided great encouragement, excellent feedback and caring support from the very start to the ultimate end.

Secondly, I would like to thank Robert Pentony, Dr. Patricia Frazer, Dr. Patricia Orr, Dr. John Hyland and Dr. Garry Prentice for their caring support of my endless questions.

Lastly, I would like to thank Xin Xiao, Shu yan Zhu, and all the people who made the project possible, all participants and friends for their time, effort and support towards my cause.

## **ABSTRACT**

Current study explores the difference between Chinese participants and Irish participants on the individualism and collectivism scale (AICS). Then Individualism and Collectivism was used as predictor to predict perception of racial discrimination by use index of race-related stress scale-brief version (IRRS-B), direct / indirect aggressive behavior by use Richardson conflict response questionnaire (RCRQ), and fear of negative evaluation behavior by use fear of negative evaluation scale, revised version (FNE). 103 people, who included Irish (51) and Chinese (52), participated in the study using snowball and convenience easy access methods. Significant difference between the two groups on collectivism scale was found, but no different on the individualism scale was found. Multiple regression found no relationship between individualism / collectivism and perceived racial discrimination at all, which also means individualism and collectivism cannot predict perceptions of racial discrimination. Also multiple regression did not found any relationship between the two predictor and indirect aggression behavior, but interestingly found that collectivism has strong association with direct aggression rather than individualism. Finally statistic test found that individualism strongly associated with fear of negative evaluation, and collectivism did not shown any significant result on the same measurement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	2
Abstract .....	3
Table of contents.....	4
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>5</b>
Collectivism .....	7
Individualism.....	8
Culture background.....	10
Education system background.....	11
Parenting style .....	12
Rational for the current study .....	13
Hypothesis summary .....	14
<b>METHOD.....</b>	<b>15</b>
Materials .....	16
Participants .....	18
Design .....	18
Procedure .....	19
<b>RESUTLE.....</b>	<b>20</b>
Descriptive analysis .....	21
Inferential analysis .....	22
<b>DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>25</b>
Individualism and collectivism .....	26
Perceptions of racial discrimination .....	27
Direct and indirect aggression .....	27
Fear of negative evaluation .....	28
Conclusion limitations and recommendation for further research .....	29
<b>REFERENCE .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>APPENDIX .....</b>	<b>41</b>

## **Introduction**

In today's globalised economy a greater understanding of culture differences is vital in an effort to avoid social confusions and conflicts, not just on a personal, intimate level but also on an economic and politic level. In today's world two of the most important constructs that differentiate societies are individualism and collectivism (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 2001). However, most of the western countries such like UK, France, and American in particular are classified as capitalism culture background societies. On the other hand Asia countries such like Japan, India, and China are mostly considered as socialism culture background societies. For capitalism individualism and competition are the fundamental aspects. In a purely capitalist society, individuals are responsible for protecting their own interests in the marketplace and within their communities. The potential success of each individual is also valued. People are encouraged to direct their talents in a way that benefits them self, such as by starting business or entering a highly profitable profession. Socialism society are more relies on governmental planning, rather than the marketplace, public services are typically numerous and funded by taxpayer money. Citizens are expected to work, but the government provides services such as education, healthcare, and public transportation for free or at very low cost. (Russett, 1993) very few societies are purely capitalist or purely socialist, although most are more strongly one than the other. For example United States is considered to be a capitalist society, but the social security system, which provides support for people who are unable to work is socialistic. Sweden is considered by some people to be a socialist country, but the majority of industry in the nation is in private hands, which is capitalism. Therefore, because of these differences, people from different societies are so different in term of ideology, perceptions and reasoning processes. However this study is not conduct to looking at the economy or the political system, but the fundamental psychological variables behind these two different societies, which is collectivism and individualism.

## *Collectivism*

Collectivistic societies have strong links among individuals and emphasize the needs and values of the group rather than those of the individual (Korostelina, 2007). In collectivistic societies, people are expected to subordinate their personal goals and ambitions to those of the group (Triandis, 1993). In another word the core element of collectivism is individuals within social units sharing common fate, common goals, and common values; the personal is simply a component of the social (Triandis, 1995). For many centuries in East Asian Societies, particularly the Chinese, Korean, and Japanese societies, have been dominated by the extremely collectivistic values of Confucianism and related philosophical systems (Bell & Chaibong, 2003). The core values of these systems include obligations to others the avoidance of conflict, toleration, magnanimous, and the maintenance of social harmony (Ho & Chiu, 1994; Nisbett, 2003; Xu et al., 2004). These values are in sharp contrast to the values of western individualistic culture, and the behaviors that are valued by individualistic societies are often perceived as selfish, shameful, and socially damaging by the collectivists. For example, Markus and Kitayama (1991) captured one important difference between individualistic and collectivistic societies when they observed, “In America, the squeaky wheel gets the grease.” But in Japan, “the nail that stands out gets pounded down.” Because of the collectivistic have strong emphasis on the avoidance of conflict and maintenance of social harmony, it is reasonable to expect that in collectivistic societies, particularly these with a strong Confucian tradition countries would have less aggression and violence, but more conflict reducing than the individualistic societies. This hypothesis is considerably empirical supported (Archer, 2007; Bergeron and Schneider, 2005). Also in one of the previous study done by Li et al (2010) they have found that Chinese adolescent endorse stronger collectivistic but may be highly individualistic in academic achievement, and individualism positively related to adolescents’ overt and relational aggression, whereas collectivism showed negative associations within the Chinese cultural context. And the conflict level that adolescents experienced primarily connected these associations. Further more they have also found that components of individualism, such as emphasis on personal goals and self-assertiveness, engage in more conflict. And in contrast, valuing submission to collectives, cooperation, and harmonious relationships involves in less conflict. Moreover Orlick et al (1990) found that

components of individualism led to more conflict and collectivism led to less conflict cross culturally as well. Therefore, taken these studies founding, it is indicating that higher level of collectivism is associated with less peer conflict at both cross-cultural and intercultural levels. However it is important to recognize that there are fundamental differences between collectivistic societies and individualistic societies, and these two types of societies perceive things in a very different manner.

### ***Individualism***

In contrast, individualistic societies are centered on the needs and desires of the individual (Korostelina, 2007). These societies perceive individuals as autonomous and links between members of the society are much weaker (Triandis, 1995). The core element of individualism is that individuals are independent of one and another. However Hofstede (1980) defined individualism as focus on rights above duties, a concern for oneself and immediate family, an emphasis on personal autonomy and self – fulfillment, basing of one’s identity on one’s personal accomplishments. Schwartz (1990) defined individualistic societies as fundamentally contractual, consisting of narrow primary groups and negotiated social relations, with specific obligations and expectations focusing on achieving status. All these definitions are showing that the individualism emphasizing the personal goals, personal uniqueness and peripheralizes the social (Bellah, et al., 1985; Hsu, 1983; Kagitcibasi, 1994; Kim, 1994; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Sampson, 1977; Triandis, 1995; Oyserman, et al., 2002). With all these definitions the psychological variables for the individualism such like self-concept, well being attribution style and relationally are easy to determine. To individualism self concept implies creating and maintaining a positive sense of self is a basic human endeavor (Baumeister, 1998); feeling good about oneself, personal success, having many unique or distinctive attitudes and opinions are valued (Oyserman & Markus, 1993); abstract traits and situation well – being for individualism very much involved externally expressing emotions and accomplishment of personal goals, and it is the source of well – being and satisfaction (Diener &Diener, 1995; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Finally judgment and causal inference are direct to the person not the situation or social context (Choi, Nisbett & Norenzayan, 1999; Miller, 1984; Morris & Peng, 1994; Newman, 1993). Regard to

the relationally, individualistic need relationships and group to achieve self – relevant goals, but individualistic will looking at this at the cost and beneficent level (Kagitibasi, 1997; Oyserman, 1993). During the processes of achieving self – relevant goals, individualism will apply equity norms to balance the relationships’ cost and benefit, and leaving the relationships or group when cost are more than benefit and shift to another group or relationship, therefore theorists assume that for individualists, relationship and group members are important but to participants is not intensive. (Bellah et al., 1985; Kim, 1994; Shweder & Bourne, 1982). Overall there are major differences between individualism and collectivism in so many levels. Another example, in concepts of masculinity the important work of Louie (2000, 2004; Louie and Edwards, 1994) has shown that traditional view point from the Chinese this concept include both reflective and scholarly, and this view of masculinity is coupled with Confucian values that emphasize the importance of avoiding conflict and maintaining social harmony (Nisbett, 2003; Xu et al., 2004). In contrast, in individualistic societies concepts of masculinity emphasize independence, personal autonomy, self-masculinity, self-reliance, and assertiveness (Forbes et al, 2011). Therefore, to understand the differences and interact each other become a very important aspect in today’s globalized worldviews. As conceptual frameworks, individualism and collectivism reflect clearly contrasting worldviews. However on the other hand, each society may have a culture that includes both individualism and collectivism, with society differing in the number of situations in which one or the other is cued, for example American Society can often be characterized as individualistic but there are situations in which American Society is better characterized as collectivistic such like when national group membership is salient or threatened (Oyserman, Kimmelmeier & Coon, 2002). However these fundamental differences would have very strong influences for the individuals, and current research is conduct to examine would these differences predict certain psychological variables, which would contribute to avoid unnecessary social misunderstanding.

## ***Culture Background***

As the world is becoming more and more flat, understanding the differences between each other becomes increasingly urgent. Among these differences, the divide between the east and the west is quite evident. When comparing the East Asian countries, studies finds that one of the commonalities is that Confucianism has been shaping these societies at some point of the history (Bell & Chaiboug, 2003). The focus of Confucianism has always been on education, or “self – cultivation.” This self – cultivation emphasizes not only knowledge accumulation, but also improving one’s morality. Most Confucian teachers attempt to equip their disciples with a set of moral values and a wealth of knowledge to serve the society. The core concept in this self – cultivation are: “Ren, Li, Xiao, Zhong, Shu.” These are chosen because of their tight connections with behaviors in a firm setting.

Ren is the most important moral concept in Confucian thought, which is translated as benevolence, love, humanness, or goodness in English. Many intellectuals and such as Yang et al. (2008) and Schwartz (2006, 1985), believe that benevolence, as the central moral value, bring all the other Confucian virtues together.

Li is translated as rituals, ritual propriety, proper form of conduct, or “concrete guide to human action.” Schwartz refers that “the order that the Li ought to bind together is simply a ceremonial order – it is a sociopolitical order in the full sense of the term, involving hierarchies, authority, and power.” (2006) Bell and chaibong even argued “It would also be in the ruler’s interest to disciplined by Li, since this could help to secure legitimacy for the government” (2003).

Xiao, translated as filial piety, Confucius said, regarding filial piety: “not disobeying parents, serving and supporting with loyalty and good – heartedness when they are alive and burring them with propriety when they are dead” (Legge in Yang et al., 2008). Filial piety emphasize the obedience and service that children should provide to parents without questioning, because of the sacrifices parents had made when rearing the children.

Zhong, translated as loyalty, conscientiousness in English. Goldin (2011) argues that Zhong, even if it is recognized as “loyalty” nowadays, had quite different

meaning two thousands years ago. He considers that it is mean “being honest with oneself in dealing with others.”

Shu is translated as reciprocity, consideration, or altruism. It is based on Confucius saying: “what you do not like yourself, do not do to others” (Yao, 2006). All of these Confucius thought leads to how should one perceived to the relationship, the virtues for self – cultivation define how one should behave towards other. Whereas these virtues are general guidelines, Confucians often mention a set of “Five Relationships”, also referred to as “Five Bonds” – King and subject father and son; husband and wife; older brother and younger brother, friend and friend. These relationships define the appropriate behavior that each role assumes: Between father and son there should be love; between the king and subject there should be just dealing; between husband and wife there should be distinctions; between the old and young there should be precedence between friends there should be good faith. (Yao, 2006, P.93)

Therefore harmony is the desirable quality that Confucians work towards in both the family and societal context. The above mentioned self – cultivation, moral values for individuals, the proper relationship between people, social hierarchy and politic order, all serve to archive this ultimate goal. Overall constitute the Confucian culture sphere have major influence on collectivism societies, from a historical point of view. In the other hand, autonomy cultures people are viewed are thought as autonomous. They been teaches to emphasized and express their own preferences, ideas, and abilities, and find meaning in their own uniqueness. Intellectual autonomy encourages individuals to pursue their own idea and intellectual directions independently. Important values in such cultures include broadmindedness, curiosity, and creativity. Affective autonomy encourages individuals to pursue affectively positive experience for themselves. Important values include pleasure, exciting life and varied life. (Schwartz, 2003) However, both societies have its own uniqueness and weakness, but current study is concentrate on how collectivism and individualism individuals’ perceive event as a social context. These culture concepts are indicating that Chinese people, as collectivistic ethnic group would have major difference than those who are individualistic. Through history these implications have strong association with the collectivistic structure, and in current study all the hypothesis are build on this structure differences, so it is crucial to introduce these culture background.

### ***Education system Background***

The education system between individualism and collectivism societies also fundamentally differ. In the west (individualism society) education system, teachers emphasize on individuation, and concentrate on expressive and initiative abilities development. Young are educated in a very flexible and non-pressured environment. Especially within class western education allow much more freedoms and give the children chance to express themselves (Samovar & Porter, 2004). In the western primary schools the atmosphere are very active, discussion during class is allowed, children can have a laugh walk around, take a drink, and so on. In class the desk are not always facing the board, and don't have fixed position, teachers and students can have much more activities without going to the yard or special room. During class teachers can use their own unique way to teacher the students, students can learn things though singing, dancing, performances, and games (Cortazzi & Jin, 1996). In the other hand collectivism societies (Chinese Specifically) have a very different education system. The education system in east would be more emphasize on collectivistic, students in class are required unified viewpoints, and for every question there is only one correct answer (Change & Chin, 1999). Most of the lecturing has to follow the precise instruction and schedule by the department of education; teaching has been more a life mission. During class teachers are the authority, students are passively taking the knowledge (Tweed & Lehman, 2002). Also during class everything is around the sense of collectivism, students have to be pleat, obey the roles such like put the hands behind the back, rise hands before speak, only speak on permission, and own thought must close to the "correct answer" (Li, 2008). These teaching style reflected that the schema form both ethnic groups would have significant different, and these different are why individualism and collectivism will have completely different ideas within the same situation.

### ***Parenting style***

Individualism background parents are more focus on developing children's sense of independences, such like self – respect, and personality. They emphasize those aspects because they believe that personality and self – respects are very important and it will influence the children for the rest of their life (Keller & Otto, 2009). In

western (individualism) world parents will discuss thing with the child listen the problem they have and give advises, but never make a choice for the children. However in collectivism (China) parents most likely will avoid individualities and more concerned on the relationships with the other, parent will guide or even make decisions for the children / child. In west world parents and children are stand on quality (from a personality wise), but both side have different viewpoint and different interest (Keller & Otto, 2009). Parents urge their child /children care and protest their own interest. In contrast collectivism parents usually teach their child /children to share, even personal things like toys, books, or even clothes are belong to the entire family, not individuals. In west world parents are encourage their children learn to be independent, not rely on their parents all the time. In China parent more prefer children listen to their parents, respect and obey been seen as virtue and well educated (Du, 1999). These parenting styles are another indication of why people form different ethnic groups perceive things in different way aside from individual differences.

### ***Rationale for the current study***

Overall in assumption China as collectivism society has major different than the individualism western societies. Ireland as a western country recently have a lot of impact from the eastern world, immigrate from a completely opposite culture glutted people's daily life in Ireland, so understand each others differences and perceptions become urgently important. Unfortunately little psychological research has been done in this specific area by the PSI, on basis of a lack of research concerning the psychological perceptions and schema between individualism and collectivism in Ireland, this study explores whether there is an overall relationship on perceiving racial discrimination, direct/indirect aggression, and fear of negative evaluation with Individualism and Collectivism. Previous study done by Hunter (2008) in American found that specific ethnic group individualism and collectivism perceive racial discrimination in very different way and levels. Other previous studies suggested that there have been positive significant correlations between racial – ethnic identity, self – efficacy, self – esteem and other measures of quality of life (Mcmahon & Watts, 2002; Kiang et al, 2006; Bamaca & Umana – Taylor, 2004). Because of Asian culture

are strongly related, and influenced by the Confucius based philosophy, it is going to be difficult to live, study, and having a relationship in a completely different culture. It is common to perceive racial discriminations when one live in another nation, and as mentioned before this aspect is linked with self-efficacy, self-esteem and other measures of quality life. Therefore monitoring racial discrimination would avoid unnecessary misunderstanding, improve quality life for both national and international ethnic groups, and also directly predict the non-national ethnic group's mental health status.

Examination of these contradicting findings would suggest that there will be significant differences between Individualistic (Irish) and collectivistic (Chinese) on perceived racial discrimination, direct/indirect aggression, and fear of negative evaluation. The general design of current research will be a questionnaire based cross – culture correlation study. In this study index of race – related stress – Brief version (IRRS – B. Utsey, 1999), individualism and collectivism scale (AICS. Shulruf, 2008); Richardson conflict response questionnaire (RCRQ. Richardson and Green, 2003); and Fear of Negative evaluation scale, revised version (Leary, 1983a) questionnaire will be use to exam weather individualism and collectivism can be use as a predictor, toward to certain perspective /attitude.

### ***Hypothesis Summary***

- 1) Chinese participants will be score significantly higher on collectivism scale than the Irish participants, and in contrast Irish participants will be score significantly higher than Chinese participants on individualism score.
- 2) Chinese people's collectivist attitude will lead to higher score on perceived racial discrimination than the Irish participants.
- 3) Chinese people as collectivistic will be more acting aggression in an indirect way then the more individualistic Irish, and in contrast Irish participants as individualistic will be more direct aggressive.
- 4) Chinese people as collectivistic will be more afraid negative evaluation than the individualistic Irish.

## **Method**

## ***Materials***

The material needed for this research study was the questionnaire packet developed by the researcher and pen or pencil. The first page of the questionnaire contained an information cover sheet that introduced the participant to the study, and informing them of the anonymity and voluntary nature of the study. The topic of the research study or any explanations of the measured constructs and the name of the questionnaire were not included in the cover sheet, but the contact information of the researcher was included. (The questionnaire packet is included in the appendix section).

Section 1 was a demographic questionnaire sheet, designed by the researcher to determine certain classification groups for further analysis. The questions include “age”, “gender”, participant’s “country of region”, “how long in Ireland”, “parent’s nationality”, “education status”, and “marital status”.

Section 2 was the individualism – collectivism scale (AICS; Shulruf, 2011). This is a 26item scale that contains questions like “ I enjoy being unique and different from others” and answers would be like “never or almost never”, “rarely”, “occasionally”, “often”, “very often”, and “always”. Corresponding to a score value of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 respectively. Questionnaire also contained 5 subscales domains, question 3, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, and 24 indicating “advice”, question 4, 9, 16, 20 indication “harmony”. Both “advice and harmony” are under the collectivism character. Under the individualism character there are 3 subscales: “compete” contain question 1, 6, 7, 14, 21, 23, and 25; “unique” contain question 2, 12, 22, and 26; “responsibility” contain question 5, 11, 17, and 19. The score for each item are summed to give a total score, the higher the score on the character the greater of that participant falls in that character. Dr. Shulruf, Hattie, and Dixon developed this questionnaire in New Zealand in 2007, the original has been modified and finalized in 2011 and it has been proven to be both reliable and valid in various field studies. Alpha values ranging from .75 to .91. (Shulruf et al, 2011)

Section 3 was the index of race – related stress – brief version (IRRS – B; utsey, 1999). The IRRS – B is a 22 items scale measure of race – related stress experience. Respondents are asked to evaluate race related situations that oneself or someone close to him/her experienced and indicate how upset that experience caused. Answers

are recorded on a 5 – point scale (0 = this never happened to me to 4 = event happened and I was extremely upset). The IRRS – B provide three subscale: culture racism stress related to the denigration of one’s culture, 2 institutional racism – stress related to racism embedded in institutional policies and practices, and 3 individual racism experienced interpersonally. Summing all 22 items of the IRRS – B derives a total racism – related stress score. Higher scores on the IRRS – B subscale and total scale indicate higher levels of racism – related stress. For the current study, only the IRRS – B total score will use for data analyses.

Section 4 was the Richardson conflict response questionnaire (RCRQ; Richardson & Green 2003). The RCRQ is a self –report scale consisting of 20 aggression items, 10 measuring direct aggression and 10 indirect aggressions, along with 8 filler items representing non-aggressive methods of dealing with conflict. It was developed for use with adult samples, however it uses a number of items taken from scales developed for use with children. Respondents are asked to indicate on a 5-point scales how frequently within a given time period they had engaged in each of these behaviors whilst angry. As such, the scale arguably only considers reactive aggression as opposed to instrumental aggression and the items are predominantly written to reflect this. This is of relevance when engaging in psychopath research since psychopath has been strongly linked to increased levels of proactive aggression (Cornell et al., 1996; Porter & Wood worth, 2006). The scale was found to display good internal validity over a number of validation studies, with Cronbach alphas ranging between .77 - .99 for direct aggression and .80 - .84 for indirect aggression (Richardson & Green, 2003).

Section 5 was a brief version of the Fear of negative evaluation scale (FNEB; Leary, 1983a), this version is convenient for quick and repeated administration. On this questionnaire, respondents rate the degree to which each of 12 statements applies to them on a 5-point liker scale from 1 = not at all characteristic of me to 5 = extremely characteristic of me. Total scores range from 12 to 60. The items selected for inclusion in the FNEB had satisfactory item – total correlations with the original scale, ranging from .43 to .75 (Leary, 1983a). The brief version of the scale also correlates highly with the original scale (Leary, 1983a; Westra & Stewart, 2001) and the reliability of the FNEB has been established using non-clinical samples. A high level of internal consistency was obtained for the items comprising the FNEB (alpha=

.90) and a test – retest reliability coefficient of .75 was found over a 4 weeks interval (Leary, 1983a). The validity of the FNEB was supported through significant correlations with the SAD (Watson & Friend, 1969) and the interaction anxiousness scale.

### ***Participants***

The method of sampling used for this study was snowball method and convenient sampling. The questionnaire packet was distributed to a number of people who further distributed questionnaires to co – workers, classmates, and friends. Questionnaires packet was also distributed to researcher’s classmate by convenient easy access sampling as well. In total, 114 paper questionnaires were returned. But 9 of the questionnaires were uncompleted, and two of them did not match the requirement. Overall, the sampling method employed tried to ensure a fair mix of participants between Irish and Chinese people while specifically targeting the racial – ethnic groups. Due to the nature of the study, specific targeting of such groups is necessary 50% of the participants were Irish (n = 51), and 50% of the participants were Chinese (n = 52).

The number of male participant was 36 and 67 were female participant, the age of participant ranged from 18 to 55, with an average of 18 to 25 years old and standard deviation of 1.47. Participants were divided into 2 categories; Irish and Chinese, Gender and age are not considered as major various, but the affect will be considered.

### ***Design***

The design of this research project was a questionnaire based cross – sectional comparison and correlation research study. Firstly a simple T test was performed to compare the two groups on the individualism and collectivism scale to determine which group is more collectivism/individualism. And then base on the result from the first analysis, a correlation analysis was conducted to exam is there any relationship between the hypothesis and the predictor (individualism and collectivism background).

## ***Procedure***

Participation in the research study was voluntary. Individual were approached with the questionnaire, which contained an information sheet. This information sheet introduced the research and the reason for the research study. The information sheet also informed the participants of their right to not complete the questionnaire and withdraw their responses at any point of the duration of the questionnaire. The nature and the requirement for this study, which are anonymous and over 18 years of age is also included. However, for the Chinese participants necessary assistant were also provided. (Translation of the information sheet and the questionnaire packet was attached along with the original questionnaire, which is included in the appendix section). All question were voluntary and not compulsory in order to continue.

For ethical purposes contact information of the researcher and the supervisor were also provided. After completing each questionnaire, the completed questionnaire was stored in a secure box to guarantee anonymity and security.

## Results

## *Descriptive analysis*

### **Gender**

Male participants were 36 and female participants were 67. Table 1 below shows the percentage breakdown of participants by gender.

Table 1.

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	36	35
Female	67	65
Total	103	100

### **Age**

Participant's age range is between 18 to 54. Table 2 below shows the breakdown.

Table 2.

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
18 – 25	73	70.9
26 – 35	21	20.4
36 – 49	7	6.8
50 >	2	1.9
Total	103	100

### **Region**

Participants were divided into two ethnic groups. Which are Chinese participants and Irish native participants. For ethnic reasons the two groups have been recoded into Asian and Europe, and the breakdown table shows as below on Table 3.

Table 3.

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Asian	52	50.5
Europe	51	49.5
Total	103	100

Education status breakdown is showed on table 4 below.

Table 4.

	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Lev-cert	15	14.6
Under-grad	75	72.8
Post-grad	10	9.7
Other	3	2.9
Total	103	100

### ***Inferential analysis***

To test the first hypothesis that Chinese participants will score significantly high on collectivism scale than the Irish participants, an independent sample t-test was conducted to compare the two ethnic groups. Chinese participants (Mean=43.83, SD=7.67) were found to have higher level of collectivism than the Irish participants (Mean=40.10, SD=8.08). The 95% confidence limits shows that the population mean difference of the variables lies somewhere between .65 and 6.81. An independent sample t-test found that there was a statistically significant difference between Chinese participants and Irish participants on collectivism ( $t(101)=2.40, p=.018$ ). Therefore the null can be rejected. However another independent sample t-test was also conducted to compare the two ethnic groups on the individualism scale. Irish participants (Mean=57.49, SD=10.31) were found to have higher level of individualism than Chinese participants (Mean=54.63, SD=9.79). The 95%

confidence limits shows that the population mean difference of the variables lies somewhere between  $-6.79$  and  $1.08$ . An independent samples t-test did not find any statistically significant difference between Irish participants and Chinese participants on the individualism scale ( $t(101) = -1.44, P = .153$ ). Therefore the null cannot be rejected. This result was indicating that there was a difference between Chinese participants and Irish participants, but the difference was not enough to be significant. Overall the Chinese participants show significantly higher scores on the collectivism scale than the Irish participants, but the two ethnic groups have no differences on the individualism scale. Therefore the result is supporting the first hypothesis.

To test the second hypothesis, which is collectivism would significantly predict greater perceptions of racial discrimination; and individualism would be inversely predictive of perceptions of racial discrimination. A multiple regression was used to test whether collectivism and individualism were predictors of perceptions of racial discrimination. The results of the regression indicated that the two predictors explained less than 1% of the variance ( $R^2 = .010, F(2, 100) = .502, P = .607$ ). It was found that collectivism couldn't predict perception of racial discrimination ( $\beta = -.087, P = .706, CI = -.492 - .335$ ) as did individualism ( $\beta = -.087, P = .389, CI = -.473 - .186$ ). Therefore the result shows that in this study individualism and collectivism cannot be used as predictors for perception of racial discrimination, and there were no relationships between them.

Test 3 was conducted to support hypothesis that Chinese people as a collectivism would be more indirectly aggressive, and Irish people as an individualism would be more directly aggressive. Multiple regression was used to test whether individualism and collectivism were predictors of indirect aggression. The result of the multiple regression indicated that the two predictors explained less than 1% of the variance ( $R^2 = .003, F(2, 100) = 1.130, P = .327$ ). It was found that collectivism couldn't predict indirect aggression behavior ( $\beta = -1.132, P = .260, CI = -.274 - .075$ ) as did individualism ( $\beta = .114, P = .258, 95\% CI = -.059 - .219$ ). Therefore the null cannot be rejected, the predictor cannot predict the indirect aggression and there is no relationship between them. Moreover the second part of test 3 was to look at direct aggression by using the same predictors; a multiple regression was used to test whether collectivism and individualism were predictors of direct aggression behavior.

The result of regression indicated that two predictor explained only 8.3% of the variance ( $R^2 = .083$ ,  $F(2,100) = 5.612$ ,  $P = .005$ ). It was found that collectivism significantly predicted direct aggression behavior ( $\beta = -.311$ ,  $P = .002$ , 95% CI =  $-.497 - -.120$ ) but individualism did not ( $\beta = .122$ ,  $P = .204$ , 95% CI =  $-.053 - .247$ ).

Test 4 was conducted to test hypothesis 4, which is that collectivism will be more afraid of negative evaluation than individualism. Multiple regression was used to test whether collectivism and individualism were predictor of fear of negative evaluation. The results of regression indicated that two predictor explained only 7.8% of the variance ( $R^2 = .078$ ,  $F(2,100) = 5.336$ ,  $P = .006$ ). It was found that individualism significantly predicted fear of negative evaluation ( $\beta = .247$ ,  $P = .011$ , 95% CI =  $.046 - .354$ ) but collectivism did not ( $\beta = .156$ ,  $P = .107$ , 95% CI =  $-.035 - .191$ ).

## **Discussion:**

The rationale behind this study was to explore whether individualism and collectivism can be used as a predictor to predict perception of racial discrimination, direct/indirect aggression behavior, and fear of negative evaluation. Overall in today's world two of the major constructs are individualism and collectivism (Hofstede, 1980). However mostly western culture is considered as individualism culture, such like American. And East Asian culture would be considered as collectivism culture such like china. (Triandis, 2001). The composition of individualistic and collectivist tendencies in a culture are thought to have direct psychological impact on the members of the culture. Moreover it is also important to note that individualism and collectivism are not mutually exclusive and these constructs co-exist within a culture, but the saliency and priority given to each construct has been found to differ across culture (Brewer & Chen, 2007). Current study will add to the previous body of research on similar topic by providing a different geographical setting. Firstly, this study examines if there is an overall significant difference between the two ethnic groups, which is Chinese participants (collectivism, group) and Irish participants (individualism group), on the individualism and collectivism scale. Based on the result, use collectivism and individualism as predictor to predict perceptions towards racial discrimination, direct/indirect aggression behaviors, and fear of negative evaluation behaviors.

### ***Individualism and collectivism***

Previous research has usually found that western world such like American, England are individualism culture. And East Asian especially china and Japan are collectivism culture (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 2001; Korostelina, 2007); this study is trying to generalize the result in different population and different geographic location. However, this study did find significant difference between Irish participants and Chinese participants on the collectivism scale. Result from an independent sample t-test shown that Chinese participants are scored significantly higher than the Irish participants, which is consistent with previous research supported that Chinese people are more collectivistic. However the two ethnic groups are also been compared on the individualism scale, surprisingly independent sample t-test did not find a significant result at all, which means that there is no significant

different between the two groups on the individualism scale. The mean score showed that the Irish participants are slightly higher than the Chinese participants on the individualism score but the level remained not significant, it is possible affected by the sample size.

### ***Perceptions of racial discrimination***

It was hypothesized that greater agreement with collectivism would be associated with greater perceptions of racial discrimination. And greater agreement with individualistic would be associated with less perceptions of racial discrimination. Therefore individualism and collectivism should be able to predict perceptions of racial discrimination. In the current research multiple regression found there was no relationship between the individualism/collectivism and racial discrimination. However, previous study done by Hunter (2008) in American found that vertical individualism and horizontal collectivism were predictive of greater perceived racial discrimination between African Americans and British Caribbean Americans, which showed consistent result with other previous study (Sellers & Shelton, 2003). These founding indicating that there are different type of individualism and collectivism, due to the limitation of current study there was a lack of control of the participants used in this study, the result of this research should be taken theoretically because it is possible that the result was affected by the limitations. Another possible fact that may affect the result was the participants were all undergrads students and they have never involved into long termed job, another word their experiences still remained preliminary, and limited by the environment that they are in at moment. Finally this study was done in Ireland therefore racial discrimination may not relevant for those Irish students who was participated.

### ***Direct and indirect-aggression***

It was hypothesized that direct aggression would significantly high as societies had fewer collectivistic values and more individualistic values. In this study multiple regression was interestingly found that Chinese participants (collectivism) was significantly high on direct aggression rather than indirect aggression and there was

no difference between the collectivism and individualism on indirect aggression score. In one of the previous research study done by Forbes et al (2009) found that the individualism and collectivism dimension is associated with indirect aggression in the same way that it is associated with direct aggression. And there was no support that the conflict-avoidant values of collectivistic societies would lead to greater indirect aggression. However Li et al (2010) studied associations between individualistic and collectivistic culture values and aggressive behavior among Chinese adolescents. They found that Chinese adolescent have a strong collectivistic orientation in the relationship context, but may be highly individualistic in the academic achievement context. And different context would lead to different conflict levels; in another word it is situational. In current study one of the possible reasons why the results did not support hypothesis might lie in the sampling method and other limitations. A majority of the participants of the current study were academic students or educated people, it could be speculated that these kinds of people are more reasonable and have good mannered. Another possible reason could be that all the Chinese participants are the only children in their family (The Chinese policy one child per family only) so the strategy to deal with the conflict and the perception toward to the conflict may have changed. Moreover, changes in Chinese society such as the increase of foreign-funded enterprises and private businesses may have influenced this finding; the environment and the value system of Chinese people are changing towards to individualism desires. (Zhou, 1993; Liping, 1995).

### ***Fear of negative evaluation***

Finally the last hypothesis was that collectivism is more afraid of negative evaluation. In a previous research, Chung and Mallery (2000) examined self-esteem in China and the United States, they have found that higher collectivism scores were associated with an increased desire to make upward comparisons, and a decreased desire to make downward comparisons. This study was indicated that within collectivism upward self-improvement are common. Using the same rational, it is speculated that those who agree more on collectivistic are desire to be better than the other, which means that they do not like negative evaluation. However, current study found that individualism was significantly predicted fear of negative evaluation rather

then collectivism, which is not supporting previous study at all. One of the possible reasons that the current study did not support previous study could be that the Irish participants in the research sample are more achieved goal individualism (vertical individualism), or under influence of environment factor such like in the process of trying to achieve academic goals.

### ***Conclusion, limitations and recommendation for further research***

Although this research has added to other studies in understanding of the relationship between Individualism/Collectivism and several psychological variables such like perceptions of racial discrimination, direct/indirect aggression, and fear of negative evaluations, there are number of limitation to consider. Despite these limitations, however, the current study has showed that there are differences between individualism and collectivism on the psychological concept. Which making western world different from the Eastern world on perceptions, schemas, and conflicts when dealing with social norms. However, current study also showed that, there are no pure collectivism or individualism society, both concepts co-exist within societies. And the level of these psychological concept are strongly influence by the environment factors and economic statuses. In today's globalised economy understanding each other is crucial, and it may contribute in so many other ways such like financial, and political.

Moreover, although careful precaution had been taken into consideration for the design of this research study, there are still limitations and weakness to the study that should be considered when interpreting the result. The sample of participants used in this study were not randomly selected, instead a snowball and convenient easy access method was used. This might mean that the participants are not representative of the entire population of Ireland or China. This method of sampling is open to bias and the result may be skewed towards to undergraduate student at DBS and DKIT, which is not representative of entire population. As a recommendation for further research study, using a randomly selected sample from different location and different socioeconomic classes may improve the quality of the current study. Moreover, the design of the research project was affected by limitations on the researcher as an undergraduate student. Further more gender differences and individual differences in individualism and collectivism are an important issue, but they were not the variable

in this study, future study can be improve by taken these variables into consideration. Another important point is that the direction of the relationships cannot be established because of the design. Finally the study was self reported rather than direct measure or direct observation and most of the Irish participants are psychology students, so the result may not be as accrued as expected. Further research should be more controlled to avoid the inaccurate result.

## Reference:

- Archer J. (2007). *A cross-cultural perspective on physical aggression between partners. Issues Forensic Psychol* 6: 125-131.
- Baumeister, R. (1998). *The self. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzed (Eds.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Vol. 1. p. 680-740. New York: Oxford University Press.*
- Bell DA, Chaibong H. (2003). *Introduction: The contemporary relevance of Confucianism In: Confucianism for the Modern World. New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 1-28.*
- Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. (1985). *Habits of the heart: individualism and commitment in American life. Berkeley, CA: University of California press.*
- Bergeron N, Schneider BH. (2005). *Explaining cross-national differences in peer-directed aggression: A quantitative synthesis. Aggression Behavior Vol. 3. P. 116-137.*
- Brewer, M. B., & Chen, Y., R. (2007). *Where (who) are collectives in collectivism? Toward Conceptual clarification of individualism and collectivism. Psychological Review, 114 (1), p. 133-151.*
- Brunet, G. F., at el. (2010). *Infant and child development, vol. 19(5). P. 498-515.*
- Change, V., & Chin, K. L. (1999). *Cultural issues in teaching and learning. Journal of the Australian and New Zealand Student Services Association, 14, P. 3-16.*
- Choi, I., Nisbett, R. E., & Norenzayan, A. (1999). *Causal attribution across cultures: Variation and universality. Psychological Bulletin, 125, p. 47-63.*

Chung, T., and Mallery, P. (2000). *Social Comparison, Individualism – Collectivism, and Self-Esteem in China and the United States. Current Psychology: Developmental. Learning. Personality. Social Winter. Vol. 18, No. 4, 340-352.*

Cornell, D. G., Warren, J., Hawk, G., Stafford, E., Oram, G., & Pine, D, (1996). *Psychopathy in instrumental and reactive violent offenders. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64 (4), p. 783-790.*

Cortazzi, M., & Jin, L. (1996). *Cultures of learning:Language classrooms in China. In H. Coleman (Ed.), Society and the language classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.*

Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). *Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68, p. 653-663.*

Du, X. Z. (1999). *In English custom comparison. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research press.*

Dysemann, D., Coon, H. M., & Kimmelmeier, (2002). *Rethining Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta – Analyses. Psychological Bulletin. Vol. 128, No. 1. p. 3-72.*

F, G., Zhang, X. Y., Doroszewicz, K., And Hoas, K. (2009). *Aggressive Behavior, vol 35(1). P.24-30.*

Fiske, A. P., Kiayama, S., Markus, H. R., & Nisbett, R. E. (1998). *The cultural matrix of social psychology. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), Handbook of social*

*psychology 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Vol. 2, pp. 915-981. Boston: McGraw-Hill.*

*Forbes, G., Zhang, X. Y., Doroszewicz, K., Haas, K. (2009). Relationships between individualism – collectivism, gender, and direct or indirect aggression: A study in China, Poland, and the US. Aggressive Behavior. vol 35, p.24-30.*

*Forbes, G. B., Collinsworth, L. L., Zhao, P. L., Kohlman, S., and Leclaire. (2011). Relationships Among Individualism – Collectivism, Gender, and Ingroup/Outgroup Status, and responses to conflict: A study in China and the United States. Aggressive Behavior. Vol. 37. P. 302-314.*

*Goldin, P. R. (2011). Confucianism. Berkeley, Calif: University of California Press.*

*Ho DY, Chiu C. (1994). Component ideas of individualism, collectivism and social organization: An application in the study of Chinese culture. In: Kim U, Triandis HC, Kagitcibasi C-, Choi S, Yoon G (eds). Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications, Newbury Park, CA: Sage, p. 137-156.*

*Hofstede G. (1980). Cultures Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.*

*Hunter, C. D., (2008). Individualistic and collectivistic worldviews: Implications for Understanding perceptions of racial discrimination in African Americans and British Caribbean Americans. Journal of Counseling, American psychological Association. Vol. 55, No. 3, P.321-332.*

*Hsu, F. L. K. (1983). Rugged individualism reconsidered. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.*

Kagitcibasi, C. (1994). *A critical appraisal of individualism and collectivism: Toward a new formulation*. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, & G. Yoon. *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*. p. 52-65. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kagitcibasi, C. (1997). *Individualism and Collectivism*. In J. W. Berry, M. H. Segall, & C. Kagitcibasi (Eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology: Vol. 3. Social behavior and Applications* p. 1-49. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Keller, H. & Otto, H. (2009). *The cultural socialization of emotion regulation during infancy*. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40 (6), P. 996-1011.

Kiang, L., Yip, T., Gonzales-Backen, M., Witkow, M., & Fuligni, A. J. (2006). *Ethnic identity and the daily psychological well-being of adolescents from Mexican and Chinese backgrounds*. *Child Development*, 77, p. 1338-1350.

Kim, U. (1994). *Individualism and collectivism: Conceptual clarification and elaboration*. In U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications*. p. 19-40. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Korostelian KV. (2007). *Social Identity and Conflict*. Gordonsville, VA: Palgrave Macmillan.

Leary, M. R. (1983a). *A brief version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale*. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 9, p. 371-375.

Liping, S., Hansheng, W., Sibin, W., Bin, L., and Shanhua, Y. (1995). *Changes in China's Social Structure Following the Reforms*. *Sciences in China*. P. 70-80.

Li, S. L. (2008). *Communication differences between the east and the west. J., Literature And History.*

Li, Y., Wang, M., Wang, C., and Shi, J. (2010) *Individualism, Collectivism and Chinese Adolescents' Aggression: Intracultural Variations. Aggressive Behavior. Vol. 36. P. 187-194.*

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). *Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. Psychological Review, 20, p. 568-579.*

McMahon, S. & Watts, R. (2002) *Ethnic Identity in Urban African American Youth: Exploring Links with Self-Worth, Aggression, and Other Psychosocial Variables. Journal of Community Psychology, 30 (4), p. 441 - 431.*

Miller, J. G. (1984). *Culture and the development of everyday social explanation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, p. 961-978.*

Morris, M. W., & Peng, K. (1994). *Culture and cause: American and Chinese attributions for social and physical events. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67, p. 949-971.*

Markus HR, Kitayama S. (1991). *Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. Psychol Review 98. p. 224-253.*

Newman, L. S (1993). *How individualists interpret behavior: Idiocentrism and spontaneous trait inference. Social Cognition, 11, p. 243-269.*

- Nisbett RE. (2003). *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently and Why*. New York: Free Press.
- Orlick T, Zhou Q-y, Partington J. (1990). Co-operation and conflict within Chinese and Canadian kindergarten settings. *Can J Behav Sci* 22:p. 20-25.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation OF Theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, p. 3-72.
- Oyserman, D., & Markus, H. R. (1993). The sociocultural self. In J. Suls (Ed.), *The self in social perspective*. p. 187-220. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Oyserman, D. (1993). The lens of personhood: Viewing the self, others, and conflict in a multicultural society. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, p. 993-1009.
- Porter, S., & Woodworth, M. (2006). Psychopathy and aggression. In C. J. Patrick (Ed.), *Handbook of psychopathy*. New York: Guilford.
- Richardson, D. S., & Green, L. R. (2003). Defining direct and indirect aggression: The Richardson conflict response questionnaire. *Revue Internationale de Psychologie Sociale*, 16 (3), p. 11-30.
- Russett, B. M. (1993). *Grasping the democratic peace: Principles for the post-cold-war world*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E. (2004). *Communication between cultures*(5th ed.). Belmont, California: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

- Sampson, E. E. (1997). *Psychology and the American ideal*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, p. 767-782.
- Schwartz, B. I. (2006[1985]). *Li and Jen*. In Ruggiero, A. (Ed.), *Confucianism*. p. 81-88. Detroit: Greenhaven Press.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1990). *Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed refinements*. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21, p. 139-157.
- Schwartz, S. H. (2003a). *Basic human values: Their content and structure across countries*. In A. Tamayo & J. Porto (Eds.), *Valores e trabalho [Values and work]*. Brasilia: Editora Universidade de Brasilia.
- Sellers, R. M., & Shelton, J. N. (2003). *The role of racial identity in perceived racial discrimination*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, p. 1079-1092.
- Shulruf, B., Alesi, M., Ciochin, L., Faria, L., Hattie, J., Hong, F., et al. (2011). *Measuring Collectivism and Individualism in the Third Millennium*. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 39 (2), p. 173-188.
- Shulruf, B., Hattie, J., & Dixon, R. (2007). *Development of a New Measurement Tool for Individualism and Collectivism*. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 25 (4), p. 285-401.
- Shweder, R. A., & Bourne, E. J. (1982). *Does the concept of the person vary cross culturally?* In A. J. Marsella & G. M. White (Eds.), *Cultural conceptions of mental health and therapy*. P. 97-137. New York: Reidel.

Triandis HC. 1993. *Collectivism and individualism as cultural syndromes. Cross Cult Res* 27:p. 155-180.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.*

Triandis HC. (2001). *Individualism-collectivism and personality. J Pers* 69:p. 907-927.

Tweed, R. G., & Lehman, D. R. (2002). *Learning considered within a cultural context: Confucian and Socratic approaches. American Psychologist, 57(2), p. 89-99.*

Umaña-Taylor, A. J. (2004). *Ethnic identity and self-esteem: Examining the role of social context. Journal of Adolescence, 27, p. 139-146.*

Utsey, S. O. (1999). *Development and validation of a short form of the Index of Race-Related Stress-Brief version. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 32, p. 149-166.*

Watson, D., & Friend, R. (1969). *Measurement of social-evaluative anxiety. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 33, p. 448-457.*

Westra, H. A., & Stewart, S. H. (2001). *The validity of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale-Brief Version. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Society, Toronto, ON.*

Xu Y, Farver JAM, Schwartz D, Change L. (2004). *Social networks and aggressive Behaviour in Chinese children. Int J Behav Dev* 28: p. 401-410.

Yang, X., Peng, Y., & Lee, Y. (2008). *The Confucian and Mencian philosophy of benevolent leadership. In Chen, C., & Lee, Y. (Eds.), Leadership and management in China:*

*philosophies, theories, and practices. p. 31-50. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.*

*Yao, X. (2006[2000]). Learning to Become Good. In Ruggiero, A. (Ed.), Confucianism. p. 89-98. Detroit: Greenhaven Press.*

*Zhou, X. (1993). Unorganized interests and collective action in Communist China. American Sociological Review, 58, p. 54-73.*

## Appendix

# INFORMATION SHEET

**Please note: Dear participant my name is Huan Zhu (Daniel). I am a final year psychology student. I am doing my final year research; this study being conducted to examine the differences between individualism and collectivism. This study is completely anonymous; participant must be 18 years of age and over. Questions may address personal and/or sensitive information. Participants can withdraw at any time during/or before the questionnaires filling in progress, but once the questionnaire is submitted withdraw will be impossible (questionnaires are anonymous collected, will be impossible to track). Data information is completely confidential and will be used for academic purposes only. Data will keep by the researcher in secure storage, with minimum access. Data will be shred or incineration when no longer needed. Research progress and findings can be notified on participant's request at any time.**

**Researcher's contact detail:**

**Name: Huan Zhu (Daniel).**

**Contact No: [REDACTED].**

**E-Mail: [REDACTED]**

**Or you can contact Dublin Business School, Psychology Department at [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]**

# Demographic Information

**Please Note: Do not leave any information that will address your identity. (Please complete all the questions and stay as accurate as possible)**

**Participant's age: 18 – 25 ; 26 – 35 ; 36 – 49 ; 50 – over.**

**Gender: M / F**

**Region of origin: Asian; Europe; America; Africa; Australia; Other.**

**How long in Ireland:                      Years,                      Months ;      Native .**

**Parent's Nationality:                      Father,                      Mother.**

**Education Status: Leaving certificate ; under grad ; post grad ; other .**

**Marital status: single ; Married ; Divorced ; Other .**

**The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out how you think or behave in regard to yourself and to groups to which you belong.**

**Please read the following questions and answer each question by indicating how often you would think or behave as described in each of the following items.**

**1 = Never or Almost never. 2 = Rarely. 3 = Occasionally. 4 = Often. 5 = Very often. 6 = Always**

1. I define myself as a competitive person. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
2. I enjoy being unique and different from others. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
3. Before I make a major decision I seek advice form people close to me.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
4. Even when I strongly disagree with my group members, I avoid an argument.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
5. I consult with superiors on work-related matters. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
6. I believe that competition is a law of nature. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
7. I prefer competitive rather than non-competitive recreational activities.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
8. Before taking a major trip, I consult with my friends.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
9. I sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
10. I consider my friends opinions before taking important actions.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
11. I like to be accurate when I communicate. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
12. I consider my self as a unique person separate from others.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
13. It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making a decision.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
14. Without competition, I believe, it is not possible to have a good society.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
15. I ask the advice of my friends before making career related decisions.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
16. I prefer using indirect language rather than upsetting my friends by telling them directly what they may not like to hear. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )
17. It is important for me to act as an independent person.  
( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

**1 = Never or Almost never. 2 = Rarely. 3 = Occasionally. 4 = Often. 5 = Very often. 6 = Always**

18. I discuss job or study-related problems with my parents/partner. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

19. I take responsibility for my own actions. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

20. I do not reveal my thoughts when it might initiate a dispute. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

21. I try to achieve better grades than my peers. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

22. My personal identity independent of others is very important to me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

23. I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

24. I consult my family before making an important decision. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

25. Winning is very important to me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

26. I see my self as “my own person”. ( 1 2 3 4 5 6 )

**The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out how you think or feel in regard to yourself. Please circle the answer that describe you most, and try to be as accrued as possible!**

**0 = This never happened to me.**

**1 = This event happened, but did not bother me.**

**2 = This event happened & I was slightly upset.**

**3 = This event happened & I was upset.**

**4 = This event happened & I was extremely upset.**

1. You notice that crimes committed by white people lend to be romanticized, whereas the same crime committed by a Non-white person is portrayed as savagery, and the Non-white person who committed it, as an animal. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

2. Sales people did not say thank you or show other forms of courtesy and respect (e.g., put your things in a bag) when you shopped at some white owned businesses. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

3. You notice that when the police arrests Non-white people, the media informs the public of the victims’ criminal record or negative information in their background, suggesting they got what they deserved. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

**0 = This never happened to me.**

**1 = This event happened, but did not bother me.**

**2 = This event happened & I was slightly upset.**

**3 = This event happened & I was upset.**

**4 = This event happened & I was extremely upset.**

4. You have been threatened with physical violence by an individual or group of white people. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

5. You have observed that White kids who commit violent crimes are portrayed as “boys being boys,” while the non-white kids who commit similar crimes are wild animals.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

6. You seldom hear or read anything positive about Non-white people on radio, TV in newspapers, or history books. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

7. While shopping at a store the sales clerk assumed that you couldn’t afford certain items (e.g., you were directed toward the items on sale). ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

8. You were the victim of a crime and the police treated you as if you should just accept it as part of not being white. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

9. You were treated with less respect and courtesy than white and others who were from an EU country while in a store, restaurant, or other business establishment.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

10. You were passed over for an important project although you were more qualified and competent than the white person given the task.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

11. White person stared at you as if you didn’t belong in the same place with them; whether it was a restaurant, theater, or other place of business.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

12. You have observed the police treat white with more respect and dignity than do Non-white. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

13. You have been subjected to racist jokes by white person in positions of authority and you did not protest for fear they might have held it against you.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

14. While shopping at a store, or when attempting to make a purchase, you were ignored as if you were not a serious customer or didn’t have any money.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

**0 = This never happened to me.**

**1 = This event happened, but did not bother me.**

**2 = This event happened & I was slightly upset.**

**3 = This event happened & I was upset.**

**4 = This event happened & I was extremely upset.**

15. You have observed situations where other non-white persons was treated harshly or unfairly by white persons due to their race. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

16. You have heard reports of white people who have committed crimes, and in an effort to cover up their deeds falsely reported that a Non-white man was responsible for the crime. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

17. You notice that the media plays up those stories that cast Non-whites in negative ways (child abusers, rapists, muggers, etc.), usually accompanied by a large picture of a Non-white person looking angry or disturbed. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

18. You have heard racist remarks or comments about Non-white people spoken with impunity by white public officials or other influential White people.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

19. You have been given more work, or the most undesirable jobs at your place of employment while the white person of equal or less seniority and credentials is given less work, and more desirable tasks. ( 0 1 2 3 4 )

20. You have heard or seen other Non-white people express a desire to be white or to have White physical characteristics because they disliked not being White.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

21. white people have treated you as if you were unintelligent and needed things explained to you slowly or numerous times.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

22. You were refused an apartment or other housing: you suspect it was because you're not white.

( 0 1 2 3 4 )

**Here is a list of things you might do when angry with someone. How often do you make each of these responses when angry or upset with someone? Use the following code and please circle the answer as honestly as possible.**

**1 = Never 2 = Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Very Often**

(1) Yelled or screamed at them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )

(2) Did things to irritate them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )

(3) Threatened to hit or throw something at them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )

**1 = Never 2 = Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Very Often**

- (4) Made up stories to get them in trouble. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (5) Didn't show that I was angry. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (6) Cursed at them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (7) Threw something at them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (8) Tried to make them look stupid. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (9) Stomped out of the room. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (10) Made negative comments about their appearance  
to someone else. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (11) Hit (or tried to hit) them with something hard. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (12) Insulted them or called them names to their face. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (13) Talked the matter over. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (14) Spread rumors about them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (15) Sulked and refused to talk about it. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (16) Kicked (or tried to kick) the other person. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (17) Dropped the matter entirely. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (18) Took something that belonged to them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (19) Hit (or tried to hit) the other person but not  
With anything. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (20) Gossiped behind their back. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (21) Pushed, grabbed, or shoved them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (22) Called them names behind their back. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (23) Told others not to associate with them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (24) Waited until I calmed down and then discussed  
The problem. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (25) Told others about the matter. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (26) Threw something (but not at the other) or  
Smashed something. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )

**1 = Never 2 = Seldom 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Very Often**

- (27) Destroyed or damaged something that belonged to  
them. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
- (28) Gathered other friends to my side. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )

**Read each of the following statements carefully and indicate  
How characteristic it is of you according to the following scale:**

**1 = Not at all characteristic of me. 2 = Slightly characteristic of me. 3 = Moderately characteristic of me. 4 = Very characteristic of me. 5 = Extremely characteristic of me.**

1. I worry about what other people will think of me even when I know it doesn't make any difference. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
2. I am unconcerned even if I know people are forming an unfavorable impression of me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
3. I am frequently afraid of other people noticing my shortcomings. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
4. I rarely worry about what kind of impression I am making on someone. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
5. I am afraid others will not approve of me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
6. I am afraid that people will find fault with me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
7. Other people's opinions of me do not bother me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
8. When I am talking to someone, I worry about what they may be thinking about me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
9. I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
10. If I know someone is judging me, it has little effect on me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
11. Sometimes I think I am too concerned with what other people think of me. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )
12. I often worry that I will say or do the wrong things. ( 1 2 3 4 5 )

**THANK YOU FOR TAKING PART IN THIS RESEARCH**

## 问卷调查中文对照

此问卷调查是以匿名的方式收集的，调查结果仅用于学术研究。所有问卷将会保密并妥善保管，研究结束后此资料将会销毁。参与者可随时获取研究进度以及研究结果的相关信息，为更好的研究此课题请参与者务必真实的填写问卷。

(注意：由于权限问题此对照表并非问卷的原版翻译，此对照表仅限于辅助此次课题研究,请将此对照表与原问卷配合使用。请勿将此对照表用于其它用途！)

(Please Notice: This document is not the original translation version of the questionnaire, it is only assisting the Chinese participants to complete this research due to the language barrier. Please use this document with the original questionnaire itself. Do not use this document for any other purpose!)

问卷一：

请仔细阅读以下问题，并回答每一个问题，说明你觉得哪一项表述是最能描述你平时的行为或想法。

1 = 从不或几乎从不 2 = 很少 3 = 偶尔 4 = 经常 5 = 很多时候 6 = 总是

- 1, 我认为我自己是一个好竞争的人。
- 2, 我喜欢独特和别人不一样。
- 3, 在我做重大决定之前我会问其它人的建议。
- 4, 即使我和同组人有很大的意见不一，我也会避免争吵。
- 5, 在与工作有关的事项方面我会与上级协商。
- 6, 我相信竞争是自然法则。
- 7, 我喜欢有竞争力的，而不是没有竞争力的休闲活动。
- 8, 在重要的远行前，我会和我的朋友商量。
- 9, 我为组织的集体利益牺牲了个人兴趣。
- 10, 在重要的行动前，我会听取朋友的建议。
- 11, 在交流的时候我喜欢我的言行准确。
- 12, 我认为我自己是一个和其它人不一样的独一无二的人。
- 13, 在做决定之前，采纳好朋友的建议是十分重要的。
- 14, 我相信没有竞争就没有一个良好的社会。
- 15, 在做事业方面的决定上，我会寻求朋友的建议。
- 16, 我偏向于用含蓄的方式而不是直接的方式告诉朋友那些他们不爱听的事儿。
- 17, 对我来说做为独立的人是很重要的。
- 18, 我会和我的父母或搭档（老婆，男女朋友，同居者）讨论工作或学习上的问题。
- 19, 我会对我自己的行为负责任。
- 20, 在对会引发争议问题上，我不会透露我的想法。
- 21, 我试图拿到比我同学好的成绩。
- 22, 我个人的身份（性格）独立于其他的人对我来说是很重要的。

- 23, 我喜欢在充满竞争的环境下工作。
- 24, 在做重大决定前我会与家人商议。
- 25, 胜利 ( 赢 ) 对我来说很重要。
- 26, 我把自己看成 “我自己的人” 。（我就是我，独一无二。独断独行）

问卷二：此问卷是用于调查在特定的情况下你的想法或感觉的，请选择你认为最能形容你自己的答案。请尽量给出真实的答案。

0 = 这事从来没发生过。 1 = 这事发生过，但是我并不在意。 2 = 这事发生过，我有些懊恼。 3 = 这事发生过，我很懊恼。 4 = 这事发生过，我非常懊恼。

- 1, 你注意到白人所犯下的罪行会被美化，而同样的罪行如果是非白人将被描绘成暴行或者犹如 “禽兽” 。
- 2, 当你在一家白人开的店里购物时，销售没有向你道谢，或者以其它的方式表示对你（作为顾客）的尊重。（比如：帮你把东西放进袋子）
- 3, 你注意到当警察逮捕非白人的时候，新闻会报道他 / 她的不好的负面信息或者贬义的信息来告知社会他 / 她罪有应得。
- 4, 你曾经被一个或者一群白人威胁过。
- 5, 你曾经见到过当白人小孩有暴力行为时，别人认为那只是 “男孩子的特性” 。而非白人的孩子有同样的行为时就是 “野兽” 。
- 6, 你很少在报纸，新闻，电视，或广播上听到关于非白人的正面新闻。
- 7, 当你在购物的时候销售人员认为你买不起某些商品。（例如：让你去打折商品区）。
- 8, 你是受害者时警察的态度让你感觉到你应该接受你自己不是白人的事实。
- 9, 当你在饭店，商场，便利店，或者其它的商业区的时候对待你的态度没有像其它人（白人）那样的尊重。
- 10, 在你的能力和条件比你的白人同事强的情况下，你还是被置身局外在一个重要的项目，而你的白人同事却加入了项目。
- 11, 在剧院，饭店，或其它地方白人向你挑衅，说你不属于 / 不该和他们在一起。
- 12, 你曾经看到过警察对待白人和非白人的态度不同。（对待白人相对尊重）
- 13, 你曾经被白人上司开关于种族类的玩笑，但应为他 / 她是你的上司（“怕穿小鞋”）你并没有抗议。
- 14, 你在购物付帐时被忽视好像你并不是个顾客或者没钱付帐。
- 15, 你曾经看到过非白人被白人欺负，就应为种族问题。
- 16, 你听说过白人犯了罪后，为了掩盖自己的行为虚报成非白人的罪行。
- 17, 你注意到在媒体报道的过程种往往把犯罪和非白人联系起来，负面新闻的背景常常是个看起来非常生气或 “不太正常” 的非白人。（丑化非白人）
- 18, 你听到过白人官员（或者有说服力的白人）发表言论说，非白人谈论种族问题时总是说白人有 “有罪不罚的” 的现象。

- 19, 你曾经在在工作中被分配脏活, 累活, 或是不该你干的活。而跟你同级甚至比你级别低的人白人却分到轻松的或者是她 / 他想干的活。
- 20, 你曾经听说或看到有非白人发表言论想成为白人, 应为他们不喜欢做非白人。( 白人不受欺负 )
- 21, 白人对待你的态度就像你是个很不聪明的人。( 例如: 一件事要和你解释很多遍, 或是要很慢的解释给你 )
- 22, 你认为应为你不是白人, 所以在租房子的时候才会被拒绝。

问卷三: 此问卷是为调查当你生气时你的行为设计的, 请从下列答案中选择最能表达你自己或最接近你自己的答案。

1 = 从不。 2 = 很少。 3 = 有时。 4 = 经常。 5 = 很多时候。

当你和别人生气时你会:

- 1, 对他们 / 她们大叫或尖叫。
- 2, 做刺激她们 / 他们的事。
- 3, 威胁, 伤害, 或者向她们 / 他们扔东西。
- 4, 编故事让她们 / 他们麻烦上身。
- 5, 不表示出我的气愤。
- 6, 诅咒她们 / 他们。
- 7, 向他们 / 她们扔东西。
- 8, 试图让她们 / 他们看起来很愚蠢 ( 没面子 )
- 9, 跺脚而出。
- 10, 在别人面前给她 / 他们负面评价。
- 11, 拿硬东西打他 / 她们, 或试图拿硬东西打她 / 他们。
- 12, 当面侮辱 ( 语言性的 ) 或叫他 / 她们外号。
- 13, 以坐下来谈的方式解决问题。
- 14, 制造关于她 / 他们的谣言。
- 15, 忧郁并不在谈及此事。
- 16, 踢或是试图他 / 她。
- 17, 彻底放下此事。
- 18, 拿她 / 他们的东西。
- 19, 打他 / 她们但不用任何东西。( 不抄“家伙” )
- 20, 在背后说她 / 他们的闲话。
- 21, 推, 抓, 撞他 / 她们。
- 22, 在背后叫她 / 他们的外号 ( 起外号 )
- 23, 告诉别人不理他 / 她们。
- 24, 等到自己冷静下来再解决问题。
- 25, 告诉别人这件事。( 告诉别人为什么生气 )
- 26, 扔东西或砸东西出气。

27, 摧毁或弄坏她 / 他们的东西。

28, 把所有的朋友都拉到我这边。

问卷四：请从下列选项中选择最能形容你自己，或最接近你自己的答案。

1 = 完全不像我。 2 = 有一点像我。 3 = 中度像我。 4 = 很像我。 5 = 十分像我。

1, 尽管不会有什么不同，但我还是在在意别人怎么想我。

2, 即使知道别人对我印象不好，我也不在乎。

3, 我经常担心别人会看到我的缺点。

4, 我很少担心别人对我印象如何。

5, 我害怕别人不认可我。

6, 我害怕别人会挑剔我。

7, 我不在意别人的意见。

8, 当我与别人交谈时，我会担心他 / 她会怎么想我。

9, 我通常会担心我留给别人的印象。

10, 别人的评判对我没什么作用。

11, 有时候我觉得我有些过于在意别人怎么想我。

12, 我会经常担心我会做错事，说错话。

