
AI translation · View original & related papers at
chinaxiv.org/items/chinaxiv-202104.00130

The Psychological Structure of Social Mindfulness Among Chinese People

Authors: Tian Yi, Wang Li, Xu Yan, Liying Jiao, Xu Yan

Date: 2021-04-26T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

To explore the psychological structure of social mindfulness among Chinese people, this study employed the personality lexical approach, selecting psychological terms representing social mindfulness from vocabulary collected through open surveys to establish a social mindfulness lexicon. Through two rounds of exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis, a Social Mindfulness Vocabulary Rating Scale comprising 18 personality trait words and a Social Mindfulness Self-Report Scale comprising 17 descriptive items were developed. The findings indicate that social mindfulness among Chinese people is an interpersonal trait characterized by a two-level four-factor structure; the second-order factors refer to agreeableness and extraversion traits, while the four first-order factors are kindness and respect, modesty and humility, tolerance and understanding, and positivity and openness.

Full Text

The Psychological Structure of Social Mindfulness in Chinese Culture

TIAN Yi¹², WANG Li³, XU Yan², JIAO Liying²

(¹ Beijing Research Center for Education Supervision and Quality Assessment, Beijing Academy of Educational Sciences, Beijing 100036, China)

(² Beijing Key Laboratory of Applied Experimental Psychology, National Demonstration Center for Experimental Psychology Education (Beijing Normal University), Faculty of Psychology, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China)

(³ School of Psychology, Beijing Sport University, Beijing 100084, China)

Abstract

Social mindfulness refers to an individual's ability to sense others' states during interpersonal interactions, their willingness to respect others' choices, and their capacity to transfer decision-making rights. Exploring the psychological structure of social mindfulness within Chinese cultural contexts is crucial for cultivating a friendly and harmonious society. This study employed a lexical approach to investigate the psychological structure of social mindfulness in Chinese culture. In Study 1, we selected 59 high-social-mindfulness words and 24 low-social-mindfulness words through word frequency analysis and multiple rounds of expert discussion. After evaluation by 43 professionals and 232 non-professionals, 40 social mindfulness words were retained. In Study 2, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) with Sample 1 ($n = 351$) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with Sample 2 ($n = 307$) yielded a three-factor structure for social mindfulness: kindness and respect, tolerance and understanding, and optimism and open-mindedness. Additionally, an 18-item Social Mindfulness Lexical Rating Scale (SMLRS) was developed. In Study 3, we further validated the psychological structure of social mindfulness (EFA: Sample 1, $n = 377$; CFA: Sample 2, $n = 220$) through scenario descriptions. This resulted in a new 17-item Social Mindfulness Self-Report Scale (SMSRS) and a hierarchical model with two second-order factors and four first-order factors. Both the SMLRS and SMSRS demonstrated good reliability and validity, serving as effective measurement tools for future research.

Through lexical and psychometric analyses, we identified a psychological structure of social mindfulness in Chinese culture comprising two second-order factors (agreeableness and extraversion) and four first-order factors (kindness and respect, humility, optimism and open-mindedness, and tolerance and understanding). Theoretically, this research establishes a social mindfulness vocabulary, verifies its second-order four-factor structure, provides new empirical evidence for higher-order factor theories of personality, and enriches our understanding of personality and social behavior in Chinese cultural contexts. Practically, the conceptualization of social mindfulness offers valuable insights for moral education, organizational training, and social governance.

Keywords: social mindfulness, psychological structure, lexical method, Chinese culture

1. Introduction

Social mindfulness was first proposed by researchers at VU Amsterdam (Van Doesum et al., 2013) and was initially translated as "social mindfulness." However, studies have shown that this concept does not significantly correlate with the mindfulness level measured by the Mindfulness Attention Awareness Scale (MAAS) (Van Doesum et al., 2013). Van Lange and Van Doesum (2015) further suggested that low "social mindfulness" corresponds to "social hostility," making

“social mindfulness” a more appropriate translation than “social mindfulness.” Chinese scholars have since adopted the term “social mindfulness” (Dou et al., 2018; Dou et al., 2017). Considering the core socialist value of “friendliness” and potential ambiguities arising from Buddhist connotations, this study argues that “social mindfulness” better captures the concept’s meaning and possesses distinct Chinese characteristics.

The measurement of social mindfulness internationally originates from the pen-choice paradigm (Kim & Markus, 1999; Hashimoto et al., 2011), which requires participants to choose between two colors of pens (e.g., one blue pen and four red pens). Inspired by this paradigm, Van Doesum et al. (2013) developed the Social Mindfulness Paradigm (SoMi), where choosing non-unique items is considered an act of social mindfulness. This paradigm reflects both the skill and willingness to consider others’ control over outcomes (Van Doesum et al., 2013). Researchers have defined social mindfulness as the tendency to pay attention to, respect, and protect others’ needs and rights during interpersonal interactions (Van Doesum et al., 2016). Domestic scholars view social mindfulness as both a mental skill (attending to others’ available choices) and a motivational willingness to make decisions that do not restrict others’ options (Dou et al., 2017). Others consider it a positive quality manifested in interpersonal contexts: perceiving others’ states, respecting their choices, and voluntarily transferring decision-making rights (Tian et al., 2020).

These definitions approach social mindfulness from a behavioral state perspective. Some researchers have conceptualized it as a trait reflecting fundamental orientations that can be activated by interpersonal relationships or situations and measured as an individual disposition (Van Lange & Van Doesum, 2015). Empirical studies have demonstrated that social mindfulness possesses characteristics of both state and trait (Mischkowski et al., 2018). As the Chinese saying goes, “internalized in the heart, externalized in action,” the behavioral expression of social mindfulness is determined by stable personality traits.

Current international research primarily uses the SoMi paradigm to explore social mindfulness as a dependent variable, examining its relationships with personality traits, cognitive variables, and prosocial behavior (Mischkowski et al., 2018; Van Doesum et al., 2019; Van Doesum et al., 2017; Van Doesum et al., 2013). Domestic research has applied the SoMi paradigm to investigate relationships between social mindfulness and morality or oxytocin (Chen, 2016; Chen et al., 2020), and to explore the psychological mechanisms through which perceived social mindfulness promotes cooperative behavior (Dou, 2016; Dou et al., 2018; Dou et al., 2017). Overall, research on social mindfulness remains in its conceptual stage, with limited indigenous original studies.

From a Chinese cultural perspective, there remains a significant gap in comprehensively and systematically exploring the psychological structure of social mindfulness. The aforementioned definitions indicate that the expression of altruism is influenced by cultural factors. Different cultural backgrounds generate different interaction patterns, affecting individuals’ inferences about others and

consequently their social mindfulness expressions (Ren, 2017). Currently, cross-cultural research on social mindfulness is underway globally to achieve better interpretation across countries (Van Doesum, 2016), making such investigations essential.

1.1 Social Mindfulness Across Different Cultures

We begin with the distinction between collectivist and individualist cultures. Drawing on regulatory focus theory (Higgins, 1997), Van Doesum et al. (2013) proposed that in collectivist cultures, altruism in social mindfulness manifests more as prevention focus—avoiding causing trouble for others (Hashimoto & Yamagishi, 2011), maintaining a good reputation, and preventing selfish choices from damaging one’s image, which aligns with the Chinese concept of “face.” In individualist cultures, altruism in social mindfulness manifests more as promotion focus (Higgins, 1998; Lockwood et al., 2002), where considering others’ needs can lead to positive outcomes.

Chinese culture is undoubtedly collectivist (Yang & Yu, 2008), specifically a form of vertical collectivism (Triandis, 1995). The individualism-collectivism framework has been widely applied in contemporary cultural psychology (Cai et al., 2020) and represents an important dimension influencing social psychology. However, cultural differences encompass many dimensions beyond this dichotomy. Hofstede (2001) identified four dimensions: individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and masculinity/femininity. Liang Shuming (2010) analyzed Western cultural thought through the lens of Buddhist epistemology (pratyaksa, anumana, and agama), revealing different pathways of thinking between Chinese and Western cultures.

From this broad perspective, we examine how cultural differences influence social mindfulness expression. Throughout history, Chinese culture has been shaped by agricultural civilization and philosophies from Confucianism, Daoism, Mohism, and Legalism, later incorporating Buddhism, Neo-Confucianism, and Mind Theory up to the New Culture Movement (Chang, 2019). These traditions directly influence social mindfulness expression through concepts like seniority, face, and moderation, leading individuals to consider others’ feelings, avoid losing face by neglecting others, and value harmonious interpersonal relationships. In contrast, Western culture, characterized by “forward-moving orientation” in conquering nature and pursuing science and democracy (Liang, 2010), has been shaped by Greek civilization, Socratic-Platonic-Aristotelian philosophy, religious reformation, the Renaissance, and modern thinkers like Rousseau, Kant, and Dewey (Russell, 2016). This has ingrained values of equality, democracy, and freedom, with modern science further promoting individualism and self-expression.

Thus, while individuals in both cultures exhibit social mindfulness, their underlying motivations differ, reflecting distinct personality traits. This necessitates exploring the psychological structure of Chinese social mindfulness by integrat-

ing indigenous research with Chinese personality characteristics.

1.2 Social Mindfulness in Chinese Culture

Indigenous psychological research in Chinese culture is essential (Yang, 2004), particularly for personality construction. Chinese personality psychology must be rooted in local culture, transcending Western frameworks to address real-world problems in China's socio-economic development (Huang, 2004). Chinese psychological behavior and personality traits possess unique characteristics distinct from other cultural groups (Zhang & Zhou, 2006).

Considering the interpersonal nature of social mindfulness, we must account for distinctive features of Chinese personality traits. Liang Shuming (2010) noted that cultural observation methods originate from daily life. Chinese life is built upon blood and family relationships, with interpersonal orientation serving as a cornerstone for understanding Chinese personality traits (Huang et al., 2010). Wang and Cui (2005) developed the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI), which includes the indigenous dimension "interpersonal relatedness" encompassing renqing (human sentiment), harmony, and face. These concepts reflect unique Chinese personality traits, cultural connotations, and social interaction patterns, demonstrating that interpersonal relatedness is a core factor in Chinese personality (Zhang & Zhou, 2006).

Therefore, it is necessary to comprehensively explore and establish the psychological structure of Chinese social mindfulness, clarifying its connotations and developing appropriate measurement tools. Allport and Odbert (1936) proposed that "all personality traits are encoded in natural language," making the lexical approach the most effective method for exploring indigenous psychological structures. This approach not only reveals internal structures but also facilitates scale development. Researchers have successfully applied this method to investigate structures of humility (Weidman et al., 2018), virtues (Cawley et al., 2000), and positive personality (Shryack et al., 2010; Xiong et al., 2018), as well as to explore Chinese personality characteristics (Wang & Cui, 2005) and the structure of virtuous personality (Zhang et al., 2018; Jiao et al., 2019).

This study draws upon relevant theories and research paradigms to explore and validate the psychological structure of Chinese social mindfulness through open-ended surveys and self-descriptions. Aligned with the national advocacy for "cultivating self-esteem, confidence, rationality, peace, and positivity in social mentality," this research provides theoretical and empirical foundations for moral and spiritual civilization construction in China.

2. Study 1: Exploration of Social Mindfulness Vocabulary

2.1 Research Purpose

Through open-ended surveys and lexical research, this study aimed to explore the connotations of social mindfulness and establish its vocabulary foundation.

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Participants Interview sample: Six experts with senior professional titles from universities and research institutions. Open survey sample: 154 working adults from education, finance, and other industries ($M = 35.01$, $SD = 7.74$) and 381 university students from four domestic universities majoring in education, psychology, finance, sports, and management ($M = 20.72$, $SD = 1.04$). Vocabulary rating sample: 43 psychology teachers, graduate students, and researchers ($M = 30.90$, $SD = 9.09$).

2.2.2 Procedure Experts were interviewed using critical incident technique to elicit conceptual definitions of social mindfulness, responding to two questions: (1) What characteristics do individuals with high social mindfulness possess? (2) What characteristics do individuals with low social mindfulness possess? Descriptions could be provided through words or statements.

Working adults and students completed open surveys via Wenjuanxing platform or paper questionnaires, answering: (1) How do individuals with high social mindfulness behave in daily work/study and life? (2) How do individuals with low social mindfulness behave? (3) List at least nine words describing social mindfulness.

Based on open survey results, a preliminary social mindfulness vocabulary list was developed and rated on a 5-point scale (1 = very uncharacteristic, 5 = very characteristic).

2.3 Results

One psychology teacher, two master's students, and six experts extracted 4,528 words describing social mindfulness characteristics. A word cloud was generated [Figure 1: see original paper], with higher-frequency words displayed larger. The top 10 words based on IF-IDF analysis were: kind, respectful, considerate, others, understanding, helpful, tolerant, inclusive, and empathetic.

Using SPSS 20.0, we conducted frequency analysis, retaining words appearing four or more times. After comparing expert and researcher results, we identified 142 words reflecting high social mindfulness and 595 words describing low social mindfulness. Following similar analysis, we obtained 66 words reflecting low social mindfulness. These 208 words formed the basis for reference with existing scales (Jiao et al., 2019; Mu, 2007; Wang & Cui, 2005; Wang, 2011; Zhang et al., 2018), resulting in modifications, combinations, and deletions to finalize 83 social mindfulness words, including 59 high-social-mindfulness words and 24 low-social-mindfulness words.

2.3.2 Vocabulary Rating Results Based on open survey results, professionals rated each word on a 5-point scale (1 = very uncharacteristic, 5 = very characteristic). Analysis of 232 participants' responses led to retaining 11 words rated below 3.5 and temporarily retaining 17 words between 3.5 and 4.0.

Researchers and two psychology teachers reviewed these words, consulting the *Modern Chinese Dictionary* and relevant literature (Jiao et al., 2019; Mu, 2007; Wang & Cui, 2005) to merge synonyms (e.g., combining “fair,” “just,” and “upright” into “fair and just” ; combining “modest” and “humble” into “humble”).

After discussion, 42 words were selected and reviewed by two personality and social psychology experts, resulting in a final 40-word social mindfulness vocabulary, including 36 high-social-mindfulness words and 4 low-social-mindfulness words, to reduce response bias and careless responding. This established a 40-trait social mindfulness vocabulary.

3. Study 2: Psychological Structure and Lexical Rating Scale Development

3.1 Research Purpose

Based on Study 1’s vocabulary, this study developed a social mindfulness rating scale, explored its psychological structure, and established a psychometrically sound measurement tool.

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 Participants Sample 1 (for EFA): 368 participants were recruited online; after excluding invalid responses (straight-lining, extreme response times, patterned responding), 351 valid participants remained (170 male, 181 female; age 18-60, $M = 27.05$, $SD = 8.29$). Sample 2 (for CFA and validity testing): 326 participants were recruited; 307 valid participants remained (223 male, 84 female; age 18-56, $M = 26.14$, $SD = 7.28$).

3.3 Results

3.3.1 Item Analysis Based on classical test theory, we used independent samples t-tests for high-low score groups and item-total correlations (r) as discrimination indices. All items reached significance, so none were deleted.

3.3.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis The initial 40-item Social Mindfulness Lexical Rating Scale was analyzed. The KMO value was 0.96, and Bartlett’s test was significant ($\chi^2 = 8337.84$, $df = 780$, $p < 0.001$), indicating suitability for factor analysis. Using principal component analysis with promax rotation, eight factors had eigenvalues > 1 , explaining 60.60% of total variance. Following psychometric principles, we deleted items with low loadings (< 0.40) and cross-loadings, retaining 18 items.

A scree test of these 18 items showed three factors with eigenvalues > 1 , cumulatively explaining 60.36% of variance, with eigenvalues flattening after the fourth factor. Factor loadings ranged from 0.55 to 0.90.

3.3.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis Using AMOS 20.0, we conducted CFA on the three-factor model. Results indicated good fit: $\chi^2/df < 3$, RMR < 0.05, GFI, IFI, TLI, CFI > 0.90, RMSEA < 0.08 [TABLE:2, FIGURE:2].

To verify the three-factor model's superiority, we compared alternative models: a single-factor model; a two-factor model combining factors reflecting personal qualities (S1 and S3); and another two-factor model combining factors directly affecting others (S2 and S3). The three-factor model demonstrated the best fit

The three factors were named: (1) **Kindness and Respect** (S1): trustworthy, humble, kind, considerate, polite, responsible, respectful; (2) **Tolerance and Understanding** (S2): tolerant, empathetic, perspective-taking, helpful, altruistic; (3) **Optimism and Open-mindedness** (S3): cheerful, outgoing, broad-minded, confident.

3.3.4 Reliability and Validity Internal consistency α coefficients were 0.91, 0.87, 0.80, and 0.82 for total scale and three dimensions, respectively (all > 0.80). Inter-factor correlations (0.56-0.77) were moderate, supporting discriminant validity. Correlations with HEXACO Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness, General Trust Scale, and Empathic Concern/Perspective-Taking were significant, supporting criterion validity.

However, as social mindfulness is a novel and abstract concept, understanding may be biased, and its situational nature cannot be fully captured lexically. Therefore, Study 3 developed a self-report scale with situational descriptions.

4. Study 3: Self-Report Scale Development and Structure Validation

4.1 Research Purpose

Building on Studies 1 and 2, this study developed a Social Mindfulness Self-Report Scale to further validate the psychological structure.

4.2 Methods

4.2.1 Participants Sample 1 (EFA): 405 participants were recruited; after screening, 377 valid participants remained (239 male, 138 female; age 18-54, $M = 26.74$, $SD = 7.23$). Sample 2 (CFA): 225 participants were recruited; 220 valid participants remained (164 male, 56 female; age 17-52, $M = 25.98$, $SD = 8.49$).

4.2.3 Procedure The initial SMSRS was developed by: (1) reviewing literature on social mindfulness; (2) expanding the lexical scale into situational descriptions; (3) incorporating typical descriptions of high/low social mindfulness from open surveys; (4) generating 331 items (including 25 reverse-scored items); (5) having two PhD students and one teacher review items for clarity

and representativeness; (6) having five PhD students and three non-psychology educators evaluate items, resulting in 62 items; (7) final review by one social psychologist, yielding 35 items.

Sample 1 completed the 35-item scale (1 = very uncharacteristic, 5 = very characteristic). Item analysis and EFA reduced this to 17 items. Sample 2 completed the final scale along with HEXACO Honesty-Humility and Agreeableness, General Trust Scale, Empathic Concern/Perspective-Taking, and Social Value Orientation Slider Measure.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 Item Analysis Item T26 (“I like being alone”) showed no significant difference between high and low scorers and low correlation, so it was deleted.

4.3.2 Exploratory Factor Analysis The 34-item SMSRS yielded KMO = 0.93 and significant Bartlett’s test ($\chi^2 = 5238.31$, $df = 561$, $p < 0.001$). Principal component analysis with promax rotation produced eight factors with eigenvalues > 1 , explaining 60.52% of variance. Following Study 2’s criteria, 17 items were retained. The scree plot showed four factors with eigenvalues > 1 , cumulatively explaining 58.11% of variance, flattening after the fifth factor. Factor loadings ranged from 0.49 to 0.90 .

The four factors were: (1) Perspective-taking and empathy; (2) Altruism and non-competitiveness; (3) Optimism and proactivity; (4) Modesty and rule-following.

4.3.3 Confirmatory Factor Analysis CFA using AMOS 20.0 supported the four-factor model: $\chi^2/df < 3$, RMR < 0.05 , GFI, IFI, TLI, CFI > 0.90 , RMSEA < 0.08 [TABLE:6, FIGURE:3].

Comparing competing models (single-factor three-factor, second-order three-factor, single-factor four-factor, second-order four-factor), the four-factor model showed superior fit . To discriminate between the equivalent single-order and second-order four-factor models, we used cross-validation and Akaike Information Criterion ($\Delta ECVI$ and ΔAIC), where smaller values indicate better fit (Liu et al., 2007) . While differences were minimal, theoretical considerations favored the second-order model, which explains correlations among first-order factors through higher-order traits.

The final second-order four-factor model [Figure 4: see original paper] includes: **Kindness and Respect, Humility, Optimism and Open-mindedness, and Tolerance and Understanding**. The first three factors align with Study 2, while Humility emerged distinctly in the self-report scale due to its strong interpersonal nature. We classified Kindness and Respect and Humility under **Agreeableness**, and Optimism and Open-mindedness and Tolerance and Understanding under **Extraversion**.

4.3.4 Reliability and Validity Internal consistency α coefficients were 0.86, 0.70, 0.78, and 0.75 for total scale and four dimensions (all > 0.70). Inter-factor correlations (0.35–0.50) supported discriminant validity. Correlations with criterion measures were significant, supporting construct validity.

5. General Discussion

5.1 Theoretical Implications

5.1.1 Primary Structure Exploration Using the lexical method, we established a social mindfulness vocabulary and identified an initial three-factor structure: kindness and respect, tolerance and understanding, and optimism and open-mindedness. Combining lexical and questionnaire methods with situational elements revealed a four-factor structure in the self-report scale. The difference lies in: (1) the abstraction of personality traits causing “humility” to merge into “kindness and respect” lexically, while situational descriptions in the self-report scale highlighted its interpersonal nature; (2) empirical evidence showing strong, independent loadings for humility, consistent with previous findings of high correlations between social mindfulness and HEXACO Honesty-Humility (Mischkowski et al., 2018; Van Doesum et al., 2019; Van Doesum et al., 2013). Therefore, based on empirical evidence, we propose a four-factor structure: kindness and respect, tolerance and understanding, optimism and open-mindedness, and humility, reflecting inner kindness, understanding of others, openness to the world, and self-modesty.

5.1.2 Interpersonal Traits and Higher-Order Structure Wiggins (1979) identified interpersonal traits as a crucial personality category. Researchers define interpersonal traits as environmentally-defined characteristics influencing individuals’ perception of others’ motivations and behavioral intentions (Ansell & Pincus, 2004; Brown et al., 2004; Gaines, 1996; Gurtman, 2009; Zhao & Zuo, 2013). This aligns perfectly with social mindfulness definitions, positioning it as an interpersonal trait.

Furthermore, Agreeableness and Extraversion from the Big Five represent fundamental interpersonal traits covering most interpersonal characteristics (McCrae & Costa, 1989). Research on higher-order personality factors has identified two meta-factors: Stability (emotional and behavioral regulation, encompassing emotional stability, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) and Plasticity (exploration and behavior, encompassing extraversion and openness) (DeYoung, 2006). Our second-order four-factor model classifies kindness and respect and humility under **Agreeableness**, and optimism and open-mindedness and tolerance and understanding under **Extraversion**.

Additionally, interpersonal complementarity theory (Xu, 1992) and the circumplex model (Trapnell & Wiggins, 1990) provide integrated frameworks for interpersonal trait research (Huang et al., 2010). Wiggins (1979, 2003) developed interpersonal trait measures based on “love-hate” and “dominance-submission”

dimensions. Future research could integrate social mindfulness factors into the circumplex model for deeper interpersonal understanding.

5.2 Social Mindfulness and Chinese Cultural Development

Yang (1999) stated that “the mechanism of Chinese personality formation and evolution is embedded in the entire river of cultural sediment.” The psychological structure of Chinese social mindfulness reflects both traditional and modern Chinese cultural development.

Kindness and Respect and **Humility** reflect traditional culture. The *Three Character Classic* states “people are born good,” while *Mencius* compares human goodness to water’s natural downward flow. The *Analects* advocates “the gentleman helps others achieve their good, not their evil,” and *Yinwenzi* describes “goodness in goodness” as supreme skill. These philosophies reflect Chinese cultural emphasis on kindness while respecting others and encouraging collective virtue. The *I Ching* describes modesty as self-regulation, and Zhu Xi emphasized lowering oneself to interact equally with others. In Chinese hearts, humility is a traditional virtue, life wisdom, and moral ideal (Miao & Liang, 2011). The *Analects* principle of “harmony in diversity” has formed a value orientation of tolerance, courtesy, modesty, and kindness over millennia, establishing China as a “land of etiquette.”

With modern social transformation and rapid development, contemporary Chinese culture has evolved. **Tolerance and Understanding** and **Optimism and Open-mindedness** embody this modern context. Research on Chinese “modern personality” shows contemporary Chinese people are more tolerant of others, with enhanced pluralistic orientations, while traditional renqing and face concepts are weakening (Zhou & Zhang, 2007). Gao and Yang (2011) noted significant changes in Chinese cultural values and corresponding personality shifts from authority-oriented to equality and openness. These findings align with our **Extraversion** dimension of Chinese social mindfulness.

5.3 Significance of Exploring Chinese Social Mindfulness Structure

This research offers theoretical and practical contributions. First, it clarifies social mindfulness as a personality trait within Chinese cultural development, enriching personality theories related to kindness and other virtues, and supplementing research on personality and social traits in collectivist cultures. Second, it provides new perspectives for Chinese indigenous personality research, demonstrating how to construct context-sensitive traits while transcending specific situations. Third, the validated higher-order structure of agreeableness and extraversion enriches higher-order factor theories and provides a basis for clarifying relationships with other constructs (e.g., cognition, emotion) and exploring underlying mechanisms of social mindfulness’s influence on prosocial behavior. Fourth, the developed SMLRS and SMSRS provide scientifically validated measurement tools.

Practically, social mindfulness aligns with moral education concepts of respect, empathy, and virtue education (Zeng et al., 2018). In organizational settings, it offers new perspectives for employee mental health and organizational climate development. Socially, low-cost social mindfulness may facilitate peaceful, harmonious social governance without requiring significant sacrifice. Particularly in building China's social psychological service system, social mindfulness contributes to cultivating "self-esteem, confidence, rationality, peace, and positivity."

5.4 Limitations and Future Directions

Despite following rigorous lexical and psychometric procedures across diverse samples, limitations remain. First, reliance on self-reports may not fully capture actual behavior, requiring behavioral validation (Baumeister et al., 2007). Second, as a novel concept, the SMSRS needs further expansion and validation, particularly regarding systematic exploration of influencing factors. Third, with personality and social psychology's development, future research could examine social mindfulness as low-cost prosociality, integrating interdisciplinary perspectives on social interaction order, cultural values, and philosophical backgrounds to reveal broader significance.

6. Conclusion

This study: (1) established a 40-trait social mindfulness vocabulary (36 positive, 4 negative), providing foundational lexical encoding for Chinese social mindfulness research; (2) identified a second-order four-factor structure (kindness and respect, tolerance and understanding, optimism and open-mindedness, and humility) under agreeableness and extraversion, explaining its psychological structure; (3) developed the SMLRS and SMSRS with good psychometric properties, providing effective measurement tools for future research.

References

- Ansell, E. B., & Pincus, A. L. (2004). Interpersonal perceptions of the five-factor model of personality: An examination using the structural summary method for circumplex data. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39(2), 167-201.
- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2001). A theoretical basis for the major dimensions of personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 15(5), 327-353.
- Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: Whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2(4), 396-403.
- Brown, H. G., Poole, M. S., & Rodgers, T. L. (2004). Interpersonal traits, complementarity, and trust in virtual collaboration. *Journal of Management*

Information Systems, 20(4), 115-138.

Cai, H. J., Huang, Z. H., Lin, L., Zhang, M. Y., Wang, X. O., Zhu, H. J., Xie, Y. P., Yang, Y., Yang, Z. Y., & Jing, Y. M. (2020). The psychological change of the Chinese people over the past half century: A literature review. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 28(10), 1599-1618.

Cawley, M. J., Martin, J. E., & Johnson, J. A. (2000). A virtues approach to personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(5), 997-1013.

Chang, N. D. (2019). *A Brief History of Chinese Thought*. Harbin Publishing House.

Chen, M. Q. (2016). Social Mindfulness and Its Relationship with Morality. *Chinese Social Psychology Review*, (01), 151-164.

Chen, Q., Chen, B., Liu, L., Zhao, Y. F., & Wu, Z. H. (2020). The Promotion Effect of Oxytocin on Social Mindfulness. *Journal of Psychological Science*, 43(03), 712-717.

Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113-126.

DeYoung, C. G. (2006). Higher-order factors of the Big Five in a multi-informant sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(6), 1138-1151.

Dou, K. (2016). *Perceived social mindfulness: An effective psychological mechanism to promote cooperative behaviors* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Jinnan University.

Dou, K., Nie, Y. G., Wang, Y. J., & Liu, Y. Z. (2018). Trust or Defence? The Enhancing Effect of Perceived Social Mindfulness on Cooperative Behavior during Interactive Game. *Journal of Psychological Science*, 41(2), 390-396.

Dou, K., Liu, Y. Z., Wang, Y. J., & Nie, Y. G. (2018). Willingness to cooperate: Emotion enhancement mechanism of perceived social mindfulness on cooperative behaviour. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 50(01), 101-114.

Dou, K., Nie, Y. G., Wang, Y. J., & Zhang, Q. P. (2017). Social Mindfulness in the Interpersonal Interaction: Conceptualization, Assessment and Influenced Mechanism. *Advances in Psychology*, 7(9), 1101-1112.

Gaines, S. O. (1996). Impact of Interpersonal Traits and Gender-Role Compliance on Interpersonal Resource Exchange among Dating and Engaged/Married Couples. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 13(2), 241-261.

Gurtman, M. B. (2009). Exploring Personality with the Interpersonal Circumplex. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 3(4), 601-619.

Hashimoto, H., Li, Y., & Yamagishi, T. (2011). Beliefs and preferences in cultural agents and cultural game players. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*,

14(2), 140-147.

Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American Psychologist*, 52, 1280-1300.

Higgins, E. T. (1998). Promotion and prevention: Regulatory focus as a motivational principle. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 30, pp. 1-46). Elsevier.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Hou, J. T., Wen, Z. L., & Cheng, Z. J. (2004). *Structural Equation Model and Its Applications*. Educational Science Publishing House.

Huang, F., Li, Y. H., Zhang, J. X., & Zhu, H. L. (2010). Circumplex Model: An Approach to Integrate Personality Research. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 18(01), 132-143.

Huang, X. T. (2004). Reflections on Chinanization of Personality Studies. *Journal of Southwest China Normal University (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition)*, 30(6), 5-9.

Jiao, L. Y., Yang, Y., Xu, Y., Gao, S. Q., & Zhang, H. Y. (2019). Good and evil in Chinese culture: Personality structure and connotation. *Acta Psychologica Sinica*, 51(10), 1128-1142.

Kao, S. F., & Yang, K. S. (2011). A critical review of psychological traditionality and modernity among the Chinese people. *Journal of Education of Zhanghua Normal University*, 100(19), 1-11.

Kim, H., & Markus, H. R. (1999). Deviance or uniqueness, harmony or conformity? A cultural analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(4), 785-800.

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2018). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO-100. *Assessment*, 25(5), 543-556.

Liang, S. M. (2010). *Eastern and Western Cultures and their Philosophy*. Commercial Press.

Liu, H. C., Xu, Y., & Wang, L. (2007). The Principal and Methods of Model Selection in Application of SEM. *Psychological Exploration*, 27(1), 75-78.

Lockwood, P., Jordan, C. H., & Kunda, Z. (2002). Motivation by positive or negative role models: Regulatory focus determines who will best inspire us. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 854-864.

Manesi, Z., Van Lange, P. A. M., Van Doesum, N. J., & Pollet, T. V. (2019). What are the most powerful predictors of charitable giving to victims of typhoon Haiyan: Prosocial traits, socio-demographic variables, or eye cues? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 146, 217-225.

- Mccrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1989). The structure of interpersonal traits: Wiggins' s circumplex and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(4), 586-595.
- Miao, Y. J., & Liang, X. L. (2011). Research on Modesty in Positive Psychology. *Mental Health Education in Primary and Secondary Schools*, (05), 7-9.
- Mischkowski, D., Thielmann, I., & Glöckner, A. (2018). Think it through before making a choice? Processing mode does not influence social mindfulness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 74, 85-97.
- Mu, S. K. (2007). *The development of Virtues Adjective Rating Scale and its applied study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Shanghai Normal University.
- Murphy, R. O., Ackermann, K. A., & Handgraaf, M. J. J. (2011). Measuring Social Value Orientation. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 6(8), 771-781.
- Ones, D. S., & Viswesvaran, C. (1996). Bandwidth-fidelity dilemma in personality measurement for personnel selection. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 17(6), 609-626.
- Ren, Y. (2017). The Review of Altruistic Option of Social Mindfulness. *The Guide of Science & Education*, 14(5), 147-148.
- Russell, B. (2016). *A History of Western Philosophy*. Commercial Press.
- Shryack, J., Steger, M. F., Krueger, R. F., & Kallie, C. S. (2010). The structure of virtue: An empirical investigation of the dimensionality of the virtues in action inventory of strengths. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(6), 714-719.
- Tian, Y., Wang, L., & Xu, Y. (2020). Research Status and Prospect of Social Mindfulness. *Advances in Psychology*, 10(8), 1069-1078.
- Trapnell, P. D., & Wiggins, J. S. (1990). Extension of the interpersonal adjective scale to include the big five dimensions of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 781-790.
- Triandis, H. C. (2018). *Individualism and collectivism*. Routledge.
- Van Doesum, N. J. (2016). *Social Mindfulness*. Ipskamp Drukkers BV.
- Van Doesum, N. J., de Vries, R. E., Blokland, A. A. J., Hill, J. M., Kuhlman, D. M., & Stivers, A. W. (2019). Social mindfulness: Prosocial the active way. *Journal of Positive Psychology*.
- Van Doesum, N. J., Van Lange, D. A. W., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2013). Social mindfulness: Skill and will to navigate the social world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(1), 86-103.
- Van Doesum, N. J., Van Prooijen, J. W., Verburch, L., & Van Lange, P. A. M. (2016). Social Hostility in Soccer and Beyond. *PLOS ONE*, 11(4), 1-13.

- Van Lange, P. A. M., & Balliet, D. (2015). Interdependence theory. In *APA Handbook of Personality and Social Psychology, Volume 3: Interpersonal Relations* (pp. 65-92). American Psychological Association.
- Van Lange, P. A. M., & Van Doesum, N. J. (2015). Social mindfulness and social hostility. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 3(4), 18-24.
- Wang, D. F., & Cui, H. (2005). *Explorations of Chinese personality*. Social Sciences Academic Press.
- Wang, D. F., & Cui, H. (2005). Exploring Personality Structure of the Chinese. *Journal of Southwest China Normal University (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition)*, 31(05), 5-16.
- Wang, P. P. (2011). *Exploring the structure of personality based on verbs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Beijing Normal University.
- Weidman, A. C., Cheng, J. T., & Tracy, J. L. (2018). The Psychological Structure of Humility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(1), 153-178.
- Wiggins, J. S. (1979). A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: The interpersonal domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(3), 395-412.
- Wiggins, J. S. (2003). *Paradigms of personality assessment*. Guilford Publications.
- Xiong, M. M., Wang, F. Y., & Cai, R. X. (2018). Development and validation of the Chinese Modesty Scale (CMS). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1-14.
- Xu, Y. (1992). A review of interpersonal complementarity theory. *Psychological Exploration*, (03), 8-14.
- Xu, Y. (2009). *Personality psychology*. Beijing Normal University Publishing Group.
- Yamagishi, T., & Yamagishi, M. (1994). Trust and commitment in the United States and Japan. *Motivation and Emotion*, 18(2), 129-166.
- Yang, B. (1999). *Chinese personality structure*. Xinhua Publishing House.
- Yang, K. S. (2004). *Sinicization of social and behavioral research in China*. China Renmin University Press.
- Yang, K. S., & Yu, Z. H. (2008). Indigenous personality research: The Chinese case. *Chinese Social Psychology Review*, (01), 192-222.
- Zeng, G., Zhao, Y. K., et al. (2018). *The science of happiness: The application of positive psychology in education*. China Industry and Information Publishing Group & Posts and Telecommunications Press.

Zhang, F. F., Dong, Y., Wang, K., Zhan, Z. Y., & Xie, L. F. (2010). Reliability and Validity of the Chinese Version of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index-C. *Chinese Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 18(2), 155-157.

Zhang, H. Y., Zhao, H. H., & Xu, Y. (2018). The structure of Chinese virtuous personality and questionnaire development. *Psychological Exploration*, 38(3), 221-227.

Zhang, J. X., & Zhou, M. J. (2006). Searching for a Personality Structure of Chinese: A Theoretical Hypothesis of a Six Factor Model of Personality Traits. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 14(04), 574-585.

Zhao, H. H., Xu, Y., & Zhang, H. Y. (2019). The Psychological Structure of Chinese Trait Awe. *Psychological Exploration*, 39(4), 345-351.

Zhao, J., & Zuo, B. (2013). Analysis on Circumplex Model of Interpersonal Traits. *Psychological Exploration*, 33(01), 57-62.

Zhou, M. J., & Zhang, J. X. (2007). Social Development and the Changes of Chinese People' s Personalities. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 15(2), 203-210.

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv –Machine translation. Verify with original.