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Introduction

Autobiographical memory – memories of significant personal experiences from an individual’s life (Wang & Conway, 2004) – and self-construal – constellation of thoughts, feelings, and actions concerning one’s relationship to others and the self as distinct from others (Singh, 2004) – are considered to be mutually interrelated.

Many cross-cultural studies investigate this relationship, but they tend to focus on recall of earliest childhood memories.

Therefore, family is typically the most prominent setting of these memories, as family’s role for adolescents’ current self

But the roles of other people for individual’s self-construal might change during development – such as in adolescence, where friends and school could become at least as influential as family.

Based on the mutual interrelatedness of autobiographical memory and self-construal, the importance of the family, school and friendship settings for adolescent’s self-construal should then be reflected in this adolescent’s autobiographical memories.

Thus, rather than asking for earliest childhood memories (selecting by time), we instead ask for the most meaningful memories (selection by importance) to elicit memories that are the most relevant to the adolescent’s current self.

Pilot results and suggested model

• In a pilot study, we asked 22 Norwegian adolescents (M = 17.95) to recall three meaningful memories about their family, school and friends.

We found:

1. Adolescents’ meaningful friendship memories were most recent and family memories oldest;

2. When asked to rate how often they have thought or talked about the specific (just recalled) memories and about family, school and friendship memories in general, the friendship memories were the most frequently rehearsed (in both cases) and family memories the least, and

3. When coding the adolescents’ recalled memories for the amount of relatedness – based on how many times they refer to other people and how many times they refer to themselves – the family memories included the highest amount of relatedness, the school memory the lowest, with friendship memories falling in between.

A similar pattern was found in the Slovak sample reported in Antalíková, Gulbransen, Hansen, de la Mata, & Santamaría (2011) with the following model suggested (see figure 1).

Aim of the current study

1. To investigate whether the results can be replicated in the Danish sample;

2. To compare Slovaks and Danes.

Participants

• 40 Slovak adolescents (M = 18.22)

• 52 Danish adolescents (M = 19.12)

Method

Similar to pilot study:

• Questionnaire asking to recall memories from three settings, which should be at least 1 year old and of a special meaning to the participant

• The settings were presented in two alternative sequences in order to test for sequence effect – there were none

• Participants also reported their age at the time of these events and gave a rating of how often they have thought or talked about the particular memory they have just recalled and about memories from this setting in general and (on a scale from 1 to 7 – very often)

• Memories were coded for relatedness (after Wang & Conway, 2004).

Results Slovaks vs. Danes

To compare Slovaks and Danes.

To investigate whether the results can be replicated in the Danish sample;

Comparing the two cultural groups, Danish adolescents report thinking or talking significantly more about their recalled family memory (t(91) = -3.673, df = 91, p < .0005, one-tailed) and friend memories (t(91) = -2.403, df = 91, p = .019, one-tailed), but they, on family and school memories.

All participants recalled family memories that included significantly more indicators of importance (F(1,87) = 11.768, df = 87, p = .0012, one-tailed); there was no significant difference in the rehearsal of the family and school memories (F(1,91) = .820, df = 91, p = .366, one-tailed); there was no significant difference in the rehearsal of the family and school memories (F(1,91) = .820, df = 91, p = .366, one-tailed).

Similarity in the rehearsal of the memories from the family and school settings (F(2,180) = 1.625, df = 90, p = .210, one-tailed).

All participants reported significantly more frequent rehearsal of the recalled family memory than the (t(79) = -2.394, df = 79, p = .019, one-tailed) and school memory (t(79) = -2.245, df = 79, p = .029, one-tailed); there was no significant difference in the rehearsal of the family memory and school memory (t(79) = 1.004, df = 79, p = .319, one-tailed)

Comparing the two cultural groups, Danish adolescents report thinking or talking significantly more about their recalled family memory (t(91) = 2.507, df = 182.68, p = .012, one-tailed), but also their family memories in general (t(91) = -4.099, df = 91, p = .0012, one-tailed) than Slovak adolescents.
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Discussion

The suggested model (Figure 1) fits the meaningful memories from Danes tax in terms of memories’ age distribution (family oldest, friend most recent) and amount of relatedness (family highest, school lowest), but rehearsed patterns differed. Young Danes think or talk more about family than young Slovaks.

One could speculate that Slovak adolescents “leave” the family setting behind faster than Danish adolescents and that family memories are therefore better representations of “who they were”, rather than “who they are now”. This assumption needs to be investigated in further research.

Figure 1. Settings’ contributions to self-construal. The developmental trajectory of settings’ shifting dominance in adolescents’ life, as reflected in the recency and relatedness of their meaningful memories.

Figure 2: Age at recall (in years)

Figure 3a: Memory rehearsal

Figure 3b: Setting rehearsal

Figure 4: Other-self ratio

Table 1: Results of ANOVA for rehearsal at the 3 memories in years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Time distribution</th>
<th>Degree of relatedness</th>
<th>Setting rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Most recent</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Most recent</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Least recent</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Results of ANOVA comparing rehearsal at the 3 memories in years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Time distribution</th>
<th>Degree of relatedness</th>
<th>Rehearsal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Most recent</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Most recent</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Least recent</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where unnoticed, P-values are after Bonferroni Correction.