Does self-construal predict activity in the social brain network? A genetic moderation effect

Yina Ma,^{1,2,*} Chenbo Wang,^{1,2} Bingfeng Li,^{2,3} Wenxia Zhang,^{2,3} Yi Rao,^{2,3} and Shihui Han^{1,2,*}

¹Department of Psychology, ²PKU-IDG/McGovern Institute for Brain Research, and ³Peking-Tsinghua Center for Life Sciences at School of Life Sciences, Peking University, Beijing 100871, People's Republic of China

Neural activity in the social brain network varies across individuals with different cultural traits and different genetic polymorphisms. It remains unknown whether a specific genetic polymorphism may influence the association between cultural traits and neural activity in the social brain network. We tested whether the serotonin transporter promoter polymorphism (5-HTTLPR) affects the association between self-construals and neural activity involved in reflection of personal attributes of oneself and a significant other (i.e., mother). Using functional MRI, we scanned Chinese adults with short/short (s/s) or long/long (I/I) variants of the 5-HTTLPR during reflection of personal attributes of oneself and one's mother. We found that, while s/s and I/I genotype groups did not differ significantly in self-construals measured by the Self-Construal Scale, the relationship between self-construal scores and neural responses to reflection of oneself and mother was significantly different between the two genotype groups. Specifically, I/I but not s/s genotype group showed significant association between self-construal scores and activity in the medial prefrontal cortex, bilateral middle frontal cortex, temporoparietal junction, insula and hippocampus during reflection on mental attributes of oneself and mother. Our findings suggest that a specific genetic polymorphism is may interact with a cultural trait to shape the neural substrates underlying social cognition.

Keywords: 5-HTTLPR; fMRI; social brain network; self-construal; culture

INTRODUCTION

Social cognition consists of processing information about oneself and others (Iacoboni, 2006; Sedikides and Skowronski, 2009) and plays a key role in appropriate social communication and behavior. Neuroimaging evidence indicates that social cognition is mediated by a distributed neural network in the human brain (referred as the social brain network, Brothers, 1990; Lieberman, 2007). For example, selfprocesses, such as reflection of one's own personality traits and social roles, engage the ventral medial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC), precuneus/ posterior cingulate and temporoparietal junction (TPJ) (Kelley et al., 2002; Zhu et al., 2007; Heatherton et al., 2006; Han et al., 2008, 2010; Ma and Han, 2011, Jenkins and Mitchell, 2011; Sul et al., 2012; Ma, Bang et al., 2014). Attributing mental states such as desires and beliefs to others engages the dorsal medial prefrontal cortex (dmPFC), TPJ and precuneus (Gallagher et al., 2000; Saxe and Kanwisher, 2003; Lieberman, 2007). The activity in the social brain network can predict both performance in laboratories (e.g. Ma and Han, 2011) and behaviors in daily life (e.g. Ma et al., 2011; Falk et al., 2010).

Interestingly, recent cultural neuroscience studies indicate that activity in the social brain network is contextually dependent and is affected by sociocultural experiences (Han and Northoff, 2008, 2009; Kitayama and Park, 2010; Chiao *et al.*, 2013; Han *et al.*, 2013). Early studies showed evidence for cultural group differences in brain activity underlying social cognition. For example, mental state judgements on another individual produce stronger bilateral TPJ and right dmPFC activity in Americans than in Japanese (Kobayashi *et al.*, 2006). Trait judgments of a close other (e.g. mother) *vs* a celebrity activate the mPFC to a greater degree in Chinese than in English-speaking Westerners (Zhu *et al.*, 2007). Reflection on one's own attributes induces stronger mPFC activity in Danes but greater TPJ activity in

We thank Michael Varnum for proof reading of the manuscript

This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Project 30910103901, 91024032, 81161120539) and National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program 2010CB833901, 2010CB833903).

Chinese (Ma, Bang *et al.*, 2014). Later studies found evidence for associations between a cultural trait and brain activity involved in social cognition. For instance, the mPFC and TPJ activity underlying self-reflection is associated with individual differences in a specific cultural trait (i.e. interdependence of self-construals, Chiao *et al.*, 2009; Sul *et al.*, 2012; Ma, Bang *et al.*, 2014). Recent research further showed evidence that cultural group differences in the neural activity underlying social cognition (e.g. TPJ activity involved in self-reflection of social roles) may be mediated by a cultural trait (e.g. interdependence of self-construal, Ma, Bang *et al.*, 2014). Taken together, these findings suggest that cultural experiences may strongly affect the neural activity underpinning social cognition and these effects may be mediated by a specific cultural trait.

However, cultural experiences are not the only force to shape the neural basis of social cognition. Our recent research has shown evidence that a specific genetic polymorphism affects the neural activity in the social brain network (Ma, Li, et al., 2014). We tested a candidate a genetic polymorphism, i.e. the serotonin transporter promoter polymorphism (5-HTTLPR), which interacts with one's life experiences to influence human traits and behaviors so that depression symptoms (Caspi et al., 2003; Taylor et al., 2006) and neuroticism (Pluess et al., 2010) were more closely associated with stressful life events in short (s) allele carriers than in homozygous long allele (l/l) carriers of 5-HTTLPR. We found that the 5-HTTLPR modulates the neural activity involved in self-reflection of personality traits. Specifically, relative to 1/1 carriers, s/s carriers showed stronger distressed feelings and greater activity in the dorsal anterior cingulate (dACC)/dmPFC and the right anterior insula (AI) during reflection of one's own unfavorable personality traits. Moreover, we found that the 5-HTTLPR effect on the distressed feelings was mediated by the AI/inferior frontal activity during negative self-reflection. These findings reveal that a specific genetic polymorphism also shapes the neural activity associated with social cognition.

Gene-culture coevolution theory suggests that culture and gene are both inheritable and influence each other during evolution (Boyd and Richerson, 1985; Richerson *et al.*, 2010; Chiao *et al.*, 2013). Behavioral studies have shown that genes interact with culture to affect social

Received 29 November 2012; Revised 15 April 2013; Accepted 6 August 2013

Advance Access publication 4 September 2013

Ger e \times cultural trait ir teractior or the social brair retwork

cognition and behaviors such as emotional support seeking (Kim *et al.*, 2010, 2011) and willingness to volunteer for prosocial causes (Sasaki *et al.*, 2013). However, to date, little is known about whether and how genes interact with cultural traits to shape the brain activity underlying social cognition. The current study investigated this by examining whether a specific genetic polymorphism influences the association between a cultural trait and activity in the social brain network. Given that the 5-HTTLPR modulates the neural activity associated with social cognition (Ma, Li, *et al.*, 2014) and the frequency of 5-HTTLPR variants is associated with the cultural trait of self-construal across nations (Chiao and Blizinsky, 2010), we tested the hypothesis that a candidate genetic polymorphism, i.e. the 5-HTTLPR, may interact with the self-construal to shape activity in the social brain network during reflection of oneself and a significant other.

Specifically, we assessed whether 5-HTTLPR polymorphism modulated the association between interdependence of self-construals and neural activity during the processing of personal attributes of oneself and one's mother using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI). We scanned s/s and l/l genotype groups during judgments on personal attributes of oneself, one's mother and a celebrity. We first conducted whole-brain simple regression analyses to identify brain regions in which activations related to reflection of oneself (defined in the contrast of self- vs celebrity-judgments) or of one's mother (defined in the contrast of mother- vs celebrity-judgments) were associated with interdependence of self-construals measured using the Self-Construal Scale (SCS, Singelis, 1994). These brain regions were then used as masks in further hierarchical regression analyses to estimate whether the 5-HTTLPR moderates the association between the activities in these brain regions and the self-construal scores. Recent studies have shown that self-reflection on different dimensions of personal attributes is associated with both common and distinct brain regions. The mPFC is commonly activated during selfreflection on personality traits, physical attributes and social roles (Jenkins and Mitchell, 2011; Sul et al., 2012; Ma, Bang, et al., 2014). The TPJ is engaged during self-reflection on social roles (Sul et al., 2012; Ma, Bang, et al., 2014) and the precuneus, superior temporal sulcus and cerebellum are involved in self-reflection on physical attributes (Jenkins and Mitchell, 2011; Ma, Bang et al., 2014). These findings raise the question whether 5-HTTLPR moderates the association between interdependence and brain activity during personal attributes judgment on different dimensions in a similar vein. To test this, we asked participants to make judgments on three dimensions of personal attributes (i.e. personality traits, social roles and physical features) during fMRI scanning, similar to our previous study (Ma, Bang et al., 2014). We would expect a genetic effect on the association between the cultural trait and the neural substrates underlying self-reflection on mental attributes because the neural activity underlying self-reflection on mental attributes is sensitive to both cultural (Ma, Bang et al., 2014) and genetic (Ma, Li et al., 2014) influences. Similar analyses of the 5-HTTLPR moderation effect were applied to the neural activity underlying self-reflection on different dimensions of personal attributes.

METHOD

Genotyping

We used PCR method (Ota *et al.*, 2007) to determine the genotypes of 5-HTTLPR. In a total volume of 50 μ l, ~25 ng of genomic DNA were amplified in the presence of 1× TransStart FastPfu DNA Polymerase (TransGen Biotech) reaction system and oligonucleotide primers (forward 5'-GCATCCCCCATTATCCCCCCT-3' and reverse 5'-AGGCTTGGAGGCCGGGATGC-3') at final concentration of 200 nM. Thermal cycling consisted of 15 min of initial denaturation at 95°C followed by 35 cycles of 95°C (20 s), 69°C (20 s) and 72°C

(15 s) each with a final extension step of 10 min at 72°C. Subsequently, PCR product was loaded onto a 3% agarose gel (BioWest G-10), to perform electrophoresis to distinguish genotypes of s/s, s/l and l/l. All genotyping was performed in duplicate.

Participants

Twenty-two Chinese college students homozygous for the s allele and 18 Chinese college students homozygous for the l allele were recruited in the fMRI experiment as paid volunteers. All participants were righthanded, reported no history of neurological or psychiatric diagnoses, and had normal or corrected-to-normal vision. Six participants were excluded from data analysis due to excessive head movement during scanning. Thus 17 s/s and 17 l/l genotype individuals were included in behavioral and fMRI data analysis. The two genotype groups were matched in gender, and did not differ significantly in age, self-construal, self-esteem and anxiety trait (see Table 1 for the mean of each measurement and independent-sample *t*-test results). Informed consents approved by a local ethics committee were provided prior to the study.

Stimuli and procedure

Stimuli and procedure during scanning were the same as those used in Ma, Bang *et al.* (2014). There were three categories of words or phrases describing the mental (i.e. personality traits), physical (i.e. the physical appearance) and social (i.e. social roles) attributes. The mental category consisted of 80 trait adjectives (40 positive and 40 negative, e.g. smart, greedy). The physical category consisted of 80 items describing one's physical features (e.g. long arm, curly hair). The social category consisted of 80 items describing one's social roles/identities (e.g. student, tourist, see the complete list in the original paper). The trait adjectives presented to each participant consisted of half positive and half negative attributes.

In separate blocks of trials, each participant was asked to judge whether a given word/phrase described the self (self-judgment), one's mother (mother-judgment) or a well-known gender-matched athlete (celebrity-judgment) by pressing one of the two buttons using the index or middle finger. Participants also judged whether a word/phrase was bold-faced or light-faced (font-judgment) to control low-level sensory/perceptual processing and motor responses. Each type of judgments was presented once in a single block using a block design. Each participant finished five functional scans. There were 10 blocks in each scan (i.e. judgments of mental/physical/social attributes of the self/mother/celebrity and a font-judgment, see Supplementary Figure S1). Eight items were presented in each block. Each item was presented for 2s followed by a 1-s central fixation. Two successive blocks were intervened by a 10-s rest block during which participants viewed a white fixation on a black screen. Different blocks in each scan were presented in a random order. Of the 80 items of each category for each participant, 40 items were randomly chosen.

Table 1 Participant information by 5-HTTLPR Genotype

Variables	s/s carriers	I/I carriers	Independent <i>t</i> -test		
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	T-value	р	
Gender	13 males	14 males	_	_	
Age (years)	19.6 (0.7)	19.5 (0.8)	0.684	0.499	
Self-esteem	29.0 (2.6)	28.9 (4.3)	0.049	0.962	
Anxiety	14.9 (6.9)	15.6 (6.2)	-0.288	0.775	
Interdependence	2.1 (10.3)	7.2 (9.5)	—1.487	0.147	

After the fMRI scanning, participants were asked to complete Selfesteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), SCS (Singelis, 1994) and the harm avoidance subscale from the Tridimensional Personality Questionnaire (Cloninger *et al.*, 1993). The SCS scale consists of 24 items for assessing individual differences in independent/interdependent self-construals on a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Interdependence was defined by the difference between the sum score of the12 interdependent self-construal items and the sum score of the 12 independent self-construal items. Higher scores indicate greater levels of interdependent self-construals.

Imaging parameters

Functional brain images were acquired using a 3.0-Tesla Siemens Trio scanner at the Beijing MRI Center for Brain Research. Blood oxygen level-dependent (BOLD) gradient echo planar images (EPIs) were obtained using a 12-channel head coil $[64 \times 64 \times 32 \text{ matrix with}]$ $3.44 \times 3.44 \times 5.0 \text{ mm}$ spatial resolution, repetition time (TR) = 2000 ms, echo time (TE) = 30 ms, flip angle = 90° , field of view $(FOV) = 24 \times 24 \text{ cm}$ while participants were performing the judgment tasks. A high-resolution T1-weighted structural image $(256 \times 256 \times 144)$ matrix with а spatial resolution of $1 \times 1 \times 1.33$ mm, TR = 2530 ms, $TE = 3.37 \, ms$, inversion time (TI) = 1100 ms, flip angle= 7°) was subsequently acquired.

Imaging analysis

SPM2 (the Wellcome Trust Centre for Neuroimaging, London, UK) was used for data analysis. The functional images were realigned to the first scan to correct for head motion. Six movement parameters (translation: *x*, *y*, *z*; rotation: pitch, roll, yaw) were included in the statistical model. The anatomical image was coregistered with the mean functional image produced during the process of realignment. The anatomical images and functional images were normalized to the standard T1 and EPI Montreal Neurological Institute (MNI) templates, respectively. Functional images were then spatially smoothed using an isotropic Gaussian kernel of 8 mm full-width half-maximum.

The onsets and durations of each block were modeled using a General Linear Model (GLM) according to stimulus conditions for each participant. A box-car function was used to model the response to each condition. The box-car function was convolved with the canonical hemodynamic response. The design matrix also included the realignment parameters to account for any residual movement-related effect. Contrasts of self- (or mother-) *vs* celebrity-judgments in mental, physical and social blocks separately defined neural activities related to the processing of mental, physical and social aspects of the self (or mother).

We first conducted whole-brain simple regression analyses to identify brain regions in which activations related to self- (or mother-) vs celebrity-judgments were significantly correlated with interdependence of self-construals. Rating scores of interdependence were entered as a regressor into the SPM simple regression analysis along with each participant's contrast image of self- (or mother-) vs celebrity-judgments in the mental, social and physical blocks, respectively. As genetic differences were not taken into account during the simple regression analysis, fMRI data from both l/l and s/s carriers were included in this analysis. Because the brain regions identified in this regression analysis were used as masks for the next step analysis, we used a lenient threshold of P < 0.005 (uncorrected, k > 50) to identify brain regions that covaried with rating scores of interdependence.

Next we conducted whole-brain hierarchical regression analysis to examine whether 5-HTTLPR genotype affected the relationship between interdependence and the neural activity underlying personal judgments on the self and one's mother. We first normalized the

independent variable (IV) (the measure of interdependence) and the covariate variable (genotype). Genotype group was coded as a dichotomous dummy variable in which 0 represented s/s carriers and 1 represented 1/1 carriers. The interactions between interdependence and genotype were calculated by multiplying the normalized variables together (Aiken and West, 1991). Normalized genotype (the moderator), interdependence (IV) and their interactions were entered as regressors into the SPM multiple regression analysis along with each participant's contrast image of self- or mother-judgment vs celebrity-judgment. Brain activities covaried with the interaction of genotype and interdependence indicated significant interaction of interdependence and 5-HTTLPR on the brain activities. Brain regions that covaried with interdependence in the simple regression analysis were used as masks for multiple correction using the WFU PickAtlas (Maldjian et al., 2003). Because these brain regions were defined based on the data from all the participants, using these brain regions in the multiple regression analysis does not bias any within-group variables in this study. Significant brain activations covaried with gene × culture interaction were identified using a threshold of P < 0.05 (FDR corrected for multiple comparisons in masked areas). Simple regression analyses were also conducted for each genotype group to further reveal patterns of the relationship between interdependence and neural responses underlying self-/mother-judgments.

RESULTS

Behavioral performance

s/s and l/l carriers did not differ significantly in age and subjective ratings on the Self-Construal Scale, Anxiety scale and Self-Esteem Scale (Ps > 0.05, Table 1). The two genotype groups did not differ in reaction times (RTs) {874 vs 917 ms, [F(1, 32) = 1.020, P = 0.320, $\eta_p^2 = 0.031$] and response accuracy {89% vs 89%, [F (1, 32) = 0.072, P = 0.790, $\eta_p^2 = 0.002$] during font-judgments (Supplementary Table S1). RTs to trait judgments were subjected to ANOVAs with Judgment (self-judgment vs celebrity-judgment or mother-judgment vs celebrityjudgment) and Dimension (mental, physical or social) as independent within-subjects variables and Genotype (s/s vs l/l genotype) as a between-subjects variable. As ANOVAs of RTs revealed a significant three-way interaction [self vs celebrity: F(2, 64) = 3.456, P = 0.038, $\eta_p^2 = 0.097$; mother vs celebrity: F (2, 64) = 4.134, P = 0.020, $\eta_{\rm p}^2 = 0.114$], 2 (Judgment) × 2 (Group) ANOVAs were then conducted on RTs in the social, mental and physical blocks, respectively. Significant Judgment × Group interactions were found only during judgments of social roles [self vs celebrity: F(1, 32) = 11.938, P = 0.002, $\eta_p^2 = 0.272$; mother vs celebrity: F (1, 32) = 7.331, $P = 0.011, \eta_p^2 = 0.186$], suggesting that l/l carriers responded slightly slower to judgments of the celebrity's social roles compared with s/s carriers $[F(1, 32) = 5.449, P = 0.026, \eta_p^2 = 0.146]$ whereas RTs to selfand mother-judgments did not differ between the two genotype groups (Fs < 1). The Judgment × Group interactions during judgments of physical and mental attributes did not reach significance (Ps > 0.26), suggesting that l/l and s/s carriers showed similar patterns of responses during reflection of physical and mental attributes.

Brain imaging results

Association between interdependence and brain activity during self-reflection

The whole-brain simple regression analysis of the brain activity related to self-reflection on mental attributes across all participants revealed significant positive correlation between the measure of interdependence and activations shown in the contrast of self- *vs* celebrity-judgments in the bilateral insula, right middle temporal cortex, left hippocampus, left superior frontal cortex, mPFC and right middle
 Table 2
 Brain activations in simple regression and moderation analyses of the contrast of self vs
 celebrity-judgments

Simple regression analysis Mental attributes Positive correlation Insula (R) 48, 14, -6 4.78 611 Middle temporal (R) 58, -12 , -10 4.36 167 Insula (L) -50 , 18, -6 4.07 83 Hippocampus (L) -16 , -52 , 2 4.06 205 Superior Frontal (L) -32 , 48, 16 3.41 152 mPFC 2, 50, 16 3.31 75 Middle Frontal (R) 38, 30, 30 3.44 317 negative correlation 54, -52 , 36 4.56 68 Cerebellum (L) -16 , -68 , -20 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) 24, -68 , -26 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) -38 , -60 , 58 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) 38, 30, 30 3.44 317 Social attributes positive correlation Inferior Parietal (L) -46 , -34 , 58 3.52 185 negative correlation Superior Frontal (L) -26 , 26 4.33	Dimension region	x, y, z	T-value	cluster size	
Mental attributesPositive correlationInsula (R)48, 14, -64.78611Middle temporal (R)58, -12, -104.36167Insula (L)-50, 18, -64.0783Hippocampus (L)-16, -52, 24.06205Superior Frontal (L)-32, 48, 163.41152mPFC2, 50, 163.3175Middle Frontal (R)38, 30, 303.44317negative correlation54, -52, 364.56Middle Frontal (L)-54, 12, 404.6768Cerebellum (L)-54, 12, 404.6768Cerebellum (R)24, -68, -204.62355Cerebellum (R)24, -68, -264.63266Superior Parietal (L)-38, -60, 584.47396Middle Frontal (R)38, 30, 303.44317Social attributespositive correlation11638, 30, 303.44Superior Parietal (L)-6, -34, 583.52185negative correlation116-22, 16, 683.87150Physical attributespositive correlation22, 42, 284.43223Inferior Parietal (L)-6, -56, 645.351166Middle Frontal (R)32, 42, 284.43223Inferior Parietal (R)58, -34, 444.42299Middle Frontal (R)52, -66, 104.33299Moderation analysisMental attributes75Middle Frontal (R)24, 56, 242.96Middle Frontal (R) <t< td=""><td>Simple regression analysis</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Simple regression analysis				
Positive correlation Insula (R) 48, 14, -6 4.78 611 Middle temporal (R) 58, -12, -10 4.36 167 Insula (L) -50, 18, -6 4.07 83 Hippocampus (L) -16, -52, 2 4.06 205 Superior Frontal (L) -32, 48, 16 3.41 152 mPFC 2, 50, 16 3.31 75 Middle Frontal (R) 38, 30, 30 3.44 317 negative correlation -54, 12, 46, -62, 58 4.71 1182 Superior Parietal and TPJ (R) 30, -62, 58 4.71 1182 Superior Parietal (L) -54, 12, 46, -66 68 266 Superior Parietal (L) -66, -20 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) 24, -68, -26 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) -38, -60, 58 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) 38, 30, 30 3.44 317 Social attributes positive correlation Inferior Parietal (L) -22, 16, 68 3.87 150 Physical	Mental attributes				
Insula (R)48, 14, -6 4.78611Middle temporal (R)58, -12 , -10 4.36167Insula (L) -50 , 18, -6 4.0783Hippocampus (L) -16 , -52 , 24.06205Superior Frontal (L) -32 , 48, 163.41152mPFC2, 50, 163.3175Middle Frontal (R)38, 30, 303.44317negative correlation54, -52 , 364.56Middle Frontal (L) -54 , 12, 404.6768Cerebellum (L) -16 , -68 , -20 4.62355Cerebellum (R)24, -66 , -68 , -26 4.63266Superior Parietal (L) -38 , -60 , 584.47396Middle Frontal (R)38, 30, 303.44317Social attributes <i>positive correlation</i> 1Inferior Parietal (L) -46 , -34 , 583.52185negative correlation33.52185Nuperior Frontal (L) -62 , 4404.15324Middle and Superior Frontal (L) -22 , 16, 683.87150Physical attributes <i>positive correlation</i> 2323Inferior Parietal (R)52, -66 , 104.33299Middle Frontal (R)52, -66 , 104.33299Middle temporal (R)52, -66 , 104.33299Middle trontal (R)24, 56, 242.96131Hippocampus (L) -20 , -36 , 03.91121TPJ (R)56, -54 , 364.27726 <td>Positive correlation</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Positive correlation				
Middle temporal (R) $58, -12, -10$ 4.36 167 Insula (L) $-50, 18, -6$ 4.07 83 Hippocampus (L) $-16, -52, 2$ 4.06 205 Superior Frontal (L) $-32, 48, 16$ 3.41 152 mPFC $2, 50, 16$ 3.31 75 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 negative correlation $54, -52, 36$ 4.56 Middle Frontal (L) $-54, 12, 40$ 4.67 68 Cerebellum (L) $-16, -68, -20$ 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) $24, -68, -26$ 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) $-38, -60, 58$ 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 Social attributes $positive correlation$ $regative correlation$ $166, -34, 58$ 3.52 Inferior Parietal (L) $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlation $50, 26, 26$ 4.35 224 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-62, 26, 26$ 4.35 224 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 224 Inferior Parietal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 229 Middle Frontal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 229 Middle Frontal (R) $24, 56, 24$ 296 131 Inferior Parietal (R) $54, -22, -42$ 4.78 51 mFPC $4, 48, 14$ 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (R) $24, 56, 24$ 296 131 Midd	Insula (R)	48, 14, -6	4.78	611	
Insula (L) $-50, 18, -6$ 4.07 83 Hippocampus (L) $-16, -52, 2$ 4.06 205 Superior Frontal (L) $-32, 48, 16$ 3.41 152 mPFC $2, 50, 16$ 3.31 75 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 negative correlation $54, -52, 36$ 4.56 Middle Frontal (L) $-54, 12, 40$ 4.67 68 Cerebellum (L) $-16, -68, -20$ 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) $24, -68, -26$ 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) $-38, -60, 58$ 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 Social attributes positive correlation Inferior Parietal (L) $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlation 50 $-66, -56, 64$ 5.35 1166 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150 Physical attributes 50 $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 223 1167 $116, 68, -34, 44$ 4.22 299 <	Middle temporal (R)	58, -12, -10	4.36	167	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Insula (L)	—50, 18, —6	4.07	83	
Superior Frontal (L) -32 , 48, 16 3.41 152 mPFC 2, 50, 16 3.31 75 Middle Frontal (R) 38, 30, 30 3.44 317 negative correlation Superior Parietal and TPJ (R) 30 , -62 , 58 4.71 1182 Superior Parietal and TPJ (R) 30 , -62 , 58 4.71 1182 Gerebellum (L) -54 , 12 , 40 4.67 68 Cerebellum (R) 24 , -68 , -20 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) 24 , -68 , -26 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) -38 , -60 , 58 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) 38 , 30 , 30 3.44 317 Social attributes $positive correlation$ 167 68 negative correlation -66 , -34 , 58 3.52 185 negative correlation -66 , -56 , 64 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) 32 , 42 , 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) -64 , -26 , 26	Hippocampus (L)	—16, —52, 2	4.06	205	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Superior Frontal (L)	—32, 48, 16	3.41	152	
Middle Frontal (R) 38, 30, 30 3.44 317 negative correlation Superior Parietal and TPJ (R) 30, -62, 58 4.71 1182 54, -52, 36 4.56 54 68 68 Middle Frontal (L) -54, 12, 40 4.67 68 Cerebellum (L) -16, -68, -20 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) 24, -68, -26 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) -38, -60, 58 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) 38, 30, 30 3.44 317 Social attributes positive correlation 1 16 15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) -46, -34, 58 3.52 185 185 negative correlation Superior Forntal (L) -62, 40 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) -22, 16, 68 3.87 150 Physical attributes genetior Parietal (L) -64, -26, 26 4.33 223 Inferior Parietal (R) 32, 42, 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (R) <td>mPFC</td> <td>2, 50, 16</td> <td>3.31</td> <td>75</td>	mPFC	2, 50, 16	3.31	75	
negative correlation Superior Parietal and TPJ (R) $30, -62, 58$ 4.71 1182 $54, -52, 36$ 4.56 4.56 68 Middle Frontal (L) $-54, 12, 40$ 4.67 68 Cerebellum (L) $-16, -68, -20$ 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) $24, -68, -26$ 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) $-38, -60, 58$ 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 Social attributes positive correlation Inferior Parietal (L) $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlation Superior Frontal (L) $-6, 24, 40$ 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150 Physical attributes positive correlation Superior Parietal(L) $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) $32, 42, 28$ 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299 Middle Frontal (R)	Middle Frontal (R)	38, 30, 30	3.44	317	
Superior Parietal and TPJ (R) $30, -62, 58$ 4.71 1182 $54, -52, 36$ 4.56 Middle Frontal (L) $-54, 12, 40$ 4.67 68 Cerebellum (L) $-16, -68, -20$ 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) $24, -68, -26$ 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) $-38, -60, 58$ 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 Social attributes $positive correlation$ $Inferior Parietal (L)$ $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlation $Superior Frontal (L)$ $-6, 24, 40$ 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150 Physical attributes $positive correlation$ $Superior Parietal(L)$ $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (L) $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 284 1166 $Middle temporal (R)$ $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299 Moderation analysis $Mental attributes$ $Cerebellum (R)$ $18, -42, -42$ 4.78 51 mPFC $4, 48, 14$ 3.96 75 756 311 1133 Middle Frontal (R) $24, 56, 24$ 2.96 311 Hippocampus (L) $-20, -36, 0$ 3.91 121 $17P$ (R) $56, -54, 36$ 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) $14, -80, 40$ 4.12 344 396 75 314 317 333 Middle Frontal (R) $24, 56, 24$ 2.96 311 $416, -80, 40$ </td <td>negative correlation</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	negative correlation				
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Superior Parietal and TPJ (R)	30, -62, 58	4.71	1182	
Middle Frontal (L) $-54, 12, 40$ 4.67 68 Cerebellum (L) $-16, -68, -20$ 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) $24, -68, -26$ 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) $-38, -60, 58$ 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 Social attributes $positive correlation$ $Inferior Parietal (L)$ $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlation $Superior Frontal (L)$ $-6, 24, 40$ 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150 Physical attributespositive correlationSuperior Parietal(L) $-6, -56, 64$ 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) $32, 42, 28$ 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) $58, -34, 44$ 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299 Moderation analysisMental attributes $Cerebellum (R)$ $18, -42, -42$ 4.78 51 mPFC $4, 48, 14$ 3.96 75 726 311 1133 Middle Frontal (R) $24, 56, 24$ 2.96 311 Hippocampus (L) $-20, -36, 0$ 3.91 121 TPJ (R) $56, -54, 36$ 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) $14, -80, 40$ 4.12 344 Middle Frontal (R) $14, -80, 40$ 4.12 344 Middle Fr		54, -52, 36	4.56		
Cerebellum (L) $-16, -68, -20$ 4.62 355 Cerebellum (R) $24, -68, -26$ 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) $-38, -60, 58$ 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 Social attributes positive correlation $16f$ $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlation Superior Frontal (L) $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlation Superior Frontal (L) $-6, 24, 40$ 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150 Physical attributes positive correlation 50 216 4.33 223 Inferior Parietal (L) $-6, -56, 64$ 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) $32, 42, 28$ 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (R) $58, -34, 44$ 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes Cerebellum (R) $18, -42, -42$ 4.78 51 mPFC $4, 48, 14$	Middle Frontal (L)	-54, 12, 40	4.67	68	
Cerebellum (R) $24, -68, -26$ 4.63 266 Superior Parietal (L) $-38, -60, 58$ 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 Social attributespositive correlationInferior Parietal (L) $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlationSuperior Frontal (L) $-6, 24, 40$ 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150 Physical attributespositive correlationSuperior Parietal(L) $-6, -56, 64$ 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) $32, 42, 28$ 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299 Moderation analysis $Mental$ $414, 4.42$ 299 Middle temporal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299 Moderation analysis $Mental$ $18, -42, -42$ 4.78 51 mPFC $4, 48, 14$ 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) $-30, 50, 34$ 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) $24, 56, 24$ 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) $-20, -36, 0$ 3.91 121 TPJ (R) $56, -54, 36$ 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) $14, -80, 40$ 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) $50, 26, 28$ 3.32 239 PTJ (L) $-64, -38, 20$ 6.17 119	Cerebellum (L)	-16, -68, -20	4.62	355	
Superior Parietal (L) $-38, -60, 58$ 4.47 396 Middle Frontal (R) $38, 30, 30$ 3.44 317 Social attributes positive correlation 1 Inferior Parietal (L) $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlation Superior Frontal (L) $-6, 24, 40$ 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150 Physical attributes positive correlation $32, 42, 28$ 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) $-6, -56, 64$ 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) $32, 42, 28$ 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) $58, -34, 44$ 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes $Cerebellum (R)$ $18, -42, -42$ 4.78 51 mPFC $4, 48, 14$ 3.96 75 75 75 $76, 0$ 3.91 121 Hippocampus (L)	Cerebellum (R)	24, -68, -26	4.63	266	
Middle Frontal (R)38, 30, 303.44317Social attributes positive correlation Inferior Parietal (L) $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185negative correlation Superior Frontal (L) $-6, 24, 40$ 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150Physical attributes positive correlation Superior Parietal(L) $-6, -56, 64$ 5.35 1166Middle Frontal (R) $32, 42, 28$ 4.43 223Inferior Parietal (L) $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 284Inferior Parietal (R) $58, -34, 44$ 4.42 299Middle temporal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299Moderation analysis Mental attributes Cerebellum (R) $18, -42, -42$ 4.78 51 mPFC $4, 48, 14$ 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (R) $24, 56, 24$ 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) $-20, -36, 0$ 3.91 121 TPJ (R) $56, -54, 36$ 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) $14, -80, 40$ 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) $50, 26, 28$ 3.32 239	Superior Parietal (L)	—38, —60, 58	4.47	396	
Social attributes positive correlation Inferior Parietal (L) -46 , -34 , 58 3.52 185 negative correlation Superior Frontal (L) -6 , 24 , 40 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) -22 , 16 , 68 3.87 150 Physical attributes positive correlation 3.27 166 Superior Parietal(L) -6 , -56 , 64 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) 32 , 42 , 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (R) 58 , -34 , 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52 , -66 , 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes $Cerebellum$ (R) 18 , -42 , -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48 , 14 3.96 75 75 1164 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30 , 50 , 34 3.71 133 1133 1121 179 121 179 121 179 14 , -80 , 40 4.12 134 141 , -80 , 40 4.12 134 141 144 , -80	Middle Frontal (R)	38, 30, 30	3.44	317	
$\begin{array}{c cccc} positive correlation \\ Inferior Parietal (L) & -46, -34, 58 & 3.52 & 185 \\ negative correlation \\ Superior Frontal (L) & -6, 24, 40 & 4.15 & 324 \\ Middle and Superior Frontal (L) & -22, 16, 68 & 3.87 & 150 \\ \hline Physical attributes \\ positive correlation \\ Superior Parietal(L) & -6, -56, 64 & 5.35 & 1166 \\ Middle Frontal (R) & 32, 42, 28 & 4.43 & 223 \\ Inferior Parietal (L) & -64, -26, 26 & 4.35 & 284 \\ Inferior Parietal (R) & 58, -34, 44 & 4.42 & 299 \\ Middle temporal (R) & 52, -66, 10 & 4.33 & 299 \\ \hline Moderation analysis \\ Cerebellum (R) & 18, -42, -42 & 4.78 & 51 \\ mPFC & 4, 48, 14 & 3.96 & 75 \\ Middle Frontal (L) & -30, 50, 34 & 3.71 & 133 \\ Middle Frontal (R) & 24, 56, 24 & 2.96 & 131 \\ Hippocampus (L) & -20, -36, 0 & 3.91 & 121 \\ TPJ (R) & 56, -54, 36 & 4.27 & 726 \\ Superior Parietal (R) & 14, -80, 40 & 4.12 & 134 \\ Middle Frontal (R) & 50, 26, 28 & 3.32 & 239 \\ \hline \end{array}$	Social attributes				
Inferior Parietal (L) $-46, -34, 58$ 3.52 185 negative correlationSuperior Frontal (L) $-6, 24, 40$ 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) $-22, 16, 68$ 3.87 150 Physical attributespositive correlationSuperior Parietal(L) $-6, -56, 64$ 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) $32, 42, 28$ 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) $-64, -26, 26$ 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) $58, -34, 44$ 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) $52, -66, 10$ 4.33 299 Moderation analysis $Mental attributes$ $Cerebellum (R)$ $18, -42, -42$ 4.78 51 mPFC $4, 48, 14$ 3.96 75 75 $Middle$ Frontal (R) $24, 56, 24$ 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) $-20, -36, 0$ 3.91 121 $17P$ (R) $56, -54, 36$ 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) $14, -80, 40$ 4.12 134 $Middle$ Frontal (R) $14, -80, 20$ 6.17 119	positive correlation				
negative correlation Superior Frontal (L) 6, 24, 40 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) 22, 16, 68 3.87 150 Physical attributes positive correlation 5 5 1166 Superior Parietal(L) 6,56, 64 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) 32, 42, 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) 64, -26, 26 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) 58, -34, 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52, -66, 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes 27 66, 10 4.33 299 Middle trontal (R) 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134<	Inferior Parietal (L)	-46, -34, 58	3.52	185	
Superior Frontal (L) -6, 24, 40 4.15 324 Middle and Superior Frontal (L) -22, 16, 68 3.87 150 Physical attributes positive correlation 5 5 1166 Middle Frontal (R) 32, 42, 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) -64, -26, 26 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) 58, -34, 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52, -66, 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes 6 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239	negative correlation				
Middle and Superior Frontal (L) -22 , 16, 68 3.87 150Physical attributes positive correlationSuperior Parietal(L) -6 , -56 , 64 5.35 1166Middle Frontal (R) 32 , 42 , 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) -64 , -26 , 26 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) 58 , -34 , 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52 , -66 , 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysisMental attributesCerebellum (R) 18 , -42 , -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4 , 48 , 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30 , 50 , 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24 , 56 , 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20 , -36 , 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56 , -54 , 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14 , -80 , 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50 , 26 , 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64 , -38 , 20 6.17 119	Superior Frontal (L)	-6, 24, 40	4.15	324	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Middle and Superior Frontal (L)	—22, 16, 68	3.87	150	
positive correlationSuperior Parietal(L) -6 , -56 , 64 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) 32 , 42 , 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) -64 , -26 , 26 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) 58 , -34 , 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52 , -66 , 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysisMental attributesCerebellum (R) 18 , -42 , -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4 , 48 , 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30 , 50 , 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24 , 56 , 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20 , -36 , 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56 , -54 , 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14 , -80 , 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50 , 26 , 28 3.32 239 PTJ (L) -64 , -38 , 20 6.17 119	Physical attributes				
Superior Parietal(L) -6, -56, 64 5.35 1166 Middle Frontal (R) 32, 42, 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) -64, -26, 26 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) 58, -34, 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52, -66, 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes 2 2 Cerebellum (R) 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	positive correlation				
Middle Frontal (R) 32, 42, 28 4.43 223 Inferior Parietal (L) -64, -26, 26 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) 58, -34, 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52, -66, 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes 2 2 Cerebellum (R) 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Superior Parietal(L)	-6, -56, 64	5.35	1166	
Inferior Parietal (L) 64, -26, 26 4.35 284 Inferior Parietal (R) 58, -34, 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52, -66, 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes 2 2 Cerebellum (R) 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Middle Frontal (R)	32, 42, 28	4.43	223	
Inferior Parietal (R) 58, -34, 44 4.42 299 Middle temporal (R) 52, -66, 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes 200 200 Cerebellum (R) 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Inferior Parietal (L)	-64, -26, 26	4.35	284	
Middle temporal (R) 52, -66, 10 4.33 299 Moderation analysis Mental attributes 51 51 51 Mertal attributes Cerebellum (R) 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 50 50, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 131 113 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 PTJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119 119 119	Inferior Parietal (R)	58, -34, 44	4.42	299	
Moderation analysis Mental attributes Cerebellum (R) 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Middle temporal (R)	52, -66, 10	4.33	299	
Mental attributes 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Moderation analysis				
Cerebellum (R) 18, -42, -42 4.78 51 mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Mental attributes				
mPFC 4, 48, 14 3.96 75 Middle Frontal (L) 30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) 20,36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) 64,38, 20 6.17 119	Cerebellum (R)	18, -42, -42	4.78	51	
Middle Frontal (L) -30, 50, 34 3.71 133 Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	mPFC	4, 48, 14	3.96	75	
Middle Frontal (R) 24, 56, 24 2.96 131 Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Middle Frontal (L)	-30, 50, 34	3.71	133	
Hippocampus (L) -20, -36, 0 3.91 121 TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Middle Frontal (R)	24, 56, 24	2.96	131	
TPJ (R) 56, -54, 36 4.27 726 Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Hippocampus (L)	-20, -36, 0	3.91	121	
Superior Parietal (R) 14, -80, 40 4.12 134 Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	TPJ (R)	56, -54, 36	4.27	726	
Middle Frontal (R) 50, 26, 28 3.32 239 TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Superior Parietal (R)	14, -80, 40	4.12	134	
TPJ (L) -64, -38, 20 6.17 119	Middle Frontal (R)	50, 26, 28	3.32	239	
	TPJ (L)	-64, -38, 20	6.17	119	

frontal cortex (Table 2). The brain activity related to self-reflection on mental attributes was negatively correlated with the measure of interdependence in the bilateral superior parietal cortex, right TPJ, left middle frontal cortex, right middle frontal cortex and cerebellum.

Interestingly, the hierarchical regression analysis showed significant gene × interdependence interaction on the activity in the mPFC, bilateral middle frontal cortex, bilateral TPJ, superior parietal cortex, left hippocampus, cerebellum (Table 2 and Figure 1), suggesting different associations between the interdependence and brain activity in these regions related to self-reflection on mental attributes in l/l and s/s carriers. *Post hoc* regression analyses confirmed that the relationship between interdependence and neural activity in these brain regions related to self-reflection on mental attributes was significant for l/l but not for s/s carriers. l/l carriers with higher interdependence showed stronger activation in the mPFC (2, 52, 16), left frontal cortex (-32, 48, 16), left hippocampus (-16, -42, 2), and cerebellum (20, -42, -44), but weaker activation in the bilateral TPJ (left: -64, -40, 40; right: 58, -52, 38).

Similar simple regression analyses of the fMRI data during self reflection of social roles showed that the measurement of interdependence was positively correlated with the left inferior parietal activity but was negatively correlated with the left middle and superior frontal activity and the medial superior frontal activity (Table 2). The measure of interdependence was positively correlated with the activity in the superior parietal cortex, right middle frontal cortex and bilateral inferior parietal cortex during self-reflection of physical attributes (Table 2). However, further hierarchical regression analyses did not reveal significant gene × interdependence interactions in any brain region during reflection of social roles and physical attributes.

Association between interdependence and brain activity during reflection on mother

The whole-brain simple regression analysis of fMRI data during reflection of mother's mental attributes showed that the interdependence positively correlated with activations in the contrast of mother- vs celebrity-judgments in the bilateral insula, mPFC, and bilateral middle/superior frontal cortex (Table 3). The measure of interdependence was negatively correlated with activations in the right precentral cortex, right superior temporal cortex and left superior parietal cortex during reflection of mother's mental attributes. The hierarchical regression analysis showed significant gene × interdependence interactions in the mPFC, bilateral middle frontal cortex, right insula, and the superior parietal cortex (Table 3, Figure 2), suggesting different associations between the measure of interdependence and brain activity in these regions during reflection on mother's mental attributes in l/l and s/s carriers. Post-hoc regression analyses confirmed that the association between interdependence and neural responses in these brain regions was significant for 1/1 but not for s/s carriers. During reflection on mother's mental attributes, l/l carriers with higher interdependence showed stronger activation in the mPFC (2, 54, 20), bilateral middle frontal cortex (left: -26, 44, 6; right: 26, 48, 12), bilateral insula (left: -50, 20, -4; right: 40, 16, -14), but weaker activation in the superior parietal cortex (12, -54, 54, -10, -42, 54), inferior frontal cortex (48, 6, 8), inferior parietal cortex (left: -58, -40, 18; right: 62, −40, 28).

Similar simple regression analyses of the fMRI data during reflection of mother's social attributes showed that the measure of interdependence was positively correlated with activities in the bilateral superior parietal cortex, right precuneus, right fusiform, right inferior parietal cortex, right insula and right inferior frontal cortex, but was negatively correlated with the left frontal activity (Table 3). The measure of interdependence was positively correlated with the activations in the contrast of mother- *vs* celebrity-judgments on physical attributes in the left precentral cortex but negatively correlated with the activity in the PCC, bilateral middle occipital cortex and left lingual gyrus (Table 3). However, the hierarchical regression analyses did not show significant gene \times interdependence interactions in brain activities related to judgments on mother's social and physical attributes.

DISCUSSION

Human behavior manifests both environmental and genetic variations during evolution and has been shaped by the interaction between gene and culture (Boyd and Richerson, 1985; Kendler and Prescott, 2006; Richerson *et al.*, 2010; Laland *et al.*, 2010). However, the effect of gene \times culture interactions on human brain activity related to social behaviors is poorly understood. Here we reported neuroimaging evidence that a specific genetic polymorphism (i.e. 5-HTTLPR) may interact with a specific cultural trait (i.e. interdependence of self-construals) to shape the activity in the social brain network.

Unlike the previous transcultural imaging studies that compared two cultural groups (e.g. Zhu *et al.*, 2007; Chiao *et al.*, 2009; Ma, Band, *et al.*, 2014), the current study recruited participants from the



Fig. 1 Genotype differences in the association between the measure of interdependence and neural activity related to judgments of mental attributes of the self. The middle panel shows the brain regions in which the association between interdependence of self-construals and brain activity related to self- vs celebrity-judgments were significantly different between the two genotype groups, as identified in the hierarchical regression analysis. The x- and y-axes of each scatterplot index the interdependence scores and the contrast values of self- vs celebrity-judgments, respectively. Blue and red scatterplots illustrate the brain regions in which interdependence scores were respectively positively and negatively correlated with brain activities involved in self- vs celebrity-judgments in the I/I genotype group.

Table 3	Brain	activations	in	simple	regression	and	moderation	analyses	of	the	contrast
of mothe	r- vs	celebrity-ju	dgr	nents							

Dimension Region	x, y, z	T-value	cluster size	
Simple regression analysis				
Mental attributes				
Positive correlation				
Insula (L)	—50, 20, —2	5.08	345	
Middle Frontal (L) and mPFC	—20, 56, 30	4.72	555	
	-6, 48, 38	3.39		
Insula (R)	46, 16, -4	4.13	280	
Middle Frontal (R)	20, 54, 18	3.92	502	
Negative correlation				
Precentral (R)	22, -28, 78	4.04	246	
Superior Parietal (L)	-22, -62, 62	3.81	210	
Superior Temporal (R)	56, -42, 14	3.90	150	
Social attributes				
Positive correlation				
Superior Parietal (R)	12, -60, 68	4.56	416	
Precuneus (R)	18, -66, 22	3.97	260	
Fusiform (R)	32, -50, -18	3.96	114	
Inferior Parietal (R)	48,	3.92	282	
Insular (R)	46, -16, 4	3.81	90	
Inferior Frontal (R)	40, 36, 16	3.71	173	
Superior Parietal (L)	-30, -40, 70	3.38	224	
Negative correlation				
Frontal (L)	-32, 44, 18	4.26	247	
Physical attributes				
Positive correlation				
Precentral (L)	-18, -12, 74	4.21	168	
Negative correlation	,,			
Middle Occipital (L)	-44, -70, -10	4.32	324	
Lingual gyrus (L)	-4, -76, -12	4.13	262	
Middle Occipital (R)	24, -92, -12	3.83	124	
PCC	2, -54, 20	3.83	54	
Moderation analysis	, , , ,			
Montal attributos				
Middle Frontal (1) and mPEC	16 57 18	131	173	
midule Hondai (L) and Infre	- 10, 52, 18 8 54 20	4.54	423	
Middle Frontal (P)	-0, 34, 20	4.25	207	
initial (n)	20, 44 , 10 20 10 10	2 20	57/	
Superior Pariotal (P)	30, 10, -12 16 70 43	2.27 117	10	
Superior Farietal (n)	10, -/0, 42	4.12	42	

same cultural context to exclude effects such as language and environmental differences. Cultural influences were scrutinized by examining variations of neural activity as a function of interdependence of self-construals across individuals. We assessed whether 5-HTTLPR modulates the association between cultural orientation in interdependent self-construals and brain activity underlying judgments on personal attributes of the self and mother. We first demonstrated that, across all participants, the measure of interdependence was correlated with the activity during the processing of the self and mother in the social brain network including the mPFC, TPJ, superior parietal cortex, insula, hippocampus, etc. Thus the brain activity involved in social cognition varies across individuals with different levels of interdependence.

More importantly, we found that the association between interdependence and the social brain network activity was moderated by 5-HTTLPR polymorphism. The neural activity underlying selfreflection on personality traits was significantly associated with the measure of interdependence in l/l carriers but not in s/s carriers. This effect was evident in multiple brain regions and was true regardless of patterns (i.e. positive or negative) of correlation results. The moderator effects were not self-specific because similar effects were also observed with the association between self-reported interdependence and the neural activity related to reflection on mother's personality traits. These moderator effects were observed in two genotype groups who were comparable in gender, age, and education. Subjective evaluations of self-construals, anxiety traits, and selfesteem did not differ between the two genotype groups. Thus the differential association between interdependence and brain activity reflects essentially the influences of genetic variation rather than the effects of personal experiences or traits.

Our findings have several implications for understanding the effect of gene \times culture interaction on human brain activity. First, previous cultural neuroscience studies have shown that activity in a specific brain region (e.g. mPFC in Chiao *et al.*, 2009; TPJ in Ma, Bang *et al.*, 2014) can be associated with a cultural trait (e.g. interdependence). The results of our simple regression analyses suggest that the



Fig. 2 Genotype differences in the association between the measure of interdependence and neural activity related to judgments of mental attributes of mother. The middle panel shows the brain regions in which the association between interdependence of self-construals and brain activity related to mother- vs celebrity-judgments were significantly different between the two genotype groups, as identified in the hierarchical regression analysis. The x- and y-axes of each scatterplot index the interdependence scores and the contrast values of mother- vs celebrity-judgments, respectively. Blue and red scatterplots illustrate the brain regions in which interdependence scores were, respectively, positively and negatively correlated with brain activities involved in mother- vs celebrity-judgments in the I/I genotype group.

activity in multiple brain regions in the social brain network during reflection on oneself and mother can vary significantly across individuals in the same cultural group with different levels of a cultural trait. Our results are consistent with the previous findings that two cultural groups showed distinct activities in multiple brain regions involved in varieties of social cognitive tasks (Han and Northoff, 2008; Han *et al.*, 2013) and suggest that human cultural experiences may shape multiple brain regions underlying social cognitive processing.

Second, our findings suggest that the association between a cultural trait and brain activity involved in social cognition may differ even within a cultural population. The association between a cultural trait and neural activity in the social brain network may be constrained by a specific genetic polymorphism. Moreover, the moderator effects of 5-HTTLPR were evident in the brain areas that constitute the social brain network rather than limited to a specific brain region. This network has been shown to be involved in self-reflection (e.g. mPFC and left frontal cortex, Kelley et al., 2002; Zhu et al., 2007; Han et al., 2008; 2010; Wang et al., 2012), episodic memory (e.g. hippocampus, Tulving and Markowitsch, 1998; Cavanna and Trimble, 2006), mental attribution of others (e.g. mPFC and TPJ, Gallagher et al., 2000; Saxe and Kanwisher, 2003), causal attribution of physical attributes (mPFC, cerebellum, Han et al., 2011), etc. Similarly, previous research found that neural responses to neutral words were modulated by 5-HTTLPR polymorphism in multiple brain regions such as the superior parietal lobule, superior temporal gyrus, inferior frontal gyrus, precentral gyrus and cingulate (Canli et al., 2005). Life stress also interact with 5-HTTLPR polymorphism to modulate the resting activity in multiple brain regions including the ACC, middle frontal cortex, caudate nucleus, etc (Canli et al., 2006). Given that different brain regions in the social brain network contribute to distinct (e.g. cognitive and affective) components of social cognition, it may be speculated that the 5-HTTLPR may play a broad role in moderation of the relationship between self-construals and multiple processes of social cognition (e.g. reflection on the self and mother in the current work).

Third, our findings suggest that the effect of gene \times culture interaction on human brain activity may vary across different tasks. The current study observed the moderator effects only in the brain activity during judgments on mental attributes of the self and mother but not during judgments on the physical and social attributes. Thus it appears that the neural substrates underlying self-reflection on mental attributes are vulnerable to gene × culture interaction. Alternatively, since only the words used in the mental judgment have clear negative or positive emotional values, it is possible that the gene × culture interaction might be more sensitive to emotion-related self-referential processing. This account is consistent with previous findings that the effect of 5-HTTLPR mainly focused on emotional processes, such as mood disorders (Lesch *et al.*, 1996; Sen *et al.*, 2004; Munafò *et al.*, 2005), amygdala reactivity to emotional stimuli (Hariri *et al.*, 2002; Canli *et al.*, 2005) and dACC/insular activity related to negative selfreflection (Ma, Li, *et al.*, 2014).

Forth, our findings suggest a possible way of gene × culture interaction on human brain and mind. Gene-culture coevolution theory (Boyd and Richerson, 1985) proposes that culture influences environments in which genetic selection occurs. In support of this theory, it has been shown that a cultural trait can influence the spread of a gene in a specific sociocultural environment (see Laland et al., 2010 for a review). In addition, cultures interact with genes to influence human behaviors such that self-reported emotional support seeking behaviors show opposite patterns of genetic variation in Western and East Asian cultures (Kim et al., 2010, 2011). While recent research suggests that genes are changing as a result of cultural variations and cultural evolution often plays the leading role during human evolution (Richerson et al., 2010), the current study suggests another way of gene × culture interaction, that is, individual differences in the association between a cultural trait and brain activity underlying social cognition are constrained by a specific genetic polymorphism. Such a pattern of gene × culture interaction may provide a biological basis of the assumption that genetic polymorphism influence the probability that a particular cultural trait will be adopted by individuals (Feldman and Laland, 1996).

Our findings also raise a few interesting questions for future research. We found evidence for genetic moderation of the association between interdependence of self-construals and the social brain network only in Chinese participants. Previous research has shown that the s allele frequency is different across different cultural groups, being much higher in Asian than Caucasian populations (Kunugi *et al.*, 1997). The interdependence of self-construals dominates East Asian populations whereas the independence of self-construals is encouraged in Western populations (Markus and Kitayama, 1991). Given these biological and cultural differences among populations, future research should address whether the genetic moderation effect observed in our work also exists in Western cultural contexts.

The current work reported the association between self-construals and brain activity during reflection on the self and mother but did not address why the correlation between interdependence of self-construal and neural activity was positive in some brain regions but negative in other brain regions in l/l allele carriers. It is likely that the distinct patterns of associations between a cultural trait and neural activity in the social brain network may reflect the fact that a specific cultural trait may facilitate one neural strategy but inhibit another neural strategy related to social cognition. This may be tested in future research.

Finally, the previous research found that depressive symptoms in s allele carriers are more sensitive to life experiences (e.g. Caspi et al., 2003), whereas the current work reported evidence for the association between a cultural trait and neural activity in the social brain network in l/l but not s/s carriers. There are at least two possible reasons for these different observations. One possibility is that s/s carriers in Chinese population adopt the interdependence to a strong degree such that s/s genotype individuals showed little variation of the association between interdependent self-construals and the social brain network activity. However, this may not be the case because selfreport interdependence did not differ significantly between s/s and l/ l carriers (the mean rating scores of interdependence was even higher in l/l than s/s carriers). Alternatively, it is possible that l/l carriers as a minority in Chinese population might be more sensitive to a cultural trait (i.e. interdependence) than s/s carriers and thus showed greater variations of the association between interdependent self-construals. This implicates that life experiences associated with an individual and cultural traits linked to a population may interact with genes in different fashions. This speculation may be clarified in future research.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary data are available at SCAN online.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

REFERENCES

- Aiken, L.S., West, S.G. (1991). Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Boyd, R., Richerson, P.J. (1985). Culture and the Evolutionary Process. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Brothers, L. (1990). The social brain: a project for integrating primate behavior and neurophysiology in a new domain. *Concepts in Neuroscience*, 1, 27–51.
- Canli, T., Omura, K., Haas, B.W., Fallgatter, A., Constable, R.T., Lesch, K.P. (2005). Beyond affect: a role for genetic variation of the serotonin transporter in neural activation during a cognitive attention task. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* USA, 102, 12224–9.
- Canli, T., Qiu, M., Omura, K., et al. (2006). Neural correlates of epigenesis. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, 103, 16033–8.
- Caspi, A., Sugden, K., Moffitt, T.E., et al. (2003). Influence of life stress on depression: moderation by a polymorphism in the 5-HTT gene. Science, 301, 386–9.
- Cavanna, A.E., Trimble, M.R. (2006). The precuneus: a review of its functional anatomy and behavioural correlates. *Brain*, 129, 564–83.
- Chiao, J.Y., Harada, T., Komeda, H., et al. (2009). Neural basis of individualistic and collectivistic views of self. *Human Brain Mapping*, *30*, 2813–20.

- Chiao, J.Y., Blizinsky, K.D. (2010). Culture-gene coevolution of individualism-collectivism and the serotonin transporter gene. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 277, 529–37.
- Chiao, J.Y., Cheon, B.K., Pornpattananangkul, N., Mrazek, A.J., Blizinsky, K.D. (2013). Cultural neuroscience: progress and promise. *Psychological Inquiry*, 24, 1–19.
- Cloninger, C.R., Svrakic, D.M., Przybeck, T.R. (1993). A psychobiological model of temperament and character. Archives of General Psychiatry, 50, 975–90.
- Falk, E.B., Berkman, E.T., Mann, T., Harrison, B., Lieberman, M.D. (2010). Predicting persuasion-induced behavior change from the brain. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 30, 8421–4.
- Feldman, M.W., Laland, K.N. (1996). Gene-culture coevolutionary theory. Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 11, 453-7.
- Gallagher, H.L., Happé, F., Brunswick, N., Fletcher, P.C., Frith, U., Frith, C.D. (2000). Reading the mind in cartoons and stories: an fMRI study of 'theory of mind' in verbal and nonverbal tasks. *Neuropsychologia*, 38, 11–21.
- Han, S., Northoff, G. (2008). Culture-sensitive neural substrates of human cognition: a transcultural neuroimaging approach. *Nature Review Neuroscience*, 9, 646–54.
- Han, S., Mao, L., Gu, X., Zhu, Y., Ge, J., Ma, Y. (2008). Neural consequences of religious belief on self-referential processing. *Social Neuroscience*, *3*, 1–15.
- Han, S., Northoff, G. (2009). Understanding the self: a cultural neuroscience approach. Progress in Brain Research, 178, 203–12.
- Han, S., Gu, X., Mao, L., Ge, J., Wang, G., Ma, Y. (2010). Neural substrates of self-referential processing in Chinese Buddhists. Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 5, 332–39.
- Han, S., Mao, L., Qin, J., Friederici, A.D., Ge, J. (2011). Functional roles and cultural modulations of the medial prefrontal and parietal activity associated with causal attribution. *Neuropsychologia*, 49, 83–91.
- Han, S., Northoff, G., Vogeley, K., Wexler, B.E., Kitayama, S., Varnum, M.E. (2013). A cultural neuroscience approach to the biosocial nature of the human brain. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 64, 335–59.
- Hariri, A.R., Mattay, V.S., Tessitore, A., et al. (2002). Serotonin transporter genetic variation and the response of the human amygdala. *Science*, 297, 400–3.
- Heatherton, T.F., Wyland, C.L., Macrae, C.N., Demos, K.E., Denney, B.T., Kelley, W.M. (2006). Medial prefrontal activity differentiates self from close others. *Social Cognitive* and Affective Neuroscience, 1, 18–25.
- Iacoboni, M. (2006). Failure to deactivate in autism: the co-constitution of self and other. *Trends in cognitive sciences, 10,* 431–3.
- Jenkins, A.C., Mitchell, J.P. (2011). Medial prefrontal cortex subserves diverse forms of self-reflection. Social Neuroscience, 6, 211-8.
- Kelley, W.M., Macrae, C.N., Wyland, C.L., Caglar, S., Inati, S., Heatherton, T.F. (2002). Finding the self? An event-related fMRI study. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 14, 785–94.
- Kendler, K.S., Prescott, C.A. (2006). *Genes, Environment and Psychopathology*. New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Kim, H.S., Sherman, D.K., Sasaki, J.Y., et al. (2010). Culture, distress and oxytocin receptor polymorphism (OXTR) interact to influence emotional support seeking. *Proceedings of* the National Academy of Sciences USA, 107, 15717–21.
- Kim, H.S., Sherman, D.K., Mojaverian, T., et al. (2011). Gene-culture interaction: oxytocin receptor polymorphism (OXTR) and emotion regulation. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 2, 665–72.
- Kitayama, S., Park, J. (2010). Cultural neuroscience of the self: understanding the social grounding of the brain. Social Psychological and Personality Science, 5, 111–29.
- Kobayashi, C., Glover, G.H., Temple, E. (2006). Cultural and linguistic influence on neural bases of 'Theory of Mind': an fMRI study with Japanese bilinguals. *Brain and Language*, 98, 210–20.
- Kunugi, H., Hattori, M., Kato, T., et al. (1997). Serotonin transporter gene polymorphisms: ethnic difference and possible association with bipolar affective disorder. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 2, 457–62.
- Laland, K.N., Odling-Smee, J., Myles, S. (2010). How cultures shaped the human genome: bringing genetics and andedScie]TJhC., GSocianal269.830R(emple,views2t4(S60.1(ene-cult-3

Ger e \times cultural trait ir teractior or the social brair retwork

- Markus, H.R., Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: implication for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98, 224–53.
- Munafò, M.R., Clark, T., Flint, J. (2005). Does measurement instrument moderate the association between the serotonin transporter gene and anxiety-related personality traits? A meta-analysis. *Molecular Psychiatry*, 10, 415–9.
- Ota, M., Fukushima, H., Kulski, J.K., Inoko, H. (2007). Single nucleotide polymorphism detection by polymerase chain reaction-restriction fragment length polymorphism. *Nature Protocols*, 2, 2857–64.
- Pluess, M., Belsky, J., Way, B.M., Taylor, S.E. (2010). 5-HTTLPR moderates effects of current life events on neuroticism: differential susceptibility to environmental influences. Progress in Neuro-Psychopharmacology and Biological Psychiatry, 34, 1070–4.
- Richerson, P.J., Boyd, R., Herich, J. (2010). Gene-culture coevolution in the age of genomics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA, 107, 8985–92.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sasaki, J.Y., Kim, H.S., Mojaverian, T., Kelley, L.D., Park, I.Y., Janusonis, S. (2013). Religion priming differentially increases prosocial behavior among variants of the dopamine D4 receptor (DRD4) gene. Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 8, 209–15.
- Saxe, R., Kanwisher, N. (2003). People thinking about thinking people: the role of temporo-parietal junction in 'theory of mind'. *NeuroImage*, 19, 1835–42.

- Sedikides, C., Skowronski, J.J. (2009). Social cognition and self-cognition: two sides of the same evolutionary coin? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 1245–9.
- Sen, S., Burmeister, M., Ghosh, D. (2004). Meta-analysis of the association between a serotonin transporter promoter polymorphism (5-HTTLPR) and anxiety-related personality traits. American Journal of Medical Genetics Part B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics, 127, 85–9.
- Singelis, T.M. (1994). The measurement of independent and interdependent self-construals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 580–91.*
- Sul, S., Choi, I., Kang, P. (2012). Cultural modulation of self-referential brain activity for personality traits and social identities. *Social Neuroscience*, 7, 280–91.
- Taylor, S.E., Way, B.M., Welch, W.T., Hilmert, C.J., Lehman, B.J., Eisenberger, N.I. (2006). Early family environment, current adversity, the serotonin transporter promoter polymorphism, and depressive symptomatology. *Biological Psychiatry*, 60, 671–6.
- Tulving, E., Markowitsch, H.J. (1998). Episodic and declarative memory: role of the hippocampus. *Hippocampus*, 8, 198–204.
- Wang, G., Mao, L., Ma, Y., et al. (2012). Neural representations of close others in collectivistic brains. Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience, 7, 222–9.
- Zhu, Y., Zhang, L., Fan, J., Han, S. (2007). Neural basis of cultural influence on self representation. *NeuroImage*, 34, 1310–7.